

FULBOURN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

FULBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Prepared by Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
on behalf of Fulbourn Parish Council

October 2021

V5.3 – Draft Plan Submission Stage

CONTENTS

1. Background to Consultation	3
1.1. Introduction	3
1.2. Aims of the consultation process	3
2. The Initial Steps	4
3. The Parish Plan	4
3.1. Overview	4
4. Subsequent Activities	5
4.2. Engagement Log and actions taken.....	6
5. Reg 14 Pre-submission Consultation	11
5.1. An overview of consultation activity.....	11
5.2. Pre-Submission Consultation Responses	13
Appendix 1. Regulation 14 pre-submission Consultation - Web Page	14
Appendix 2. List of Statutory Consultees	15
Appendix 3. Other Consultees	18
Appendix 4. Regulation 14 Consultation – Email to Consultees	19
Appendix 5. Regulation 14 pre-submission Consultation – List of Responses Received ...	20
Appendix 6. Regulation 14 pre-submission Consultation –Responses and Modifications ..	21

1. BACKGROUND TO CONSULTATION

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This consultation statement explains the consultation process that was undertaken in producing the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Development Plan (referred to in this document as the Neighbourhood Plan). It demonstrates how the requirements of Regulation 14 and 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (2012) Regulations have been satisfied in producing the Neighbourhood Plan
- 1.1.2. It includes all the non-statutory consultation, the consultation with statutory bodies and other stakeholders undertaken during the Neighbourhood Plan's development. It documents the issues raised, how these have been considered in the plan making process and any changes that have been made to the Neighbourhood Plan as a result of the Regulation 14 consultation.
- 1.1.3. Fulbourn Parish Council has from the beginning of the plan process committed to the ambition that the Neighbourhood Plan should be developed with the full input of the community. Every effort has been made to consult with the community in a meaningful way at every stage of the Plan's development. Latterly of course the impact of the Covid Pandemic has restricted the "face to face" opportunities and reliance has been placed on our web site and circulation to each house/premises.
- 1.1.4. The work started in 2018 with the aim to engage as many people as possible. The team had the benefit of the already produced Parish Plan and the process has been very much an update and addition to that valuable work.

1.2. Aims of the consultation process

- 1.2.1. The aims of the process were:
 - To involve as many people as possible in the Plan's development
 - To ensure that the Parish Plan, agreed by the Parish council as the start point for the Neighbourhood Plan's development was still relevant.
 - To ensure that consultation took place at critical points in the process.
 - To keep people informed of the Plan's progress.
 - Provide a tool for continuous input.

2. THE INITIAL STEPS

- 2.1.1. On the 7th March 2018 a public meeting was held to consider the development of a Neighbourhood Plan for the village. Representatives from South Cambridgeshire District Council were present to outline all that would be involved. After discussion it was agreed in principle to move forward with establishing a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.1.2. At the March Parish Council on 14th March it was agreed to move forward with the development of a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.1.3. Publicity articles were included within the PUMP (the Parish Council quarterly magazine which is delivered to all houses within Fulbourn) and THE MILL (a monthly village magazine circulated on subscription to around 500 houses). A “kick-off” meeting was advertised for 11th April and all were invited.
- 2.1.4. At the meeting a Steering Group of 16 interested villagers and subgroups covering Social, Economic and Environmental issues were established.

3. THE PARISH PLAN

3.1. Overview

- 3.1.1. The Parish Council had implemented a Parish Plan process starting in 2007 and culminating in a Parish Plan in 2009 together with associated Action Plans.
- 3.1.2. The information gathering to devise the plan was centred on a detailed questionnaire drawn up by the overall steering team.
- 3.1.3. The format of the questionnaire enabled all those living in each household to express their views. The questionnaire was split into the following sections:-
 - Household Section covering type of accommodation, numbers living in each household etc.
 - Personal Section covering gender, age, what is important to you about the village, employment status, services used, environment etc.
 - Youth questionnaire for 11-16 year olds.
 - A page for general comments.
- 3.1.4. The questionnaires were completed by 653 households involving 1474 residents. This represented a response rate of 32% given that there were 2021 properties and 4673 residents according to figures obtained from District and County Council. All the statistical analysis was carried out by Warwick University.
- 3.1.5. Working Groups took the information forward and formulated draft proposals in the following areas:-
 - Planning

- Housing
- Business and Employment
- Conservation and Environment
- Roads and Transport
- Safety and Policing
- Health
- Education and Library
- Religion
- Shopping
- Clubs and Sports
- Youth
- Communication

3.1.6. The resulting plan was delivered to each house and subject to public exhibition. Action plans were established and have helped to formulate actions taken subsequently. The whole process was funded by the Parish Council at a cost of £10,000.

3.1.7. By 2018 the number of properties had grown to 2185 and the population to c5000 (no formal figure available). This represented an increase of less than 8%.

3.1.8. Subsequently the Parish Council confirmed that the Parish Plan should form the basis of the Neighbourhood Plan. This approach would enable the working groups to delve into key areas without the need to embark on a major data gathering which would involve both cost and time.

4. SUBSEQUENT ACTIVITIES

4.1.1. During 2018 and 2019 many focus groups, full team meetings and discussions were held. Articles were circulated in the Pump and Mill and key questionnaires were designed and followed up by the working groups.

4.2. Engagement Log and actions taken

The following log details the many and varied consultations carried out during the drafting of the Plan.

The number shown in the "Ref" column identifies the supporting document that is contained within the evidence base located at https://tinyurl.com/Fulbourn-NPDate	Activity	Ref	Participants
2008	Parish Plan Survey	232 233	Approximately 2000 homes within the Parish area
2009	Parish Plan (with Action Plans)	230	Report made available to the Fulbourn Community.
7March2018	Neighbourhood Plan Public Meeting (at Swifts Meeting Rooms)	139	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
14March2018	Parish Council Meeting Presentation to the Parish Council (Public Meeting) of the opportunity for Fulbourn to undertake a Neighbourhood Plan	140	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
April	Publicity articles inserted in Parish Magazine (Pump) and Village Magazine (The Mill) To be repeated in subsequent issues	610	Parish Pump circulates quarterly to 2000 Parish households The Mill circulates monthly by subscription
11April2018	Kick-off meeting of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan Team. (Open to public) Establishment of three sub-groups based on Social, Economic and Environmental issues.	731	Attendees listed on minutes Team members drawn from the village community..
9May2018	Parish Meeting	142	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
30May2018	NP Team meeting (Open to public)	732	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
24June2018	Display at 'Village Feast' event A hand-out leaflet produced	612	Predominantly attended by Fulbourn residents.
11July2018	Parish Council Meeting	141	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded

The number shown in the "Ref" column identifies the supporting document that is contained within the evidence base located at https://tinyurl.com/Fulbourn-NPDate	Activity	Ref	Participants
July2018	Set up of the Village Design Statement team. Application for SCDC funding Appointment of consultants.		Team drawn from interested residents
2018	Village Design Study awareness campaign involving circulation of leaflets		To entire village population by leaflets to homes and also via village community publications (The Mill, Parish Pump)
25July2018	NP Team meeting (Open to public)	733	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
Aug2018	Designation of Fulbourn Parish as a Neighbourhood Area	124	
Sept2018	Publicity articles inserted in Village Magazine (The Mill)	611	
17Sept2018	NP Team meeting (Open to public)	734	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
Oct2018	Poster exhibited at village locations	616	
Oct2018	Neighbourhood Plan Web Site launched. <i>www.fulbournneighbourhoodplan.org</i> Notified via posters and articles in The Mill and Parish Pump. Links from other community websites Web site updated to allow questions, input and information requests		Anyone with web access.
17Oct2018	Meeting with SCDC	791	Attendees listed on minutes
20Nov2018	NP Team meeting (Open to public)	735	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
Dec2018	Publicity articles inserted in Village Magazine (The Mill)	613	Established circulation
Dec2018	Flyer distributed at Community Market	614	

The number shown in the "Ref" column identifies the supporting document that is contained within the evidence base located at https://tinyurl.com/Fulbourn-NPDate	Activity	Ref	Participants
07Nov2018	<p>Village Design Study Consultation Day.</p> <p>A series of activities to enable the community to contribute to the Village Design Study.</p> <p>Included an initial presentation by the consultants followed by group walks around the village.</p> <p>Several follow-up feedback sessions collected views arising from the day</p>		<p>The Fulbourn Community.</p> <p>The event was notified by posters and leaflets.</p> <p>Approximately 50 attended the opening session and 30 the evening discussions.</p>
Nov2018	Recreation facilities survey issued	473 475 476	
7Jan2019	NP Team meeting (Open to public)	736	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
March2019	<p>Facebook page set up for Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Linked to other village interest Facebook pages</p>		Facebook users
March2019	Update Leaflet produced to outline the Neighbourhood Plan key issues and to update on the process.	617	
6March2019	NP Team meeting (Open to public)	737	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
9March2019	<p>Community Market (Event)</p> <p>Distribution of Update Leaflet</p>	617	<p>Available via the Fulbourn Forum stalls at the Community Market, 9Mar2019.</p> <p>Approximately 250 predominantly Fulbourn residents attended.</p>

The number shown in the "Ref" column identifies the supporting document that is contained within the evidence base located at https://tinyurl.com/Fulbourn-NPDate	Activity	Ref	Participants
2April2019	Distribution of Update Leaflet 20x to Surgery, also to their community noticeboard 20x to school, laid out in reception area 20x to Twelve, also to their community noticeboard 20x to Library 10x to Swifts leaflet rack	617	Fulbourn residents who use these locations
12April2019	Update Leaflet circulated within the 'Parish Pump magazine	617	2000 households within the Fulbourn area
12April2019	Questionnaire to residents on the Parish Council allotment waiting list. Included stamped return envelope. Questions investigated their continued interest, willingness to travel and what price they might pay.	315	18 residents who were on the Parish Council Allotment Waiting List at the end of March 2019 as they had previously registered an interest in a local allotment.
18April2019	NP Team meeting (Open to public) Work-shop sessions with Consultants	739	Team members from each of the subject groups.
24April2019	Parish Council Annual General Meeting The PC AGM is an event where residents are informed by Councillors as to activities over the year. An agenda item was a presentation on the progress of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan.	143	10 Councillors 22 Fulbourn residents
25April2019	Public consultation on the draft final version of the Village Design Study. (The Swifts).		Community notified via 'Parish Pump' magazine, posters on visit noticeboards, announcement at Parish Council AGM on 24April and hand-out leaflets
6June2019	NP Team meeting (Open to public)	740	Team members from each of the subject groups.

The number shown in the "Ref" column identifies the supporting document that is contained within the evidence base located at https://tinyurl.com/Fulbourn-NPDate	Activity	Ref	Participants
8June2019	NP Information Stand at Community Market Questionnaire circulated, leaflet available	619	150 visitors to the event
July2019	Questionnaire circulated within the July 'Parish Pump magazine	620 621	2000 households within the Fulbourn area
9Sept2019	NP Team Meeting (Open to public)	741	Team members from each of the subject groups.
19Sept2019	Parish Council Meeting (Open to public)	144	Attendees listed on minutes Public identities not recorded
Oct2020	Website updated with consultation docs	n/a	Consultation documents and page to leave comments at; www.fulbournneighbourhoodplan.org
Oct2020	Article in The Mill (Pre-consultation briefing)	624	Established circulation
Oct2020	Article in The Parish Pump (PC approval)	625	2000 households within the Fulbourn area
Nov2020 Dec2020	Executive Summary to all households	627	Final Version 30Nov2020, circulated to village 28Dec2020
Dec2020	The Village Pump, NP Special Edition,	628	Outline awareness plus notification of consultation.
1Jan2021	Consultation period starts		
4Jan2021	Statutory Bodies email list	652	Provided by Ron Ward. (4Jan2021)
1Feb2021	Fulbourn Forum, Consultation Notification, Feb2021	653	
2Feb2021	The Mill, Consultation Notification, Feb2021	654	
25Feb2021	SCDC Letter to F. Parish Council Feb 2021	655	Covering Letter
25Feb2021	SCDC response to F.NP Draft Feb 2021	656	Comments from SCDC on Reg14 F.NP
25Feb2021	Moss Response to F.NP Reg14 Feb2021	657	Comments from Moss Charity & Moss Fam'

- 4.2.1. The following key activities were actioned:-
- July 2019. Questionnaire to each house using the PUMP magazine
 - November 2018. Recreation facilities survey issued to all clubs, societies etc.
 - Spring 2019. Questionnaire to 235 businesses listed on Yell.com, Endole and others known.
- 4.2.2. In early 2019 it was agreed that experienced support was needed to progress the initial data gathering into an appropriate neighbourhood plan format so that policies defined were workable and met legal requirements. Urban Silence, a consultancy with experience in the field of Neighbourhood Plans, who had supported South Cambridgeshire District Council in their work with Fulbourn on the Village Design Guide were appointed.
- 4.2.3. During 2020 the work focussed on the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan following all the consultation work and group work. A draft pre-submission plan was subject to much review in the latter part of 2020 including helpful support from South Cambridgeshire District Planning Department.
- 4.2.4. All the work related to Reg 14 Pre-Submission Consultation is detailed below in Chapter 5.
- 4.2.5. The Covid pandemic has of course restricted face to face exhibitions, meetings etc. To seek to mitigate this, as can be seen from the Engagement Log, we have relied on ensuring publicity to each household and premises within the village. An executive summary of the Plan was distributed and extensive publicity of the online evidence base, draft plan, communication channels etc. was actioned.
- 4.2.6. Chapter 5 goes into much more detail of the steps taken during Regulation 14 Consultation and the responses. All have been logged, discussed by the Steering Team supported by our consultants, and relevant amendments made.

5. REG 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

5.1. An overview of consultation activity

5.1.1. The Fulbourn Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation was held between 1st January 2021 and 28th February 2021 – a period of just over 8 weeks.

5.1.2. We consulted:

- Statutory Organisations & consultation bodies
- Residents
- Community/Voluntary Organisations
- Businesses
- Landowners

- Neighbouring Parishes
- Bodies that represent the interests of particular groups
- Other individuals and organisations that had opted in for plan communications

5.1.3. As a result of the restrictions imposed by the Covid pandemic on meetings and the limitations in respect of providing hard copies of the draft plan in a central location for review all material related to the consultation were provided via a web site with links to the draft plan documents, maps and the evidence base of documents supporting the conclusions and proposals included in the plan. An online form was also provided allowing reviewers to provide direct comments via the web site.

5.1.4. A copy of the web page including the online form is provided in Appendix 1.

5.1.5. The web site was actively publicised in local media, on local notice boards, in the parish magazine (The Mill), a special edition of the Parish Council Magazine (The Pump), via South Cambridgeshire District Council and in a direct mail drop comprising an Executive Summary of the plan with a hard copy feedback form to all residents.

5.1.6. An email was sent to statutory consultees and other interested parties providing full details of the web site and access to all the relevant documents. A full list of the statutory consultees, community groups and other bodies are listed in Appendices 2 and 3. A copy of the email sent to statutory and other consultees is provided in Appendix 4.

5.2. Pre-Submission Consultation Responses

- 5.2.1. In total 54 responses from a variety of consultees were received to the Regulation 14 pre-consultation process. The details of the points and observations raised and indication of the actions taken is provided in Appendix 5.
- 5.2.2. A total of 33 responses were received from residents: 25 online, 5 paper based and 3 by email.
- 5.2.3. A total of 5 responses were received from statutory consultees
- 5.2.4. A total of 16 responses were received from other interested parties including businesses, builders and property developers and organisations with interests in the local area.
- 5.2.5. A meeting with South Cambridgeshire District Council was held in June 2021 to discuss their key comments and concerns.
- 5.2.6. The revised Neighbourhood Plan (Submission Draft – October 2021) takes account of all the inputs received to date.

Appendix 1.

Regulation 14 pre-submission Consultation - Web Page

Tell us how Fulbourn can thrive!

The Fulbourn Parish Council and a group of volunteers from the village has been working for the past two years to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan to influence the development the village and the wider Parish. A draft plan has now been approved by the Parish Council to provide the basis for the next stage of consultation, a process know as **Regulation 14 pre-Submission Consultation**.

This is your opportunity to tell us what you think.

The formal consultation period runs from 1st January 2021 to 28th February 2021.

The draft Plan and all the associated documents can be found online via the links to the right (at the bottom of the page on a mobile device).

Your comments or questions can be submitted online using the form below or sent directly to the Parish Council, Fulbourn Hub, Home End, Fulbourn, CB21 5BS.

In normal circumstances, hard copies of all documents would be made available for viewing around the Parish and elsewhere but this is not currently possible due to Covid restrictions. If you require a hard copy please contact the Parish Council or make a request via the form.

Your Name *

First

Last

As part of the Reg.14 Pre-submission Consultation process, we need to ask you provide your name and an email address. These, and any other contact details you share, will be used only for the purposes of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan and will be shared with South Cambridgeshire District Council (Statutory Planning Authority). Please refer to our Privacy Policy (link below) for further information.

Your Email address *

We may contact you to follow up on your feedback.

Please Indicate your connection with Fulbourn *

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fulbourn Resident | <input type="checkbox"/> Work in Fulbourn |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fulbourn Business | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Organisation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Statutory Consultee | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Please check any that apply

Business/Organisation Name

Your comments on the Plan *

For specific comments on the plan documents, please include the document name, page and paragraph numbers where relevant to help us relate you comments to the plan.

Your Postcode

Your Street Address

Your Telephone Number

Submit

Links to the Plan

All links will open in a new window. Switch back to this page to comment as you read.

The Plan

[The Plan](#) - a low resolution version for faster loading on slow links

All Plan Documents & Maps

[Evidence Base](#) - the documents supporting the conclusions and proposals included in the plan

Evidence Base Index

Engagement Log

[Privacy Policy](#)

Parish Council Office, Fulbourn Hub, Home End, Fulbourn, Cambridge CB21 5BS

© 2021 Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan. Bento theme by Satori Studio

Appendix 2. List of Statutory Consultees

A list of Statutory Consultees was provided by South Cambs District Council. All on the list were contacted by email for the purpose of Reg 14 Pre-Submission Consultation.

Consultation Body	Contact
Local Planning Authority	neighbourhood.planning@scambs.gov.uk
County Council	Transport: Richard.lumley@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Flood and Waste Management: fr.planning@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Other Matters: Graham.hughes@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Jeremy.smith@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Neighbouring Parishes	Babraham: clerk@babraham-village.net Balsham: Tracy@Coston.me.uk Gt. Wilbraham: ClerkGW@wilbrahams.co.uk Lt. Wilbraham: clerkLW@wilbrahams.co.uk Teversham: clerk@teversham.info
Neighbouring Local Planning Authority	Cambridge City Council: Claire.flowers@cambridge.gov.uk
The Coal Authority	thecoalauthority@coal.gov.uk
Homes and Communities Agency (replaced by Homes England)	deanharris@hca.gsi.gov.uk
Natural England	consultation@naturalengland.org.uk
Environment Agency	Planning Liaison Officer: Adam.ireland@environment-agency.gov.uk
Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England	edward.james@historicengland.org.uk
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	steven.taylor@networkrail.co.uk
A strategic highways company part of whose area is in or adjoins the neighbourhood area	Highways England: David.abbott@highwaysengland.co.uk
Where the Secretary of State is the highway authority for any road in the area of a local planning authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the neighbourhood area, the Secretary of State for Transport	Not applicable
Marine Management Organisation	Not applicable

<p>Any person</p> <p>i) to whom the electronic code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106 (3) (a) of the Communications Act 2003; and</p> <p>ii) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority</p>	<p>National Grid Development Liaison Officer: box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com</p> <p>EE: Public.affairs@ee.co.uk</p> <p>Openreach: clive.selley@openreach.co.uk</p> <p>Vodafone: emf.enquiries@ctil.co.uk</p>
<p>Where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clinical commissioning group established under section 14D of the National Health Service Act 2006 • The national health service commissioning board • A person to whom a license has been granted under section 6 (1) (b) and (c) of the Electricity Act • A person to whom a license has been granted under section 1(2) of the Gas Act 1986 • A sewage undertaker • A water undertaker 	<p>NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Trust: Jessica.bawden@nhs.net tina.almond@nhs.net</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust: Alison.manton@cpft.nhs.uk</p> <p>Cambridge Universities Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust: Lawrence.ashelford@addenbrookes.nhs.net</p> <p>UK Power Networks: enquiries@ukpowernetworks.co.uk</p> <p>Anglian Water: spatience@anglianwater.co.uk</p> <p>South Staffs Water (Cambridge Water): philnewland@south-staffs-water.co.uk danielclark@south-staffs-water.co.uk</p>
<p>Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum: Philip.clark@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</p>
<p>Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire Race Equality learn.together@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</p> <p>Age UK: Lynne.byrne@ageuk.org.uk</p>
<p>Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area</p>	<p>Dioceses of Ely: Paul.evans@elydiocese.org</p>
<p>Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area</p>	<p>Federation of Small Businesses: David.barnes@fsb.org.uk</p> <p>Cambridge Chamber of Commerce: j.bridge@cambsccl.co.uk</p>
<p>Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area</p>	<p>Disability Cambridge: info@disability-cambridgeshire.org.uk</p>

Other organisations whose interests may be affected by the proposals of the plan

Cambridge Area Bus Users:
secretary.cabu@gmail
Sustrans (Cycle Network):
secretary.cabu@gmail
Cambs Past Present and Future:
ceo@cambridgeppf.org
Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership:
contactus@greatercambridge.org.uk

Appendix 3. Other Consultees

Other Consultees were drawn from a list held by South Cambs District Council of individuals and organisations who have asked to be kept informed of Neighbourhood Plans and their development. They were therefore contacted as part of the Reg 14 Consultation process.

Adrian Moxon	Anne Rutland	Avison Young
Axiom Developments	AXIS Land Partnerships	Barker Parry Town Planners
Bidwells	bpha (Housing Association)	Britesparx
Brown & Co	John Buxton	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cambridgeshire Land	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Camcycle
Carter Jonas	Chalky Paul Taylor	Chris Few
Claremont Planning	Cofinitive	Commercial Estates Group
Cottenham PC	Countryside Properties	Deloitte
D Gant	DLP Consultants	DPDS Planning Consultancy
Dr. Bates	Durman Stearn	Eclipse Planning Services
E Halford	ESCOP Developments	Fournorthfield
Fred Hancock	GW Padley	Gladman
Hill	Histon & Impington Parish Council	Hopkins Homes
Howes Percival	Huntingdonshire Council	Hutchinsons Planning
IM Land	JK Design	John Boyle
Julie Norman	KG Moss Will Trust and the Moss Family	Lesley Golding
Lisa Hudson	Logistics UK (FTA)	Lynda Warth
Matt Lockyer	Meriem Mckenzie	Michael Osbourn
Mjred House	Navigate Planning	NewBreed CPS
North Herts Council	Northwest Biotherapeutics	Orchestra Land
Over PC	P. Knighton	Parker Planning Services
Paul Milliner	Peaseacom	Persimmon Homes
Peter Burge	PHPJ	PILGP
Plansurv	Popplewell	Prana Chavan
Pryer Consultancy	Pumpkin	Quod
R2 Developments	RJ Willis	Roe Buckland
Savills	Scott Properties	SF Planning
SMG Hughes	Sophie Raven	Sphere 25
SSA Planning	Stephen Sheree	Storey Homes
Strutt and Parker	Studio Partington	Tag Uk
Taylor Wimpey	Terence O'Rourke	Teversham PC
Thakeham	Theatre Trust	Think Trees
Tibbalds Homes	Tulley Bunting	Y Reynolds
Welbeck Land	Woodland Trust	

Appendix 4. Regulation 14 Consultation – Email to Consultees



Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan

4 January 2021 at 15:27

Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 pre-Submission Consultation

[Details](#)

To: fulbournnp.reg14@gmail.com Bcc: & 93 more

Hello,

The Fulbourn Parish Council has approved the draft Neighbourhood Plan to go forward for Regulation 14 pre-Submission Consultation. The draft has also been reviewed by South Cambridgeshire District Council. We are now seeking your comments as part of the Regulation 14 Consultation Process.

The draft plan can be viewed at www.fulbournneighbourhoodplan.org

The consultation period began on January 1st and ends on 28th February 2021.

If you wish to comment on the plan please use the form on the web site or if you prefer you may either email your comments as a reply to this email or send them to the Parish Clerk at Fulbourn Parish Office, Fulbourn Hub, Cambridge CB21 5BS.

Regards

Tish Newman Parish Clerk

Note

This email has been sent to you either because you have been identified as a Statutory Consultee for the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan or because you have previously opted-in to receive communications concerning the Plan. If you believe you have received this email in error or you no longer wish to receive communications concerning the Plan please notify the sender and destroy it.

GDPR - Please see the Plan website for the Data Privacy Notice at www.fulbournneighbourhoodplan.org

Appendix 5. Regulation 14 pre-submission Consultation – List of Responses Received

All stakeholders and residents who responded to the Reg. 14 Consultation are listed below. The three digit code is used to cross reference their comments in Appendix 6.

Residents	Statutory Bodies
R01 David Oldfield	S01 Anglian Water
R02 Pam Collis	S02 South Cambs District Council
R03 Ruth Sexton	S03 Historic England
R04 Darryl Goddard	S04 National Grid
R05 John Cooter-Baker	S05 Cambridge County Council Flood Risk
R06 Hannah James	Other Interested Parties
R07 Jean and Richard Doe	B01 Gary Robinson
R08 Timothy Vaughan-Lane	O01 Philippa MacGarry
R09 Gill Aslett	O02 Wallace Land Investment and Management
R10 Irene Hall	O03 Mark Jackson, MillerHomes Ltd
R11 Gary & Linda Topham	O04 Matthew Punshon
R12 Justyna Muraczewska	O05 KG Moss Will Trust
R13 Bernard Smith	O06 British Horse Society
R14 Simon Chubb	O07 Countryside
R15 Fiona Ewart	O08 Penelope Davies-Brown
R16 Amanda M. Beart	O09 Ely Diocesan Board of Finance (EDBF)
R17 Dudley Hedge	O10 Wallace Land Investment and Management
R18 J Harding	O11 Castlefield International
R19 Audrey Dean	O12 Hill Residential
R20 Laurie Butler	O13 Peterhouse College & Guys & St Thomas' Charity
R21 Christopher Meakin	O14 Fulbourn Forum
R22 Rebecca Roberts	O15 Cambridge Past Present and Future
R23 Karl Dembicki	
R24 Vivienne Sanders	
R25 Julia Rogers	
R26 Penny Seddon	
R27 Eve Hartmann	
R28 Peter Jackson	
R29 David Gant	
R30 Peter Collis	
R31 Ian Gould	
R32 Norman Gutteridge	
R33 Peter Salt	

Appendix 6. Regulation 14 pre-submission Consultation –Responses and Modifications

The following table details the responses received during the Reg 14 consultation period and the subsequent action taken. The comments are presented as received. For simplicity they are listed following the page sequence of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The 'Ref' column relates to the reference in Appendix 5 against each respondent.

Ref	Policy/Plan Ref.	Comment	Action
S02	All policies	<p>Clear, unambiguous policies:</p> <p>4. In reading through your plan, we are aware that there are some policies which do not have this clarity. There is a risk that if planning permissions were to be shaped and determined in line with these policies the future development may not achieve what the parish council in preparing the plan had intended. There should not be room for a reasonable person to be able to misinterpret your aspirations. There is also the possibility of a legal challenges to the exact wording of policies where they fail to provide clarity.</p> <p>5. To test the usability of your policies you may wish to look at recent planning applications within your parish and see whether you are able to assess these applications against your policies. Are they implementable? It may help to have others who have not been involved in writing a particular policy to carry out this task.</p>	<p>Policies reviewed and amended for clarity</p> <p>Noted</p>
S02	Policies Maps and Figures	<p>6. The maps in your Plan are well presented but are too small scale to show the whole parish especially for those unfamiliar with the village. Whilst we can see that you have included in Figure 7 a summary map of all the strategic neighbourhood plan designations this is not of a sufficient scale to clearly show the boundaries of designated sites. Although it is acknowledged that a single Policies Map is not a requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan, SCDC considers that, for a Plan area like Fulbourn, such a map helps in providing clarity to those policies that include site allocations and site-specific issues. Practitioners generally find it useful to go to a single point for land related designations, such as in a Policies Map with more detailed Inset Maps for areas where there are a</p>	<p>A1 map provided with Reg. 14 Consultation had been overlooked.</p> <p>Maps changed where appropriate. Two large scale Policy Maps in PDF format provided (whole area and Village Area)</p>

		<p>number of policy designations, rather than have a number of maps to look at that are dotted through a Plan. For example, Policy FUL/02 'Protecting the Setting of Fulbourn' refers to important views shown in Figure 5, but this map is not next to the policy. Figure 8 is on an adjacent page but not referred to in the policy. Figure 7 showing the strategic neighbourhood plan policies also shows the views but is not reference. This is not helpful for a future user of your Plan.</p> <p>7. You may wish to consider having larger scale maps to cover the whole of your parish to provide a comprehensive Policies Map – maybe at A3 scale so that it is easy to read. Alternatively, you could consider the approach used in our Local Plan Policies Map where individual villages can be covered by several A4 maps at legible and easy to read scales. This format has the added advantage of having maps of the village in a portrait format which is easier to read than having landscape ones for any future user of the plan.</p> <p>8. The map base used throughout your plan is very pale which results in surrounding features such as roads and buildings being difficult to identify particularly if an area is overlaid with a colour – such as on Figure 8 where the Green Belt shading almost covers the whole map. Combine this with the small scale then further overlays make it difficult to see a clear boundary- e.g. Do the sensitive fields shown in Figure 8 to the west, south and east of the built up area of the village follow field boundaries or are they illustrative only? This is further overlaid with a key visual gap to be retained to the west, but boundaries are unclear/vague at this scale and with this colouring. Without clarity the policy to protect these features cannot be achieved.</p> <p>9. When a policy area or boundary is shown on a map in your plan it is important in the key to refer to the relevant policy number in your plan. Figure 7 has a mixture of Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies which could be confusing unless the future user is familiar with both plans.</p> <p>10. The NPIERS guidance on examinations also mentions the importance of mapping in a neighbourhood plan. It sets out that the qualifying body should</p>	<p>Two large scale Policy Maps in PDF format provided (whole area and Village Area)</p> <p>Map base amended. Large scale maps provided</p> <p>Additional maps included in Submission Draft for improved clarity</p> <p>The sensitive fields now included for reference only as they are identified in the Village Design Guide.</p> <p>Maps amended</p> <p>Advice noted</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>check the following prior to submitting a Plan to the local planning authority (Page 29):</p> <p>1.7.2. Plans should be supported by clear mapping, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate delineation of the boundaries of the plan • The boundaries of any site allocations, and designations made in the plan (preferably including street names). <p>11. All maps need to ensure that they have the required copyright permissions which needs to be correctly worded especially when you are using OS maps- the copyright and licence information must be clearly readable. We note that you have a statement on page 3 referring to copyright but would prefer each map to contain this copyright information clearly to avoid any confusion.</p>	<p>Noted and actioned</p> <p>Copyright and licence information noted within NP (once per document is legally acceptable) and on the Policy Maps</p>
S02	Village Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (VDG SPD)	<p>12. The Fulbourn Village Design Guide was adopted as a supplementary planning document by SCDC in January 2020. We consider that more should be said about this document rather than it being briefly summarised in paragraphs 3.13-3.15. To add weight to proposals and guidance included in your VDG you should be highlighting key ideas within your Plan. A neighbourhood plan has greater weight in determining planning applications than an SPD. Whilst key considerations can be cross referred to within policies it would be very helpful for the future user of your Plan to incorporate policy wording of those that you consider very important actually within the Plan. A busy developer or planning officer would prefer to only have to consider one document rather than having to find what is in another. It could help to achieve the aspirations contained within the SPD. It will, in our view, be a missed opportunity to not formally weave the findings of the SPD into the Plan. You are in the fortunate position to be able to have the opportunity to include key aspects of the VDS within your Plan to give it added weight.</p>	<p>Changes made where considered necessary. Text amended.</p>
S02	Fulbourn Conservation Area Appraisal	<p>13. In parallel with this pre-submission public consultation of the Plan SCDC is carrying out a consultation on the revised Fulbourn and Fulbourn Hospital Conservation area appraisal between 18 January and 15 February 2021. This appraisal once adopted will need to be mentioned within your Plan. The draft</p>	<p>Noted and NP updated.</p>

		includes a list of possible non-designated heritage assets as well as a map showing buildings that make a valuable contribution to the overall character of the Fulbourn conservation area. You may wish to consider adding a policy into your Plan about such buildings to add weight to their protection, cross referencing to the Appraisal which is where the evidence to support their designation will be found.	NP decided not to include buildings of merit.
S02	Accessibility	14. Any documents that are published in future on the South Cambridgeshire website must be accessible to all. We can share with you the current guidance that has been provided to us by our Communications Team at South Cambridgeshire. The current Regulation 14 consultation of your Plan is available from your website. But you will need to be aware of the accessibility requirements once your Plan and all its associated documents is submitted to South Cambridgeshire as they will all need to be published on our website and therefore all need to be accessible.	Noted and it is the intention that all documents produced for the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan will meet these requirements. External reference documents are presented in their original form
S02	Glossary	15. We welcome the fact that you have included a glossary in your draft as this a good idea to help to explain any planning jargon. However, it currently does not include many terms. We had suggested in comments on an earlier draft of your Plan the glossary should be enlarged to include more terms that non-planners may not be familiar with. You can consult the National Planning Policy Framework glossary and that in our South Cambridgeshire Local Plan to help you create one for your Plan.	Glossary expanded
S02	Evidence documents references	16. All policies included in your Neighbourhood Plan must have proportionate and appropriate evidence to back them up. We note that with the draft Plan that was sent to us you had included an appendix listing much evidence documents which I am sure contains a wealth of information. Your Plan as drafted sometimes does not include enough justification within supporting text to policies to explain why such policies are included in your Plan. You may wish to include more evidence to help to tell the story of the area. It is a delicate balance between providing too much detail in the Plan but then not having an explanation as to why	Noted and actioned The plan is supported by six evidence papers. An appendix lists the main evidence sources that can be accessed either directly from their own websites or alternatively from the F.NP on-line evidence base.

		<p>a policy has certain criteria within it that a planning application would have to be determined against.</p> <p>17. The way that you have references to all the evidence documents throughout the Plan does not make for an easy read and is not necessary.</p>	<p>The references to evidence is now via a subscript within the text and a corresponding note in the page footer.</p>
S02	Structure of your neighbourhood plan and its story	<p>19. The best neighbourhood plans tell a story. It helps if it highlights your overall vision and objectives from which the policies will flow.</p> <p>20. The overall appearance of your Plan is pleasing to a user and you have obviously given this much thought creating a document that people will want to read. It has a distinct style. You have put some of the information into visual charts which makes it easier for the user to be informed of the facts. We are sure that there are historic maps and photos of your parish that could, should you wish, add to helping a user understand the character and development if they are not familiar with your parish.</p> <p>21. Whilst we appreciate that those that have written the Plan know Fulbourn parish very well, future users of your Plan are unlikely to have this same local knowledge. Your Plan mentions many facilities and places that are important, but it is not always clear as to their location. Where specific locations are mentioned your Plan would benefit from having a map showing where these are in the parish or a clear address. A developer putting together a scheme for development in Fulbourn may not know where Pound Green is or The Swifts or particular facilities such as shops are in relation to their proposal.</p> <p>22. Throughout your Plan at the start of each chapter you have a section that seems to summarise the contents of this chapter. It almost seems as if you are quoting from another document? We like that style, but does it perhaps need a heading of explanation?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>An additional historic map has been included in v3</p> <p>Noted and actioned The text has been amended to better explain the village and various additional maps have been included. Key street names have been added to the maps.</p> <p>Noted The NP as drawn input from many sources and attempted to present them in a style distinctive to Fulbourn</p>
S02	1. Introduction	<p>24. Section below 1.9 should have a paragraph number so that it can easily be referred to. (Non-BC Test)</p>	<p>Noted and actioned</p>

		<p>25. The Engagement Log is referred to in paragraph 1.13 as Appendix 2. This appendix now contains the Glossary. There are only two appendices with no engagement log. Paragraph 1.13 – 1.14 need updating.</p>	<p>Text has been edited. The report has been restructured since this comment and the numbering corrected.</p>
S02	2. The Plan Area	<p>26. Figure 1 shows the Designated Neighbourhood Area for Fulbourn and is at such a small scale and has such a pale background it is difficult to read. It would help if a whole A4 page was allowed for this map so that the boundaries of the Neighbourhood Area are clearly defined. There should be no doubt to future users of the Plan as to where the policies of the plan apply. This is especially the case where the boundary includes the Teasel Way development on the edge of Cherry Hinton in Cambridge. (BC Test)</p> <p>27. It would help to place Fulbourn within its surroundings if you were to annotate Figure 1 or include an additional map that shows the area surrounding Fulbourn identifying parishes for those who may not be as familiar with this area as you are.</p> <p>28. Throughout the Plan you refer to the 'Neighbourhood Plan Boundary. We have usually used the term 'Designated Neighbourhood Area'. It would make for consistency if all the neighbourhood plans in South Cambs used the same term so that there is no room for confusion.</p>	<p>Noted and actioned Report V03 contains a half page map that supports the nearby text. The online version contains a scalable map.</p> <p>Noted and actioned Fig1 has been amended to show the neighbouring areas</p> <p>Noted and actioned The text has been edited.</p>
S02	3. Planning Policy Framework	<p>29. Paragraph 3.1-3.6 - Your Plan does not need to include so much detail about the National Planning Policy Framework especially the mention of recent consultations such as the 'Planning for the Future' White Paper. The Government regularly publishes initiatives relating to planning and your plan does not need to mention them all.</p> <p>30. In the section on the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (paras 3.7 – 3.10) only some relevant policies are highlighted. There is always a danger of just highlighting some as if the others are of lesser importance. We consider a better</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Text amended. Only policies with specific allocations in Fulbourn are now mentioned.</p>

		<p>method is to reference the relevant Local Plan policy in the supporting text to the specific neighbourhood plan policy that it links to.</p> <p>31. Figure 2 We have already mentioned our concerns about the scale of the maps and the pale background of the base layer map. If you are using the policy designations from the Local Plan you must use the correct terms so as to avoid confusion for the different designations e.g. Village Amenity Area should be Protected Village Amenity Area.</p> <p>32. Emerging Local Plan – Paragraph 3.12. This section should be updated as the Local Development Scheme was revised in July 2020.</p> <p>33. Other Relevant Planning Documents – Top of page 14 – This list does not need to be included in your Plan. Your plan can incorporate key elements relevant to your village.</p>	<p>Maps amended. Large scale map provided.</p> <p>Text amended. No specific stage of the Local Plan is mentioned as progress is fast and the reference will soon be out of date.</p> <p>Noted – listed documents are considered relevant.</p>
O10	Para 3.3	<p>Figure 4 - Heritage [Page 21] provides a visual overview of heritage assets within Fulbourn and the surrounding area. It is an observation of Wallace that whilst this figure picks up the vast majority of designated heritage assets, it does not provide a complete picture. Specifically, a scheduled monument located to the west of Station Road Fulbourn is not visually represented whilst other scheduled monuments are. The heritage asset that Wallace is referencing is the Iron Age ritual enclosure containing a Bronze Age barrow, and Roman cemetery (List Entry Number: 1465057).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is believed that the NP V03 achieves a suitable description of heritage assets. A developer needs to refer to the full, formal, list of heritage assets, scheduled monuments etc held by the nominated official authorities.</p>
R16	Para 3.6	All good	Support noted
R16	Para 3.8	<p>Will the Ida Darwin site have its own school and shop?</p> <p>Will it end up as an isolated small hamlet between Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn?</p>	<p>Not within the current plans</p> <p>Unlikely</p> <p>Issues outside the NP scope</p>
R16	Para 3.10	<p>Climate Change: The Teversham Road Development should not be allowed to happen. The land is too low lying</p>	Opinion noted

S02	4. Local Context	<p>34. This section would come alive if there were historical maps or photographs to illustrate the character and landscape setting of the parish. Much of the description relies upon local knowledge of how the village fits together. It would help to include a map showing the key buildings in the parish.</p> <p>35. Paragraph 4.7 –The heritage team at SCDC thought that your Plan could say a little more about the original hospital and its grounds and their history. Their historical significance is worth emphasising at this point. Had you considered this?</p> <p>36. Figure 3 is entitled ‘Approximate Business Locations’. Should approximate be deleted or is this indicating that locations for the different features shown on the map are not accurate? The key refers to ‘Community Services, shops and businesses but there is no clear definition of how to differentiate between these different uses. The map shows numerous blobs which give no indication of scale – whether it is a business park or a single workshop/ office. It is clear where all the shops are since these merge together. It would help to have an inset map of this section of the village. Are the Community uses the same as those listed from a-n in Figure 6? The map does not help the user of the plan understand business locations.</p> <p>37. Paragraph 4.20 – Mention is made of three industrial sites outside of the development framework – it would help to have an inset map showing these sites for future users of the plan who are unfamiliar with the parish.</p> <p>38. Figure 4 Heritage. It would be helpful if the listed buildings were not shown as circles but rather by their property boundaries to avoid confusion of their location.</p> <p>39. Landscape setting and Relationship with the Countryside – This is another section which would greatly benefit from an annotated map showing where all the</p>	<p>Noted and actioned Various listed buildings are shown</p> <p>Noted and actioned. Evidence Paper 3 covers three green spaces (LGS) on the Capital Park site and their descriptions include historical context</p> <p>Caption clarified and map amended to provide additional detail. This map is in the context section and is descriptive rather than regulatory. It provides an overview of business activities and not a directory of them.</p> <p>Locations included in Fig. 5</p> <p>This map is in the context section and is descriptive rather than regulatory. The source data is from English Heritage and the details of Listed Buildings is provided by them.</p> <p>Noted and edited accordingly.</p>
-----	------------------	---	--

		<p>key features, buildings and roads are located within the parish. There is too much reliance on local knowledge.</p> <p>40. Paragraph 4.24 – In the third sentence there is a spelling mistake – richness of tress should read ‘trees’.</p> <p>41. Figure 5 – It would be helpful to know where Fulbourn Fen Nature Reserve is on this map and Fleam Dyke. There are many different types of habitat listed in the key – a link could be provided to the definition of each on the Natural England website and to the Forestry Commission Inventory. This also includes a type called Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh – is coastal a correct category for Fulbourn or is the relevant element ‘floodplain grazing marsh’? We are not sure of the value of showing the different types at such a scale.</p> <p>42. Figure 6 Existing Community Facilities – What does the purple diamond symbol stand for? Are these the Assets of Community Value? Should the boundaries of the recreation ground, Fulbourn Fen Nature Reserve and the allotments be shown rather than just a diamond? Is ‘m’ included on the map?</p> <p>43. Chapter 4 leads to chapter 5 about the neighbourhood planning policies. The bold title at the top of page 26 confuses as it looks like a heading for the next chapter and it is not but rather a section break. – slightly odd style.</p>	<p>Fig11, Green Infrastructure, shows the key environmental sites in a simplified way. SSSI identified by name on the map.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>See map showing Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Purple Diamond = Key Existing Community Facility. Figure has been updated to improve clarity all references correspond to the text.</p> <p>Noted and edited accordingly</p>
R33	Para 4.3-4.6	<p>The historical section doesn't really affect the proposed policies, but I'm disappointed to find what I believe are errors in it: p.16 4.3 "several timber framed 14th century farmhouses". I'm aware of two houses with 14th-century origins, Highfield Farm in Apthorpe Street and Queen's Farm in Church Lane. Ludlows, College Farmhouse and Old Shardelows (the last two in Balsham Road) date from the 15th century, according to Historic</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The text has been amended to increase clarity</p>

		<p>England listings. Wouldn't it be better to say "several late medieval timber-framed farmhouses"?</p> <p>p.16 4.4 "the construction in the mid-19th century of the Windmill and the Dissenting Meeting House". The windmill dates from 1808 and Don Crane's <i>_Walks round Fulbourn_</i> (1986) says that the URC was "first erected in 1810" - so early, rather than mid, 19th century.</p> <p>p.17 4.5 "In the late 19th century the school, the alms-houses and Fulbourn Hospital for mental health patients were built isolated in the countryside". The hospital is relatively isolated but that could hardly be said of the school or almshouses.</p> <p>p.17 4.6 "with time, they [i.e. the inter-war council houses and later estates] have acquired some of the local diversity, trees and planting". This makes little sense to me; do you mean that "with time, the growth of trees and other planting has helped to integrate them into the village"?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The text has been amended to accurately describe the location of the almshouses</p> <p>The houses which were initially identical have since acquired individual character and each contribute to the variety of the village</p>
R16	Para 4.5	<p>Rail line already runs through village</p> <p>To lessen the road traffic, would a Station be possible?</p>	Outside the scope of the NP
R02	- Para 4.19 - Figure 6	I spotted on Page19, Paragraph 4.19, that the Beauty Salon and Gift shop (Body Image) had been missed from the list of High Street businesses. Also, Figure 6, Page 26 contains a reference to The Bakers Arms pub, which has been renamed the Hat and Rabbit.	<p>Noted and actioned</p> <p>The text has been edited to include these</p>
S02	5. Vision and Objectives - Page 28 - Chart 3 - Figure 7	<p>44. Section under the Vision Statement on page 28 – The paragraph numbering has slipped here.</p> <p>45. Chart 3 – The Golden Thread is a useful table showing how the objectives will be delivered. For accessibility purposes the formatting of this table would have to be amended as it has merged cells which cannot be read online by those with disabilities. (See paragraph 15 accessibility)</p> <p>46. Figure 7- Summary Map of Strategic Neighbourhood Plan Designations - Is there a definition of what “strategic” means? Generally, neighbourhood plans do</p>	<p>Noted and amended</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The table remains unchanged for legibility purposes. Alternative Text has been provided to describe the content of the table.</p> <p>New Fig8 map revised</p> <p>Strategic reference removed</p>

		<p>not make strategic policies and so it might be appropriate to use a different term? Is this map illustrating all the land use policies of the Neighbourhood Plan?</p> <p>It would be helpful if the relevant NP policy references were added to the key.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that the map is a minimum of A4 size with a separate key or maybe even split into two A4 maps (east and west) or more if appropriate in order that the sites and boundaries can be defined more accurately.</p> <p>It would help if where local plan policies are to be used to designate sites in the neighbourhood plan that a similar symbol is used e.g. the symbol for important countryside frontage in the local plan is a row of brown triangles. It would avoid confusion for future users of your plan.</p> <p>47. Looking at the designations shown on Figure 7 there are many protecting the setting of the parish. Also Fulbourn is as your Plan makes clear, within the Green Belt. A neighbourhood plan should not be overly protective as it needs to consider opportunities for future development. We would question the extent of the countryside frontages and sensitive fields to the east of the village which would restrict any future development. It is possible to have development that is sensitively designed to protect views into and out of the village.</p>	<p>Map enlarged on the page. Larger Policy Map available</p> <p>Similar symbols and graphics used as far as possible. ICFs marked with slightly different symbol to differentiate between NP and LP designations.</p> <p>Noted and amended. The ICFs have been revised and Evidence Base added</p>
O05	5. Vision and Objectives	<p>The Vision Statement and Objectives for Draft FNP refers to new development providing suitable housing. It is noted that Draft FNP makes no allocations for new housing. The approved housing developments off Balsham Road, off Teversham Road and at the Ida Darwin Hospital site all have planning permission and are commitments not allocations. The design, layout, housing mix, and affordable housing including the proportion of housing for those with a local connection have already been determined for these commitments, which means that the Draft FNP will have no influence on these matters.</p>	<p>Noted. The NP sets out policies for future permission and for integrated growth. This could apply to new planning applications for the existing site or to other windfall sites. Proposals for new development within the Development Framework will be considered taking into account policies in the Local Plan and the</p>

		<p>As set out in the representations to Policy FUL/10: Housing Development and Local Need only a small proportion of the housing to be delivered at the Teversham Road and Ida Darwin Hospital sites will be specifically allocated for those with a local connection to Fulbourn and most will be available to meet district-wide housing needs, which means that the local affordable housing needs of Fulbourn will remain unmet by 2031.</p> <p>In addition, Fulbourn is surrounded by the Green Belt, and Draft FNP seeks to introduce new policy designations relating to 'sensitive fields', 'key outward view from village', 'key view towards the village' and 'important countryside frontage' that cover most of the land around the village. The Green Belt and new policy designations effectively prevent new housing development from being delivered on the edge of Fulbourn. There are Listed Buildings and a Conservation Area within Fulbourn, and there is land identified as Local Green Space and Protected Village Amenity Areas, which will further limit or prevent new development from taking place within the village boundary. It is not clear how much development could be provided from redevelopment or infill sites within the village, but it is likely that any opportunities that do exist will be small scale and fall below the threshold where affordable housing is required.</p> <p>Therefore, since Draft FNP contains no housing allocations, no deliverable strategy to meet local affordable housing needs, and new policy designations that are designed to prevent new housing development, it is concluded that in terms of providing suitable housing the Vision Statement and Objectives will be ineffective.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan (following adoption).</p> <p>Policy changed accordingly.</p> <p>The policy and designations have been simplified and clarified for their intention. Text clarified. The emerging GCLP is not contemplating further expansion at Fulbourn within the Green Belt outside the large sites already identified.</p> <p>Noted See comments above</p>
O12	5. Vision and Objectives	<p>Therefore, since Draft FNP contains no housing allocations, no deliverable strategy to meet local affordable housing needs, and the proposed new policy designations are likely to frustrate the delivery of new homes in the most sustainable way. It is concluded that in terms of providing suitable housing the Vision Statement and Objectives will be ineffective.</p>	<p>Significant growth will take place at Fulbourn in the near future within sites already allocated and not yet delivered. Infill development will continue. Vision</p>

			and Objectives aim at the harmonious integration of this growth.
O05	5. Vision and Objectives Figure 7	It is requested that the proposed 'sensitive fields', 'key outward view from village', 'key view towards the village' and 'important countryside frontage' policy designations are removed from Figure 7. Therefore, for all of the above reasons, it is concluded that the proposed 'sensitive fields', 'key outward view from village', 'key view towards the village' and 'important countryside frontage' policy designations in Draft FNP are not consistent with national guidance and as such do not meet Basic Condition (a).	Map changed to reflect NP designations only.
O09	5. Vision and Objectives Figure 7	It is requested that the proposed 'Green Belt – key visual gap to be retained', 'sensitive fields', 'key outward view from village', 'key view towards the village' and 'important countryside frontage' policy designations are removed from Figure 7.	Map changed to reflect NP designations only.
R33	Para 5.4	"As Cambridge continues to expand, suburban development models could be 'exported' to Fulbourn, with a pattern approach that could be "anywhere" rather than as respectful of local distinctiveness as the community aspires to achieve, with new development within the village making a positive contribution to the character of the area and becoming well integrated in the physical and social life of the community, as also promoted by the NPPF and the Fulbourn Village Design Guide". This sentence is not easy to follow. Perhaps say: "As Cambridge continues to expand, suburban development models could be 'exported' to Fulbourn, with a pattern approach that could be "anywhere" rather than respectful of the local distinctiveness that the community aspires to preserve. The community wishes to see new development within the village making a positive contribution to the character of the area and becoming well-integrated in the physical and social life of the community, as also promoted by the NPPF and the Fulbourn Village Design Guide."	Noted and actioned The entire paragraph has been amended to increase clarity
R16	Vision & Planning Objectives Page 28 & 29	Important	Noted

O06	Vision Statement Section 7	<p>The BHS was initially pleased to see that Fulbourn NP mentions equestrians in Section 13 (Streets, Transport and Mobility, stating that 'Equal importance should be given to all transport users, whether vehicular, pedestrian, cycle or equestrian', Equestrians are also mentioned in the Policy FUL/18 'Within the village, where appropriate, development should: Clearly demonstrate a clear order of priority given to road users as follows: pedestrians, cycling and horse riding, public transport, innovative mobility, shared transport, private transport.' However this would appear to contradict the statement in Section 13 ie equal importance should be given to all transport users.</p> <p>The plan needs to meet the requirements of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan (LTP), as Active Travel is defined in the plan as pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. However despite equestrians being mentioned as above this is not carried through into the rest of the report.</p> <p>Although equestrians are mentioned at the start of Section 13, in other parts of Section 13, for instance 13.6 there is no mention of equestrians, and again in 13.10. Equestrians must be included in both these sections as the plan needs to meet the requirements of local and national policies.</p> <p>Section 4.16 states that 'Improvement to walking, cycling and public transport will be essential to mitigate some of the traffic issues and reduce the carbon footprint of the village, but so will be the need for additional efforts in integrating increasingly diverse populations and lifestyles'. Equestrians must be included in this section as the plan needs to meet the requirements of local and national policies.</p> <p>In the Vision Statement, Section 7 says 'Increase the safety of local streets and lanes and enhance access to public transport services. Walking and cycling through the winding lanes and narrow streets of the village are part of the life and experience of Fulbourn and need to be supported through all measures that increase safety and comfort, while respecting local character...Future development should also be accompanied by strong support for walking, cycling and improvement of public transportation for the village as a whole'.</p> <p>Equestrians must be included in this section as the plan needs to meet the requirements of local and national policies.</p>	<p>Opinion noted</p> <p>The interests of equestrians are represented within various parts of the NP</p> <p>Ful/17 supports all mobility modes but recognises that horse riding is a leisure activity and not part of Active Travel as defined by Government in their plan for reducing carbon emissions and improving air quality. Horse riding is not treated on a par with cycling and walking as a means of commute.</p>
-----	-------------------------------	--	---

R19	Objective 1	<p>Much is made of the idea of retaining ‘the character of Fulbourn as an individual village, separate from Cambridge’. (Objective 1, p. 28) However, I feel that this is a little disingenuous. The village may still seem a distinct entity when approaching it from the Fulbourn Road, but it is quite a different matter using the route beside Tesco. Fulbourn Old Drift used to present itself as a country lane with shrubbery effectively screening the business park and with the village in the distance. There was a real sense of leaving Cambridge and entering the countryside. However, any sense of separation has recently been lost by the erection of a large residential building at the start of the lane behind the business park (as well as decimation of the hedgerow in various places along the length of the lane). How this meets the requirement to ‘enhance the character of the local area, respond to its landscape context and be compatible with its location’ is a mystery to me. You state that ‘The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) makes clear that [the Ida Darwin Hospital site needs] careful design and landscape to ensure that the character of the Green Belt is not compromised, no coalescence with Cambridge takes place and countryside views are protected.’ (Section 3.8, p. 10) The inappropriate siting of this new building has destroyed the effect before the Ida Darwin site has even been reached.</p>	Opinion noted
S02	<p>6. Protected Village Setting and Separation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Para 6.1-6.4 - Para 6.5a - Para 6.9-6.10 - Para 6.4-6.5 	<p>48. Paragraphs 6.1-6.4 supports the retention of the Green Belt around Fulbourn, but this is not in the gift of the neighbourhood plan to change as this is a strategic issue. The NPPF does now allow neighbourhood plans the opportunity to redraw Green Belt boundaries but there needs to be a strategic policy in the Local Plan to facilitate this. If the parish council feels strongly about this retention, it would be best to take the opportunity to make representations to this effect in future consultations of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.</p> <p>49. Paragraph 6.5a – There is currently a live discussion about the Ida Darwin planning permission with submission of details required by conditions including that for design statements. Policies in your neighbourhood plan cannot override an extant permission for this development.</p>	<p>Text amended</p> <p>Noted. Policy changed.</p>

		<p>50. Paragraph 6.9 – 6.10 The Plan cross refers to the Village Design Guide SPD. We consider that there should be a section in your Plan summarising the key elements from the SPD. Future users may decide to not look through the SPD as well as the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>If the key views, specific fields, important countryside frontages and local landmarks from the SPD are important then there should be a clear list of each included in the Plan.</p> <p>It would be beneficial for each specific feature to be listed within the relevant policy so that a developer or development management officer could refer to a particular view in their report about any development proposals – e.g. View A to the Windmill ...or view C towards St Vigor’s Church. Or Sensitive field H north of xx Road.</p> <p>51. Paragraphs 6.4-6.5 You could emphasise here the importance of the parkland element of the Fulbourn Hospital conservation area (both present hospital and Elizabeth House sections) in maintaining the ‘separation’ of Fulbourn village.</p>	<p>The VDG is comprehensively referenced within the NP and where clarity would be enhanced then parts of the VDG has been replicated within the NP</p> <p>Noted and clearly referenced in the NP</p> <p>Noted and implemented</p> <p>See Fig 8</p> <p>Noted and implemented</p> <p>The parklands within Capital Park are described as three separate LGS, see Fig8</p>
R16	Para 6.9	Important to support intention to protect views.	Noted. Evidence Paper included.
R06	Para 6.9	Could we protect certain views? For example, prevent housing developments from blocking the view of the windmill from Cambridge Road, Cherry Orchard, and Shelford Road and ditto for the Fulbourn Hospital?	The NP aims to protect key village views and this is an important tenet of the plan. Policy expectations made clearer. Evidence Paper included.
R33	Para 6.11	The questionnaire mentioned here and elsewhere had 123 respondents, which is a tiny proportion of the village population. To how many households was it circulated?	All premises (residential & commercial) received the F.NP Executive Summary and were invited to respond. See the Engagement Log for the various communications undertaken with the community.

S02	Policy FUL/02 Protected Setting of Fulbourn.	<p>54. Whilst the rationale of this policy is reasonable for what it seeks to do, its application and interpretation based on its detailed wording needs further review to ensure it is robust and has taken account of extant planning consents.</p> <p>55. Part 2 of policy –Important views - Are the views referred to those shown on Figure 7 and 8 as within the policy it refers to Figure 5 which is confusing? We understand that these views originate from the VDG SPD. We suggest that each view should have a specific identity, so it is easily referred to if required by a developer or planning officer in a report. It would be useful if each is identified in a list in the policy. Within the policy you need to clearly state which map or figure they are shown on – without this the policy is not implementable.</p> <p>56. Your policy states that the views are to be protected but what does this mean in your Plan. No development? Or any development should not have a detrimental impact on the view? Your policy needs to be worded in such a way that it is not open to interpretation. The keys of in Figure 7 and 8 show different sorts of protected views and we are not sure if these are to be treated differently within the policy? Are all these views to be protected through this policy? It is not clear.</p> <p>57. Your policy further states that it is not just the views that are to be protected but the uses of the land across which the views point – planning policy cannot control agricultural land uses or retain woodland unless it includes protected trees or is an ancient woodland.</p> <p>58. One of the views is shown to be extending over your neighbourhood boundary – you are only permitted to have policies within your designated neighbourhood area. E.g. Long-distance views from lower ground at Teversham.</p> <p>59. Part 3 of policy –It is not clear what is meant by the term ‘built up’ area of the village –do you mean the development framework? When writing policies, you need to define terms used in the policy clearly. You may know what you mean but a developer or a planning officer may not interpret it in the same way.</p>	<p>Noted and NP edited accordingly</p> <p>Noted. The various edits and improvements to the text and maps of the NP have drawn these aspects together. See Fig 8, 9 & 10 and their supporting text. Text has been edited</p> <p>Clarity added to the text to set out expectations. All the views are associated with the Green Belt so any development would need to take this into account.</p> <p>Noted. Text changed</p> <p>The view has been amended to be entirely within the Fulbourn designated area.</p> <p>Noted and text amended</p>
-----	--	--	---

		<p>60. Part 3 of policy - It would be useful to provide clarity on whether this part of the policy seeks to protect the character/pattern of field penetrating the built area or protect the existing boundaries for the lifetime of the plan? The language in the policy is different to that used in Figure 8. If figure 8 is to be implemented the policy should refer to it?</p> <p>61. We are unclear of the distinction between 3a and 3b as it appears that many of the new important countryside frontages have sensitive fields beyond them which is double protecting these areas. Many of the views are across Green Belt which gives them triple protection and they are also outside the development framework. - not the term 'village framework boundary' as stated in the policy. Any development outside of the development framework is considered by Policy S/7 Development Framework in the Local Plan and you do not therefore need to repeat protection outside of a development framework. We are unsure what you are implying could be developed in such areas as only certain restricted uses relating to the countryside are permitted under Policy S/7.</p> <p>62. We are concerned that the demarcation of an important countryside frontage shown in Figure 8 does not take account of the extant outline consent and approved parameter plans for the Ida Darwin site. Whilst it is possible to still achieve the objectives of this policy and that of Policy NH/13 Important Countryside Frontages from the Local Plan, some of the definitive extents of the important countryside frontage needs to be reviewed by either altering the wording of the policy to be flexible or adjusting the representation in Fig 8 to be consistent with the outline permission. Your Plan in this instance goes further than what the VDG SPD had suggested.</p>	<p>Noted and actioned Part 3 has been removed</p> <p>Noted and actioned Part 3 has been removed</p> <p>Noted The boundaries of the ICFs have been revised to take this into account. Previous Windmill View ICF has been split into Ida Darwin ICF and Capital Park ICF.</p>
O05	Policy FUL/02.	<p>...</p> <p>It is requested that Policy FUL/02 is amended to avoid repeating development plan policy and national guidance on Green Belt, is amended to be consistent with the mix of uses allowed in the Green Belt and outside Development Framework</p>	<p>Noted and actioned The text has been amended accordingly</p>

		boundaries, and all references to 'sensitive fields', 'key outward view from village' and 'key view towards the village' are deleted in the absence of any evidence.	
009	Policy FUL/02.	... It is requested that Policy FUL/02 is amended to avoid repeating development plan policy and national guidance on Green Belt, is amended to be consistent with the mix of uses allowed in the Green Belt and outside Development Framework boundaries, and all references to 'important countryside gaps', 'sensitive fields', 'key outward view from village' and 'key view towards the village' are deleted in the absence of any evidence.	Noted and actioned The text has been amended accordingly
012	Policy FUL/02.	It is requested that Policy FUL/02 is amended to avoid repeating development plan policy and national guidance on Green Belt, is amended to be consistent with the mix of uses allowed in the Green Belt and outside Development Framework boundaries, and all references to 'key outward view from village' and 'key view towards the village' are deleted in the absence of any evidence.	Noted and actioned The text has been amended accordingly
013	Policy FUL/02.	We therefore request that the western edge of the key visual gap as shown in Fig 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan be revised, so that it follows the boundary of the Green Belt and does not encroach upon the Policy E/3 site.	Noted and actioned The map has been amended accordingly
S02	Policy FUL/03 – Development in the Green Belt and Outside the Development Framework.	63. Part 1 – This is repeating Local Plan policies for development frameworks and for Green Belt and does not offer anything specific to Fulbourn. (Policy NH/8 Mitigating the impact of development in and adjoining the Green Belt and Policy S/7 Development Frameworks) 64. Both Figures 7 and 8 have a designation of a 'Green Belt – key visual gap to be retained' which is shown as an area in the parish between the village and the edge of Cambridge. Is this a green buffer between the two built up areas?	Noted and actioned Ful/03 has been revised Designation amended following meeting with SCDC. Text clarifies the intention. The NP uses the term ' Important Visual Gap' as referenced in Ful/01 and

	<p>Is this designation for use in this policy? It has not been clearly referenced if it is within a policy. We note that it is included in the VDG SPD as an important visual gap between Fulbourn and Cambridge.</p> <p>65. Part 2a – Have you defined the term ‘integrity ‘ for use in the policy?</p> <p>66. Part 2b - Maintaining the richness of trees calculating the expected height of trees after 10years from planting is somewhat outside the scope of policy planning and therefore neighbourhood plan policy.</p> <p>67. Part 2b We are unclear as to what ‘richness of trees and tree belts ‘means in practical terms. We believe this may mean abundance. Richness could mean species diversity but his is already limited and will be further limited by the policies listed in this document. We suggest that the words are changed to something clearer.</p> <p>68. Part 2c - The NPPF already refers to light pollution in the following way – “limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.” The County Council has minimum standards for street lighting, and they may not adopt streets where provision is below standards. Suggest that reference to the Green Belt is not necessary given the Policy title? If this policy in your Plan is to limit street night light pollution it is not clear what this limit is? You would need to state this in the policy and have evidence to justify.</p> <p>69. Part 2d Have these outward views been identified – we presume these are from the Village Design Guide and that there will be evidence of how these views were assessed to add to your Evidence Base.</p> <p>70. Part 2e - Would a developer / planning officer know what “abundant” tree planting would look like in a development? What is abundant? If it is to be just native species that are suitable for additional planting be aware of how limited the woody native species list is.</p>	<p>in Figs 8, 9 & 10. Integrity edited out</p> <p>Noted and amended accordingly</p> <p>Noted. Text has been amended and an ‘appropriate tree list included as App2 and in Evidence Paper 6 (Biodiversity)</p> <p>Ful/02 para2c asks for appropriate levels to avoid excessive lighting. Ful/09 3d mentions low level lighting. Reference to Green Belt edited out</p> <p>Yes – see Fig 8</p> <p>Noted Ful/03 edited accordingly</p>
--	--	---

		71. Part 2e – Should this be ‘open spaces’ rather than open space?	Text amended
		72. Part 2f – Have you defined ‘gateway buildings’ ? Is this gateway building on the edge of sites or in the whole of the site? It is not clear from the wording of the policy.	Text amended
O05	Policy FUL/03.	It is requested that Policy FUL/03 is amended to avoid repeating development plan policy and national guidance on Green Belt and Development Frameworks, all references to outward views are deleted in the absence of any evidence, and all design related issues are deleted to avoid repeating development plan design policies and national design guidance.	Text amended. Evidence included.
O09	Policy FUL/03.	It is requested that Policy FUL/03 is amended to avoid repeating development plan policy and national guidance on Green Belt and Development Frameworks, all references to outward views are deleted in the absence of any evidence, and all design related issues are deleted to avoid repeating development plan design policies and national design guidance.	Text amended. Evidence included.
O12	Policy FUL/03.	It is requested that Policy FUL/03 is amended to avoid repeating development plan policy and national guidance on Green Belt and Development Frameworks, all references to outward views are deleted in the absence of any evidence, and all design related issues are deleted to avoid repeating development plan design policies and national design guidance.	Text amended. Evidence included.
S02	7. Enhancing Rural Environment - Para 7.1-7.2	73. There seems to be some text missing between 7.1 and 7.2. 74. It would be helpful to have a map showing the rural environment of the parish in this section of the Plan and to identify the key elements such as the location of the SSSIs.	Noted and actioned, text added Noted and actioned Fig7 & Fig 11 amended as suggested. Also shown on A1 Policy map
O14	7. Enhancing Rural Environment	It is suggested that in line with Paragraph 17 (Evidence Documents) of the SCDC Regulation 14 Response Document, it is necessary to review the content of the Rationale and Justification' Sections of the Environmental Policies in Sections 7 to	Noted Substantial revisions have been made to address this.

		8, together with that in Section 9, Village Character', and the specific feedback provided by SCDC on each relevant Policy, to ensure that adequate justification is provided for the Policies based on the supporting Evidence Documents. Additional material, including photographs, might need to be incorporated from these documents.	
R16	Para 7.2	Too much water abstraction at the expense of the wildlife.	Noted
R16	Para 7.6	Hurray Stick to the Vision.	Noted
O15	Para 7.7	<p>In para 7.7 (and also illustrated in Fig 5) it is noted that there are many important nature conservation sites just across the parish boundary. However the conclusion is not reached that, therefore, the Fulbourn Parish has an important role in helping to connect these sites and helping to achieve a nature recovery network for the Cambridge Area. Cambridge PPF and the Wildlife Trust BCN has identified opportunities for nature recovery in the countryside surrounding the village (Cambridge PPF can provide mapping for this if you contact me by email) and we would recommend that this is referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Many nature areas around Cambridge are under pressure from recreational use as a consequence of a lack of suitable alternatives, Fulbourn Fen Nature Reserve is one such site. We feel that this should be recognised and any new developments contribute towards providing additional or alternative green sites in order to avoid further pressure. In future there may be opportunities for creating new natural green space within the parish in the Gog Magog Hills.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed Ful/03 Fig11 & 12 Green Infrastructure recognises the place Fulbourn has in the wider environment. Text substantially revised.</p> <p>Noted Ful/03 encourages wider opportunities for access to the countryside</p>
O12	Policy FUL/04.	FUL/04 places certain requirements on developments in relation to provision of open space and biodiversity enhancements. Paragraph 34 of the NPPF requires plans to set out the contributions expected from development. Paragraph 001 (Ref ID. 10) of the Planning Practice Guidance expects any policy requirements or contributions to be informed by an assessment of viability. The Draft FNP does not appear to be accompanied by an assessment of the impacts of the policy on the	The policy sets out the environmental ambitions of the village, mainly relating to good design and other obligations for biodiversity enhancement already established in national and strategic policy. National

		<p>viability of development, and hence Policy FUL/04 is not consistent with national guidance and does not meet Basic Condition (a).</p> <p>It is requested that, in the absence of a viability assessment of the policy requirements contained in Policy FUL/04, that this policy is deleted or revised.</p>	<p>policy sets out that planning should provide biodiversity net gains where possible. The Environment Bill will make it mandatory for housing and development, subject to some narrow exemptions, to achieve at least a 10% net gain in value for biodiversity. The NP only makes these policy objectives clearer and more detailed for the village.</p> <p>The wording of Policy FUL/04 has been amended in response to representations to state that ‘Where appropriate and <i>taking into account the scale of the proposals, new development shall incorporate proportionate measures</i> to protect and where possible enhance existing natural features’. The policy also makes specific that certain requirements will only apply to larger developments over 10 units.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate new sites for development or propose</p>
--	--	---	--

			development or new infrastructure provision above the level assessed in the Local Plan. Further viability assessment is not therefore required to support the Neighbourhood Plan. South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council will secure contributions from new development to secure necessary infrastructure provision. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan prepared by the District Council provide the framework for informing what planning obligations may be required depending on the nature, location and scale of development.
S02	8. Local Green Spaces - Para 8.7 - Para 8.6	<p>88. Paragraph 8.7 – This indicates that the local green space (LGS) sites are identified in the Policy Map which this neighbourhood plan currently does not include. Figure 9 shows the sites as well as Figure 7. Because of the scale of your parish wide maps it is not clear what the exact boundaries are of all of the proposed Local Green Spaces and Protected Village Amenity Areas included in your policy.</p> <p>89. Paragraph 8.6 - Did you consider other green spaces such as the green in front of the Alms houses in Church Lane and at the south end of Home End? They cover small areas but are visually very important in this part of the village</p>	<p>Large scale Maps provided. Revised maps and text in later NP version. Evidence Papers 3 & 4 provide detailed information on LGS and PVAA</p> <p>The list of LGS and PVAA has been extended.</p>

		according to our heritage team. Also did you address the parkland green space on the present Fulbourn Hospital site and also the parkland green space to the south of Elizabeth House. These are not within the village but are within the plan area and Fulbourn Hospital conservation area, and they are very important visually and historically to Fulbourn.	
R30	8. Local Green Spaces - Para 8.11	Open green spaces could be managed better for wildlife such as the sowing of wild flowers although the grass cutting team already put paid to any attempts to encourage wild flowers. Since it was first identified as being important to villagers in 2008/9 nothing has been done. See Community aspirations page 47. Page 48 Local green space as was the gardens to the pumping station have been left to grow wild and the trees are not managed. This area was once a wonderful example of a Victorian water company utility with a lake and island originally used to condense steam from the engines. Wildlife once abounded the area and ducks were a regular feature but alas all now history which is being eroded from the village. Page 49 9:1 makes no reference to the above when talking about the pump house.	Noted See section 14 - Aspirations
R27	Biodiversity and Green Spaces	I would like to congratulate you to this excellent initiative and the work undertaken to gather the detailed information, well outlined in the report. In particular, I welcome the strong emphasis on biodiversity and the plan to "enhance 'green networks' and provide more resilient areas of biological and wildlife interest.". This will help to bring back the insects the swifts will need. However, it would have been nice to see a greater emphasis on Fulbourn neighbourhood as an important local recreation area with many walkers appreciating it. In addition, the surrounding of Fulbourn hosts a number of horse yards. I myself enjoy the surrounding for beautiful hacks on my horse that is stabled at Rectory Farm. However, our hacking options have got severely restricted in recent years. I would say the main reason for this restriction is the lack of an initiative that would bring farmers, walkers and horse riders together to clarify the conditions under which the different paths over the farmers' land can be used. Let me use the field that is parallel to the Romain Road, on the left close to Meg's Mount, and owned by the	Opinion Noted See Ful/17 for comments on 'mobility for all'

		<p>Council as an example. The farmer leasing the field left this year a grass path at the end of the field, in parallel to the Romain Road. This track used to be there two years ago and was plough away last year. Does the fact that he re-established the grass path at the end of the field mean that we horse riders are allowed to use it? It would be highly appreciated since we then can leave the Romain Road to the ramblers and dog walkers and just ride on the other side of the hedge. The Romain Road is very busy in particular on Saturdays and Sundays. Another example would be the uncertainty we have as to whether we are allowed to ride over stubble fields after harvest in autumn. Again, the field owned by the Council would be a good example. Some people say there is a tradition and we can therefore ride over it, while others say we are not allowed. This uncertainty is unsettling since we have not many alternatives left than using in one way or the other the paths over the farmers' land since the only bridleway is the Romain Road. The situation has been exacerbated this year with the game keeping and shooting went out of hand (even during lockdown). I personally have been in contact with individual farmers to ask for permission. But given the number of horses in the areas, I would say it requires a collective arrangement. Many other areas have set up arrangements between farmers and horse riders whereby the riders pay an annual fee for using the farmers' paths (e.g. Abington and Coton). All people at Rectory Farm I have talked to would be more than happy to pay such a fee if it improves the current situation. It would be appreciated if such a coordination between the different stakeholders is included in the plan. Please do not hesitate to contact me, if you need further details. I would be happy to coordinate the rider side if needed.</p>	
R02	Local biodiversity	<p>I am particularly concerned that future development does not interfere too much with the local biodiversity of sites around the village. Living in Hinton Road, opposite the proposed site of the Teversham Road development, I am aware that the existing garden next to the old pumping station is included in the outline plans for development. This is currently not managed, but I witness regularly proof of owls, woodpeckers and other common and less common birds, foxes, deer and other mammals as well as amphibians such as toads in the vicinity. I am</p>	Noted

		concerned that these will be lost if there is no formal direction that this can be maintained in a way similar to its present form, and not manicured.	
S02	Policy FUL/05 Additional Protected Green Spaces within the Village	<p>90. It is important to be clear about definitions of words used in a policy – The policy is entitled ‘ Additional Protected Green Spaces’ which could confuse a future user of the Plan who is simply looking for the LGS and PVAA policy in your Plan. It would be clearer to simply call the policy the ‘Local Green Space and Protected Village Amenity Areas’.</p> <p>91. Part 1 – This section of the policy can be deleted as you do not need to mention the existing LGS sites in the Local Plan.</p> <p>92. The policy is currently very wordy and could be simplified. It is not necessary within the policy to repeat that the Local Plan has identified sites. Look at Histon & Impington Neighbourhood Plan’s LGS policy which states in Policy HIM11 ‘ In accordance with Policy NH/12 in the adopted Local Plan the sites identified in Table 5 and which are identified on Map 16 are designated as Local Green Space.’ This states where you can find the list of sites and the map where they are identified. You could use similar wording for both the LGS and PVAA designations referring to the Local Plan policy NH/12 for LGS and Policy NH/11 for PVAAs.</p> <p>93. Within the policy it would be helpful to give each site a reference so that this can be used to identify it on a map. Without local knowledge it is difficult to know where the newly proposed PVAAs listed in 1b of the policy are located Figure 9 appears to give letters and numbers to the sites but there is no reference list in the key to know which is which or cross refer to the policy. Such a reference list would need to be added to the key of Figure 7 as this too shows the green spaces. This could then be used in the assessments so there is no confusion over sites for a future user of the Plan who does not have local knowledge of Fulbourn.</p> <p>94. Figure 9 – In the Policies Map of the Local Plan PVAAs are shown with a pink symbol and it would help if those in your Plan also used this to avoid too many shades of green.</p>	<p>Noted Text has been revised</p> <p>Noted and actioned</p> <p>Noted and actioned Text has been revised</p> <p>Noted and actioned See Policy Ful/05, and Fig13 & 14 for named sites</p> <p>Noted. Colour differentiation very evident. Green shades normally used to identify green space in a</p>

			way that is legible on the Policy Map.
S02	9. Village Character - Fig 10 & 11 - Para 9.3 - Para 9.9 - Para 9.11	<p>95. Within the VDG SPD there is a map showing the different character areas within the village – It would be helpful if this map were included in this section of your Plan with a little summary description of the key characteristics of each area. The current description of the parish is reliant on local knowledge to know where the key buildings and roads are or cross referring to the VDG. The photographs in Figures 10 and 11 help but there are no locations to understand where each photograph was taken in the village.</p> <p>96. Paragraph 9.3 – Second bullet. We presume that you mean unfarmed/unmanaged when you use the term ‘wild’?</p> <p>97. Paragraph 9.9 You could mention fieldstone as a facing material, and the fact that roofs of the traditional buildings are predominantly of thatch, clay tiles or pantiles.</p> <p>98. Paragraph 9.11 You could include other features such as kerbstones, signpost and other street furniture.</p> <p>99. We note that Fulbourn Hospital is only briefly mentioned in this section of your Plan – had you considered including this? Both the landscape and the buildings on the present-day hospital and Capital Park sites are of visual and historic importance and the plan could indicate the need to protect them. The heritage team has highlighted the importance of views across the parkland south of Victoria House and towards the Victoria House building. Its landmark status is worth stating in your Plan.</p>	<p>Noted and actioned See Fig 2</p> <p>Noted. The images give a general impression of the village character and do not describe specific village locations.</p> <p>Yes – text has been removed / revised</p> <p>Noted – detailed issue</p> <p>Noted– detailed issue</p> <p>Noted and actioned NP V03 includes three LGS in Capital Par, ie Victoria House Parkland, Fulbourn Hospital Parkland & The Old Cemetery.</p>
R30	Para 9.3	Why do we have to be subject to traditional evolved architecture? New builds although in need of being sympathetic to the area around when new groups of houses are planned there should be more radical thinking in their design or we end up with areas that look like council estates all the same with no character.	Opinion noted. The NP does not impose a single style of buildings. Only respect for character.

R30	Para 9.4	Welcome but local planners are unable to move beyond what they think is acceptable and boring.	Opinion noted
R16	Para 9.7	Traffic too heavy	Opinion noted
R33	Para 9.9	"Architectural massing is also fairly low". What does this mean? You've already talked about the height of buildings; are you now talking about their size, the density of development, or both?	Noted Text amended and clarified
R30	Para 9.10	Whilst getting away from the suburban building we need to enhance the types of houses we build and as above challenge the local planners.	Opinion noted
S02	Policy FUL/06 – Securing Village Character	<p>100. For development management officers dealing with planning applications it could be confusing if similar criteria are used in different policies and not clearly stated once in one policy. For example, criteria c in this policy about trees and hedgerows is already referred to in part in Policy FUL/04. A future planning committee report can then simply refer to one policy rather than many if they are saying the same thing. It could lead to confusion.</p> <p>101. Part 1 – The policy does not need to state 'within the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan area' simply within Fulbourn will explain sufficiently.</p> <p>102. An earlier draft of this policy made mention of the requirement to consider the Fulbourn VDG SPD when considering character. We suggest that you include mention of the SPD within this policy.</p> <p>103. Part 1 – What is meant by the term integrity in the first sentence – it needs to be defined.</p> <p>104. Part 2 - The policy seems to be rather prescriptive for all new developments including infill and house alteration in seeking a contemporary response to respect and positively contribute to the essential character. This may</p>	<p>Noted NP 3.1 included App2 'Appropriate Tress for Fulbourn' with an extensive explanation with Evidence Paper 6 (Biodiversity)</p> <p>Noted and edited accordingly</p> <p>Noted and actioned</p> <p>Integrity edited out</p> <p>Noted</p>

		<p>well be appropriate in many circumstances, but there may be instances for example on listed buildings/conservation areas where a traditional response may well be appropriate as has been successfully achieved in the village e.g. at 7-8 School Lane and 45 Pierce Lane. The word 'contemporary' needs to be explicitly defined as it means different things to different people. If this definition seeks to achieve a modern approach, than it should be 'strongly encouraged' rather than expected/demonstrated acknowledging that a traditional design may be appropriate in some instances.</p> <p>105. Part 2a – As the Plan includes a specific policy about streets and lane layouts does this criterion need to be also included within this policy?</p> <p>106. Parts 2c /2d – Planning policies do not extend to controlling what is planted in rear gardens although we can request hedgerows and tree planning on village edges which could achieve criteria 2d of your policy.</p> <p>107. Part 2d – What is meant by 'soft edges? Is this on the edge of the settlement and a transition with the countryside? Your policy wording needs to be unambiguous if it is to be implemented.</p> <p>108. Part 2d – What is meant by the term diverse building frontages? This could contradict other parts of this policy that wishes to retain the essential character of Fulbourn and in Policy FUL/03 2f objections to gateway buildings. Can all these things be achieved? Your policies should not be open for interpretation but clear in what is being asked for.</p> <p>109. The policy could also be further strengthened by requiring new developments to take opportunities for improving the character of area where these do not reflect the essential character of Fulbourn. This would provide a hook to improve parts of the village many recently developed which do not share the essential village characteristics.</p>	<p>Moved to Policy Ful/07 that has been redrafted to take note of these and similar comments</p> <p>Noted See Ful/08, streets section</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Definition of 'soft-edges' added to glossary</p> <p>Text has been edited / amended to address this</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>110. This Policy could include a reference to protecting and enhancing buildings identified as non-designated heritage assets (NDHA). A number, in both conservation areas, are set out in the draft conservation area appraisal. Explicit reference to the suggested NDHAs and their possible future status in a local list would accord closely with the community aspiration which follows this policy.</p>	Noted
S02	Policy FUL/07 – Street and Lane Layout	<p>111. Given that the policy refers to streets and lanes, is it perhaps more appropriate for it to be in the Streets, Transport and Mobility chapter?</p> <p>112. Would some elements of this policy be covered by the essential design considerations in the Design Guide? It might be better to have a comprehensive policy for larger developments as they are the ones that will be providing additional streets, pedestrian and cycle routes.</p> <p>113. Part 1 and 2 – These two parts of the policy appear to be repeating each other so part 1 could be deleted.</p> <p>114. The policy refers to the existing streets and lanes. There may be instances or opportunities in some existing streets and development which could benefit from improvements to the existing character. Hence an improvement to the wording of policy FUL/07 para.1 is suggested by replacing the word ‘essential’ to ‘positive’, and add the word Positive in para 2a –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FUL/07 Para 1: “The existing streets and lanes of Fulbourn shall retain their positive character as defined by green aspect, scale, width and alignment”. • FUL/07 para 2a: Adopt the positive characteristics..... <p>115. Part 2d - Should this section perhaps also have a reference to highway surfaces, particularly the desirability of retaining existing traditional kerbstones, avoiding the introduction of highly engineered kerb details, and maintaining the kerb-free character of many streets and lanes.</p>	<p>Noted. This is now included in Policy Ful/08 as we want to keep together all aspects of village character.</p> <p>Covered in Ful/08 para2</p> <p>Noted and amended accordingly</p> <p>Noted and actioned See Ful/08</p> <p>Noted and actioned</p> <p>Noted Ful/08, Para 2e now covers this</p>

		<p>116. Part 2d – Planning policy does not have control of signage – this would be a highway matter.</p> <p>117. Part 4 – Is there part of this policy missing?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Nothing missing</p>
R30	Policy FUL/07 – Street and Lane Layout	<p>2:d I would suggest we have too much lighting at particular areas which given the type of lighting used has had a severe impact on wildlife with pigeons and blackbirds now not knowing if it is night or day. The dawn chorus is no more with them singing and cooing all night long. More work needs to be done in surveying the impact of modern lighting on wildlife.</p>	Opinion noted
S02	Policy FUL/08 Building and Landscape Design	<p>118. Part 1 – The words ‘they respond’ are repeated in this paragraph. (Non-BC test)</p> <p>119. Part 1a – This criterion could be hard to implement in practice comparing the height of proposed buildings to the height of surrounding trees. Who would determine which trees are to be taken into account?</p> <p>120. Part 1a/b – The first two criteria of this part of the policy are considering height. They refer to all buildings and do not distinguish between residential and non-residential buildings such as community/doctor surgery, commercial or business which may have larger floor to ceiling heights and therefore a higher overall height. This needs clarification with opportunity for relaxation of height where appropriate or justified in non- residential buildings.</p> <p>121. Part 1b - The policy is overly restrictive in that it provides no opportunity for buildings more than 2.5 storeys where it may well be possible to achieve up to 3 storeys without a detrimental impact to the village character, for example in larger new developments which benefit from larger landscape settings. There are existing outline consents such as at Ida Darwin and land at Teversham Road, whilst predominantly seeking 2 storeys, already permits buildings up to 3 storeys in limited instances up to a maximum of 10.5m. Indeed, Victoria House, Waterworks or Chapels in Fulbourn may well be above 8.5m height. We therefore</p>	<p>Noted and edited Ful/07, Building & Landscape</p> <p>Noted. Text has been edited to specific measured heights</p> <p>Noted See Ful/07, para 2a</p> <p>Noted The policy has been amended to take these comments into account.</p>

	<p>suggest that the policy wording should be amended to allow for a more flexible approach to height. We suggest 'predominantly 2 storeys with potential for exceptional 2.5 to 3 storey buildings which positively relates to their use or landscape setting'. This will provide for a greater variety and diversity of built form and in order to promote sustainable densities, it would be beneficial to offer more flexibility in terms of height for 2.5/3 storeys which is different from 2 storeys below the tree crown cover which may well be varied across Fulbourn. The restriction of height for 2.5 storeys may result in over-dominant dormer windows or shallower or flat roof profiles.</p> <p>122. It would be useful to clarify how the large employment sites would need to comply in terms of height as the existing sites would not be consistent with Policy FUL/08 as parts of both Peterhouse Technology Park and Fulbourn capital park have buildings of 3 storeys and heights above 8.5m. Whilst Fulbourn Capital Park clearly has a village character, the Peterhouse Technology Park, in character terms appears to be an extension of the city, albeit must take account of a sensitive edge from the VDG SPD.</p> <p>123. Part 1d – This criterion is not fully explained. What is meant by the term elegant simplicity? What variety of building types would be acceptable? How would a development management office know whether a development scheme met this criterion?</p> <p>124. Part 1e = Have you considered electric charging points for both cycles and vehicles?</p> <p>125. Part 1f – This criterion appears to be repeating elements already considered in the policy.</p> <p>126. Part 2 There are a number of policies in your Plan that cross refer to another policy. There are occasions when you can refer to other policies, such as when allocating a site and requiring development to provide a mix set out in another policy – e.g. The mix shall be in accordance with the requirements set out in Policy X. But it can make for a more complicated plan for a future user to refer</p>	<p>Noted The revised policy accommodates this</p> <p>Noted This has been removed in v3.</p> <p>Noted Included in Ful/07/ para 2d</p> <p>Noted, edited out</p> <p>Noted Text edited to reflect this point</p>
--	---	--

		<p>to. We should suggest that you consider carefully when using this technique of cross referencing. You should aim for your policies to be clear and easy to use.</p> <p>127. Part 2a – Should this read ‘Native trees and shrubs?’</p> <p>128. Part 2c – Mention could be made in the supporting text to this policy to highlight the Local Plan Policy SS/8 Sustainable Drainage Systems. Currently this criterion has no supporting text to explain why it is included in a policy.</p>	<p>The policy has been redrafted. App 2 ‘Appropriate Tress’ added and also explained within EP6 (Biodiversity)</p> <p>Noted Text edited and moved to Ful/09, para 3b</p>
S01	Policy FUL/08	<p>Anglian Water fully supports the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) wherever possible to addresses the risk of surface water and sewer flooding and which have wider benefits including water quality.</p>	Noted
S05	Policy FUL/08	<p>I can see reference is made to the SCDC Local Plan, policies CC/8 and CC/9. It is really encouraging to see reference to the Local plan and promotion of the inclusion of SuDS across the village. I have provided some comments below for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which I have linked below for ease of reference, should be made regarding the principle of designing surface water drainage into a development. This document is adopted by South Cambridgeshire District Council • SCDC Local Plan policy CC/7 is particularly important for protecting existing watercourses and groundwater bodies from pollution. It would be beneficial to include reference to this within the Neighbourhood Plan 	<p>Noted This is covered and referenced in; Ful/04 2c & 3d Ful/09 3a</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be worth drawing attention to Chapter 14 of the NPPF, as this relates to flood risk. For example, paragraph 160(b) aims for development to be safe for the lifetime without increasing flood risk and where possible reducing flood risk overall • With reference to the flood risk around Fulbourn, it is noted that this is made up mainly of surface water flood risk. There is some useful information on the gov.uk website on surface water flood risk, as well as in the South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • It would be good to include some policy directly related to the flood risk, drawn together from the policy within SCDC Local Plan, but relating to the risk around Fulbourn, particularly around water quality and quantity, to protect the chalk streams, and to ensure development does not increase flood risk within the village. 	
R30	Policy FUL/08	1:e All new houses should have parking for 2 cars minimum and electric charging points for them. Solar panels should be mandatory in the build to offset the usage and with battery storage. There will always be cars needed given the poor transport network.	Noted Ful/07 includes electric charging points
R33	Policy FUL/08	para. 1: "they respond" repeated.	Noted and edited
O11	Policy FUL/08	This policy places a restriction on the height of dwellings. With regard to development at Teversham Road, the outline parameters allow a ridge height of up to 10.5m. The policy should therefore allow flexibility for taller dwellings where it can be demonstrated that the additional height would not impact upon the aims of objectives of other policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted Ful/07 outlines the NP preferences. Existing outline planning permission exists on some sites and the NP is aware of this.
O12	Policy FUL/08	...	Text amended where relevant

		It is requested that Policy FUL/08 ... are deleted. Sections 9 and 10 of Draft FNP already refer to existing adopted policy and guidance..	
R30	10. Housing	I would question the need for so many houses given the proposed new villages around and the possible shift in labour to other parts of the country with cheaper housing.	Opinion noted
O07	10. Housing	Countryside have an interest in land west of Station Road, Fulbourn, and recognise the potential for residential development on the site ... We ... request that the DNP is revised to allocate the land west of Station Road site as a 'community-led' housing scheme. This would represent an opportunity for the Parish Council and local residents to play a fundamental role in shaping the village to meet it's the current and future growth needs.	The NP has been prepared in compliance with the adopted Local Plan which has made a full assessment of housing needs over the period 2018-2031 and believes that local housing needs will be met from the existing plan. No exceptional circumstances have been identified for the release of Green Belt land. Where appropriate, the Parish Council will consider either a full or a partial review of the Plan to take account of revisions of the Local Plan and any wider change in circumstances which may arise.
S02	10. Housing - Para 10.3	129. Paragraph 10.3 for clarity it should be stated that it was Cambridgeshire ACRE that carried out the survey.	Noted Page 79, para 10.7 references Cambridgeshire ACRE and it is its report is included in the Evidence Base as doc EV270
R30	Para 10.4 & 10.13	talks about affordable housing which in reality can never be given the cost of living in and around Cambridge. No young person is able to afford a home in the area, part of one maybe so the term affordable housing is misleading. 10:13 bears this out. We are one of the few countries that aspires to home ownership.	Opinion noted

R19	Para 10.4	You indicate that the level of planned and recent housing provision far exceeds the requirements identified by housing needs studies, yet you do not address the harmful effects of infill (Section 10.4, p. 57). I entirely agree with the importance of Local Green Spaces, the need for allotments and the sharing of large back-garden vegetable plots. However, lockdown has highlighted still further the importance of gardens to people's health and wellbeing. Therefore, surely, we should be questioning the rate at which large gardens are being lost to infill in the village. Infill is also likely to reduce rather than enhance habitats for wildlife and impose additional obstacles to their movement.	Opinion noted
R04	Affordable Housing	There are very commendable generalisations in the plan with regards housing growth. However I would like to know what criteria is being used to determine what 'appropriate size' and 'affordable' means. 'Affordable' by whom? Given the cost of housing and the need for key workers to have secure accommodation and be close to the work place because of both the environmental cost of travel and the ability for local young people to stay in the area, isn't it vital that caps are put on the prices of homes and that local residents are prioritised when it comes to the purchase of new homes?	Opinion Noted The terms 'affordable' with regard to housing is a well-used concept.
R02	Environmental Enhancement	I have been impressed to see that the new small development on Balsham Road includes external charging points for electric vehicles, and would like to see this as a requirement of future planning permissions, together with solar panels, heat pumps, grey water capture and other environmentally friendly measures.	Opinion noted
R05	Para 10.9	For new housing developments, can consideration also be given to installing a community heating network using a closed-loop ground-source heat pump, as is being planned by residents in Swaffham Prior?	Suggestion noted
S02	Policy FUL/09 - Housing Design Quality	130. The urban design officers have commented on this policy and do not consider that its content aim and principles are consistent. They consider that parts of this policy could be better placed in other policies in the plan. You may wish to consider this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 1 could be consolidated in PolicyFUL/01 	Noted The policies have been redrafted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parts 2 and 3 are more about detail and would be better placed in FUL/08 <p>131. Part 2c – We would question why only modification and extensions to existing dwellings would require to demonstrate that a contemporary design need to have been considered (as it would really depend on the character and context), but not the same requirement applied for minor and major developments, which could also be viewed as overly prescriptive. There are some successful schemes in Fulbourn that have delivered a traditional design in keeping with the original house and have been successful. See comments in paragraph 108 about Policy FUL/06 and the use and definition of the term contemporary which are relevant to this policy too.</p> <p>132. Part 2c – How would a developer be expected to demonstrate the ‘creative solutions that are sought in this criterion?’</p> <p>133. Part 3 – Do the criteria in this section add anything locally specific for Fulbourn or is it simply repeating Policy HQ/1 Design Principles from the Local Plan and the Design Guide SPD?</p> <p>134. Part 3 - You will need to include in your glossary a definition of the different housing types mentioned in this section – infill and windfall sites, self build and co-housing.</p> <p>135. Part 3b – What is meant by the term ‘design context’ in the policy?</p> <p>136. Part 4a – There is no information in the supporting text about a Building for a Healthy Life (BHL) assessment and where a developer could find out how to carry such an assessment out. You will need to include such information. If an appraisal system is to be agreed with the Parish Council again there will need to be information about this process. It is not possible to include elements in a policy without the evidence base to back it up.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Section has been redrafted</p> <p>The NP is consistent with the VDG</p> <p>Glossary extended</p> <p>Policies clarified</p> <p>Noted Text edited and moved to Ful/09</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>137. We consider that the use of BHL toolkit should be used with caution as it does not provide absolute results on design quality. It is useful as an engagement tool or for discussion to agree on what the development should aim to achieve. It uses a traffic light system for 12 questions with the aim to score greens, reduce ambers and avoid reds. As the tool is for all development it is very difficult to differentiate in the document different responses to village/rural areas as compared to urban and could conflict with the objectives of neighbourhood plan. A reference to the village SPD or a future design code for villages/rural areas which is being considered by Ministry of Housing Community and Local Government would be more appropriate. (There is currently a consultation being carried out the central government on design codes which you may wish to note)</p> <p>138. Part 4b – We are not sure what this adds to the Local Plan policy SC/7?</p> <p>139. Part 4c – What does this add to the policies in the Local Plan about renewable energy - Policy CC/3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy in New Developments. We adopted a new SPD last year which you may wish to cross refer to in the supporting text about renewables - Greater Cambridge Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document</p> <p>140. Part 5 – This section relates to all proposals but will only be for housing development. You may wish these to cover all types of development within the village including employment and therefore have a specific policy in your Plan?</p> <p>141. Part 5 – You could consider adding an additional criteria that show homes could have examples of wildlife friendly gardens and provide guidance leaflets for new residents. You mentioned this in paragraph 7.13 but did not then include the idea within a policy.</p> <p>142. The supporting text to this policy would benefit from having more justification for all of the criteria included. They cover a range of different design considerations and would impact on the viability of any scheme.</p>	<p>Noted, Section 4 rewritten</p> <p>Noted, Section 4 rewritten</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted Now included in Biodiversity</p> <p>Noted The policy has been restructured</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>143. Part 5c – We are not sure what this criterion is about as it covers many issues. How could it be implemented?</p> <p>144. Part 5f – How does this add value to the existing Local Plan car parking policy which has a design-led approach? Policy TI/3: Parking Provision.</p>	<p>Noted The policy has been restructured</p> <p>Noted The policy has been restructured</p>
O12	Policy FUL/09	<p>...</p> <p>It is requested that ... FUL/09 ... are deleted. Sections 9 and 10 of Draft FNP already refer to existing adopted policy and guidance..</p>	Noted. No action required
S02	Policy FUL/10: Housing Development and Local Need	<p>The numbering system for this policy needs to be reconsidered as it has e-g rather than a-c.</p> <p>146. Part 1e – Why at least 5% in the housing mix? Do you have justification for this amount? There is no information in the supporting text other than mention that the local residents think the needs of an ageing population should be considered. As this is for housing schemes of 10 or more units in order to achieve 5% of anything the scheme would have to be much more than 10 – (a development of 50 units to get 2.5 homes)</p> <p>147. Part 1f – What would you consider to be a ‘suitable proportion’ for low-income houses for sale? Where is the justification for affordable housing for people with a disability? Should this be a separate consideration? Does part e also apply to part f – i.e. should 5% of the 40% be small units? How would a planning officer dealing with an application know what a “small unit” is?</p> <p>148. Part 1g - Density is a crude measure of development form or a control on quality and hence should be considered carefully. It is curious why a density policy is added in this chapter as it relates to built form. Whilst the objective of restricting overall average net density in the village to 30 dph is reasonable to protect its character, heights etc, it isn’t advisable to restrict this in every part of</p>	<p>Noted Incorrect numbering corrected</p> <p>Noted The policy has been restructured</p> <p>Noted The policy has been restructured</p> <p>Noted The policy has been restructured</p>

		<p>developments due to its implication on creating diversity. For example, a closer-knit building on a high street or a row of terraces of two storeys which is in keeping with village character could at times be up to 80 dph. There are existing outline consents which proposes densities beyond 30 dph in specific areas; Ida Darwin and the site off Teversham Road being an example (33- 45 dph).</p> <p>149. Final part of the policy – Developers can only be asked to contribute outside their site (i.e. in the Parish) through a Section 106 Planning Obligation and where the Government rules can be met. They must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • directly related to the development; and • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A developer could not be required to contribute to strengthen existing facilities for the village as a whole. <p>150. We are not sure what is meant by 'to support community integration in response to the requirements set out by Fulbourn Parish Council'. Is this requirement set out in your neighbourhood plan and supported by evidence for such requirements? There is a list on page 91 in the Delivery Priorities chapter of the Plan. How would a development know what is required or a planning officer know when it has been met?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted The policy has been restructured</p>
R33	Policy FUL/10:	Subsections start at "e."	Noted and corrected
O05	Policy FUL/10.	<p>...</p> <p>It is requested that Policy FUL/10 is amended to include a clear commitment that all identified local affordable housing needs will be met by 2031, and to assess and allocate housing sites where affordable housing or a proportion of affordable housing can be delivered. If it is not possible to identify a sufficient amount of land to meet affordable housing needs because of policy constraints, then Policy FUL/10 should include a commitment to support the release of land from the</p>	<p>The NP believes that local housing needs will be met from the existing plan. No exceptional circumstances have been identified for the release of Green Belt land. Where appropriate, the Parish Council will consider</p>

		Green Belt through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to ensure the delivery of additional affordable housing in Fulbourn.	either a full or a partial review of the Plan to take account of revisions of the Local Plan and any wider change in circumstances which may arise.
O09	Policy FUL/10.	... It is requested that Policy FUL/10 is amended to include a clear commitment that all identified local affordable housing needs will be met by 2031, and to assess and allocate housing sites where affordable housing or a proportion of affordable housing can be delivered. If it is not possible to identify a sufficient amount of land to meet affordable housing needs because of policy constraints, then Policy FUL/10 should include a commitment to support the release of land from the Green Belt through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to ensure the delivery of additional affordable housing in Fulbourn.	The NP believes that local housing needs will be met from the existing plan. No exceptional circumstances have been identified for the release of Green Belt land
O12	Policy FUL/10	... It is requested that ... Criteria (g) of FUL/10 are deleted. Sections 9 and 10 of Draft FNP already refer to existing adopted policy and guidance. ... It is requested that Policy FUL/10 is amended to include a clear commitment that all identified local affordable housing needs will be met by 2031, and to assess and allocate housing sites where affordable housing or a proportion of affordable housing can be delivered. If it is not possible to identify a sufficient amount of land to meet affordable housing needs because of policy constraints, then Policy FUL/10 should include a commitment to support the release of land from the Green Belt through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to ensure the delivery of additional affordable housing in Fulbourn.	Noted. No action required. The NP believes that local housing needs will be met from the existing plan. No exceptional circumstances have been identified for the release of Green Belt land

S02	Policy FUL/11 – Ida Darwin and Teversham Road Sites	<p>151. There is no supporting text to provide any further information as to why these additional requirements are being asked on these sites. Justification is required rather than just adding it into a policy.</p> <p>152. The policy should not repeat the Local Plan policies and must be in general conformity with them but can set out additional requirements “in addition to the Local Plan policies H/3 and SS/3. The policy currently does not mention the Local Plan policies.</p> <p>153. Are these sites identified on any maps – it would be helpful to have an inset map near to this policy for those who do not have local knowledge of the parish.</p> <p>154. Part 1c – Mention is made of preserving views across open countryside etc but is this shown on any maps. We note that the VDG SPD includes a map showing such views which could be incorporated into the Plan or cross referenced - page 16.</p> <p>155. Part 1e It would be helpful to have an inset map showing where these pedestrian and cycle connections are within Fulbourn – the VDG SPD does include such a map about the Ida Darwin site - Page 16.</p> <p>156. Part 1f This should be applicable to either the entire Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan or for a certain threshold of development in the Neighbourhood plan area rather than rather than just the Ida Darwin site.</p> <p>157. 2a – How could this be measured? Not sure that a planning policy could protect against this completely.</p> <p>158. The formatting of this policy seems to have hidden the footer on page 63.</p>	<p>Noted Supporting text added</p> <p>Noted Policy has been removed and replaced with new Policy FUL/09 relating to Larger Residential Development (over 10 Units). Reference to Ida Darwin and Teversham Road sites included in supporting text</p> <p>Map added</p>
S01	Policy FUL/11	It is suggested that Policy FUL/11 makes clear that the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems is the preferred method of surface water drainage.	Noted

		It is therefore proposed that Policy FUL/11 is amended as follows: b. There is an effective and sustainable drainage scheme incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems for this low-lying site in perpetuity, including future-proofing for the challenge of the escalating climate emergency.	Sustainable Drainage is considered in Ful/09, section 3
R30	Policy FUL/11	1:f will never happen. People need cars, they may not use them for work but will for recreation/distance travel. Decent road infrastructure need to be assured for any development. 2:a will have an impact, it cannot be any other way. Futureproofing has not been shown to have been taken into account as the data is flawed.	Opinion Noted
R33	Policy FUL/11	2d. "Design and layout of the site should be integrated into the pattern of streets and lanes of the village, at least for pedestrians and cyclists" - I would prefer this to say "but only for pedestrians and cyclists" to avoid any risk of increased motor traffic in Cox's Drove and Cow Lane. I agree with the Parish Council and others that the arrangements currently proposed to prevent motor traffic to and from the development using Cox's Drove are inadequate; the existing wording ("at least") doesn't help the case for arrangements that will allow access and egress for emergency vehicles but not for other motor traffic.	Opinion noted
O11	Policy FUL/11	Fulbourn parish Council will be aware that outline planning permission was granted on the Teversham Road site through reference S/0202/17/OL dated 26 October 2017. The granted consent for 'development up to 110 dwellings with areas of landscaping and public open space and associated infrastructure works'. Amongst the approved plans referenced in condition 4 is plan 'M06 rev E – Parameters Plan'. This shows the developable areas where the 110 dwellings can be erected and can be viewed within Appendix 1 of this response. A subsequent reserved matters application (reference S/3290/19/RM) has been submitted and awaits determination from South Cambridgeshire District Council. The key area of comment relates to Figures 7 and 8, shown on page 32 and 37 of the draft Plan. This shows an area defined as 'sensitive fields' and annotated 'key	Noted The NP outlines the preferences of the community Existing outline planning permission exists on some sites and the NP is aware of this.

		<p>long distance views' on or across the Teversham Road site ... The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore be cognisant of the extant planning permission that allows development within the agreed parcels, the suitability for which has been tested at planning appeal. The screen shot above conflicts with the outline permission, and as such, should be amended to respect the approved parameters. This is particularly a concern to the east fo the chalk, where development has consent to be located within both the sensitive field and key long distance view areas. Without amendment, we respectively conclude that the Neighbourhood Plan would need be considered sound.</p> <p>This concern should also be reflected in the wording to criteria 2.c within policy FUL/11 regarding the Teversham Road site. this references the 'vistas' to the surrounding countryside from Poorwell Water. Given the parameters of the approved consent, this should more specifically reference a singular vista northwards along the chalk stream.</p>	Opinion noted
S02	Policy FUL/12 Rural Exception Sites	<p>159. What does this add to the existing Local Plan policy(H/11)? We do not think that these criteria could be implemented without full justification. The NPPF is more flexible on the facilitation of rural exception sites including limited market housing at a minimum level to make the affordable housing scheme viable.</p> <p>160. Part 1d – The reference to the policies is slightly confusing and may need each policy to be spelt out to be clear – Policies FUL/01; FUL/02; FUL/03 and FUL/04. Also it may not just be these policies that the development of rural exception sites should have regard to – Policies FUL/06 FUL/07, FUL/08 and FUL/10.Also see the comments that we made in paragraph 127 about cross referring to policies.</p>	<p>Noted – policy amended to make it more relevant to Fulbourn</p> <p>Noted The policies have been restructured to increase clarity</p>
S02	11. Employment - Para 11.6	<p>161. It would help to have an inset map showing where the key employment sites are within the parish.</p>	<p>Noted Fig 5 shows employment locations</p> <p>Noted</p>

		<p>162. Paragraph 11.6 – Your Plan does not need to include support for the employment policies within the adopted Local Plan, but it must be in general conformity with the identified strategic policies.</p> <p>163. Could policies FUL/13 and FUL/15 be merged to reduce duplication and to aid clarity? Rural and Edge of Village Employment sites appear to have fewer requirements than those within the built-up area.</p>	<p>Noted The various policies have been restructured to increase clarity</p>
S02	Policy FUL/13 – Employment Development in General	<p>164. Part 1 – The correct term to use is development framework boundary and this part of the policy is simply repeating the Local Plan policy E/12. Whilst recognising that it is good for local people to live and work within a village it is not possible to restrict new employment opportunities to only local residents – planning policy does not have that level of control.</p> <p>165. Part 2a – Is it realistic to require no loss of character and visual amenity from an employment development with some level of car parking? Is there a different wording that could be used that would prevent an unacceptable loss of character/visual amenity? How could a developer demonstrate that their proposals will not ‘materially’ increase the traffic load on village roads. Surely any new development is likely to generate some traffic, so it is unreasonable to expect no increase in traffic movement as a result of new development?</p> <p>166. Part 2b – Whilst recognising that heavy vehicles may impact the smaller roads within the parish is it realistic to expect to reduce movements by vans too. Surely this would restrict the types of employment that would be acceptable within the parish.</p> <p>167. Part 2c - It is not clear what the requirement for heavy vehicle movements at the periphery of the village means? Are there lorry weight restrictions through the village? Which roads does the periphery cover? What does the Village Boundary refer to? As it currently stands, it would be difficult for a business that used HGV’s to understand acceptable sites in the area. Restrictions on HGV movements from a development would possibly need a Section 106 obligation to</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted The phrasing has been revised</p> <p>Noted This matter is clarified in later versions</p>

		<p>be entered into for every such development and it would need to meet the tests referred to previously, namely that any obligations must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • directly related to the development; and • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development 	
S02	Policy FUL/14 Large Employment Sites	<p>168. We would recommend that you include a map showing the employment sites mentioned in this policy.</p> <p>169. The policy is more stringent than Local Plan Policy TI/2 which effectively requires a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for all development on the two employment sites referred to. The requirements are potentially overly onerous.</p> <p>170. Part 2 – What is meant by ‘ambitious sustainable travel’? How would this be measured? What is ‘accepted best practice’? Explanations for these are not included in the supporting text.</p> <p>171. The policy mentions clear responsibilities for monitoring but by whom? Who is to monitor the transport assessment – ourselves or the future business?</p>	<p>Noted and actioned. Fig. 5</p> <p>Noted and edited out</p> <p>Noted and reworded</p> <p>Noted</p>
O09	Policy FUL/14.	<p>Policy FUL/14 of Draft FNP relates to large employment sites including Capital Park. EDBF is promoting an extension to Capital Park for office and research related employment through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process. Policy FUL/14 refers to existing employment policies in the adopted Local Plan and to sustainable travel outcomes for any employment development at the large employment sites. Policy E/13 of the adopted Local Plan already sets out the requirements for new development proposed in edge of village locations, including taking into account impacts on character and appearance and accessibility by walking and cycling. Section 3 of the NPPF provides guidance on plan-making. Criteria (f) of Paragraph 16 states that plans should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. Policy FUL/14 serves</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Policy reworded to emphasise the VDG</p>

		<p>no clear purpose and duplicates existing Policy E/13 of the adopted Local Plan, and as such it is inconsistent with national guidance and so does not meet Basic Condition (a).</p> <p>It is requested that Policy FUL/14 is deleted to avoid repeating adopted development plan policy.</p>	Opinion noted
S02	Policy FUL/15 Rural and Edge of Village Employment	<p>172. Part 1 – This includes requirements for there to be “no increase in volume.” would seem to be unachievable and it takes no account of whether there is a material impact upon local amenity and road safety. If it only relates to the volume of HGVs then this might also be onerous, depending upon what size of vehicle is determined to be a “heavy vehicle”?</p> <p>173. Part 1b – How would you define adequate planted edges? Is this buffer planting? How would a planning officer considering a planning application be able to determine if planting is adequate?</p>	Policy clarified. But requirement for control of heavy vehicles (defined in highway code and transport policy) needs to remain.
S02	12. Community Facilities - Para 12.3-12.4	<p>174. Paragraph 12.3-12.4 - In preparing the currently adopted Local Plan SCDC and Cambridge City Council jointly commissioned a survey of all the playing pitches within the Greater Cambridge area. This is likely to be updated to inform the new local plan being prepared. https://www.scambs.gov.uk/media/3455/final_playing_pitch_strategy_2016_rd-csf-190_revised.pdf</p> <p>There was also a study carried out on indoor sports facilities - https://www.scambs.gov.uk/media/3445/final_indoor_sports_facility_strategy_2016_rd-csf-200_revised.pdf</p> <p>175. It would help to tell the different story lines in this chapter if the supporting text for each topic was put nearer to the actual policy. Currently the recreation ground and health care provision are all together. We would suggest that each of these issues has its own policy rather than being put together in one as Policy FUL/17.</p>	Noted

R16	Para 12.6	New Improved Health Centre should be top key priority: Could it be re-located to the field beside the Fulbourn Centre and the Entrance drive? Car Parking is already in place.	Policy amended following meeting with SCDC
R05	Para 12.7	Updating and redevelopment of Fulbourn Medical Centre needs to be an urgent priority in my opinion. It needs to have its own identity and not be a satellite of Cornford House practice, though I realise this is in the hands of the NHS. At present patients wanting an appointment urgently can be asked to go to Cornford House nearly 3 miles away. This is an anachronism for a village this size, especially when the public transport service is so poor.	Policy amended following meeting with SCDC
R16	Para 12.8	Excellent.	Opinion noted
S02	Policy FUL/16 – Valued Community Assets	<p>176. This policy appears to be all embracing. Is it the intention that it covers all the assets of community value that are formerly accepted on the register held by SCDC? These would not need to be protected again through your Plan. Or is it protecting more than this formal list – it is unclear as there is no information in the supporting text to explain. Are these the assets listed from a-n in Figure 6 shown as a purple diamond on the map with no explanation of what this represents? There are already a range of policies in the adopted Local Plan that protect existing assets. Policy SC/3: Protection of Village Services and Facilities and Policy SC/8: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community Orchards.</p> <p>177. Community Aspiration – This will need to be formatted so that it looks very different from the policies in your Plan – it is only a subtle colour change as currently shown. This needs to be more distinctive.</p>	<p>Noted This section moved to Section 14 that covers Community Aspirations</p> <p>Noted. Actioned.</p>
S02	Policy FUL/17 – Recreational and Healthcare Facilities	<p>178. Part 1 – In order for Section 106 obligations to be used they must meet three legal tests namely that any obligations must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • directly related to the development; and • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development 	<p>Noted Changed to Ful/15</p>

		<p>This policy seeks to direct the district council to secure funding for existing facilities in preference to the creation on new ones. It is accepted that using section 106 contributions to extend existing facilities will in many cases be the most logical and cost-effective way to mitigate the impact of a development. However, there are times when a new standalone community facility is required, and the decision will always rest with the planning decision taker having regard to the specific circumstances.</p> <p>179. Part 2 – Has this requirement been discussed with Sport England? The first sentence is confusing. Has there been a suggestion to create alternative facilities elsewhere?</p> <p>180. Part 2a – Has the landowner of this field been consulted over this proposal and is happy for the recreation ground to expand into this area? If the landowner is not willing for this to take place it may make this policy aspiration unviable/ unachievable.</p> <p>181. You will need to add wording to the policy indicating which map the designated field is shown on – ‘...as shown in Figure 1 and 7’.</p> <p>182. Part 2b – Has an assessment been carried out on the demand for indoor facilities? You will need evidence to justify why you are stating that outdoor facilities are to be prioritised over indoor ones.(Refer to the studies done of indoor facilities as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan mentioned in paragraph 123)</p> <p>183. Section after 2b – The Local Plan has a policy to ensure developers contribute towards open space provision. New developments will require green space and must comply with the minimum standards included in Policy SC/7 in the Local Plan so that their new residents will have access to open space A policy can state a preference for investment in existing facilities unless specific circumstances dictate otherwise (no room to expand for example)</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. It is considered to be too early in the process for this activity</p> <p>Landowner consulted.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Yes, see Section 12, part G</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>184. Part 3 – Is the current GP practice and / or the Local Heath authority supportive of the proposals in your policy? If the current site is not used it would be helpful to have a criteria-based policy to indicate what would be required of a new site to be suitable for a health centre. Size, location, design, parking requirements etc. Some of this information to create this policy is included on page 82 in the Fulbourn Health Centre section of Village Aspirations – Any new facility should be located at the heart of the village; easily accessible; site large enough for an integrated services approach such as on site pharmacy, dental, physiotherapy and counselling services</p> <p>185. It would be helpful to have an inset map showing where the existing Health facility is located in the village.</p> <p>186. Part 3 – The first section supports a multipurpose healthcare facility etc over any other community facilities. Does this imply that there are other community uses that could go into the existing site and would be in competition for the site???</p> <p>187. Figure 1 – This must be out of sequence as there is already a Figure 1 at the start of the Plan showing the designated neighbourhood area for Fulbourn.</p>	<p>Discussions underway with GPs and they agree.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Maybe It is too early in the process to define.</p> <p>Noted and amended</p>
O05	Policy FUL/17.	<p>...</p> <p>It is requested that Section 12 and Policy FUL/17 are amended to explain how the proposed extension to the recreation ground, the proposed new multi-purpose health centre, and additional allotments for the village will actually be delivered, including confirmation of landowner agreement and an indication of sources of funding to enable delivery of these facilities. In the absence of the requested information these facilities will remain an undeliverable aspiration.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is too early in the process to define. Policy wording and supporting text amended.</p>
O09	Policy FUL/17.	<p>...</p>	

		It is requested that Section 12 and Policy FUL/17 are amended to explain how the proposed extension to the recreation ground, the proposed new multi-purpose heath centre, and additional allotments for the village will actually be delivered, including confirmation of landowner agreement and an indication of sources of funding to enable delivery of these facilities. In the absence of the requested information these facilities will remain an undeliverable aspiration.	Noted It is too early in the process to define.
O12	Policy FUL/17.	... It is requested that Section 12 and Policy FUL/17 are amended to explain how the proposed extension to the recreation ground, the proposed new multi-purpose heath centre, and additional allotments for the village will actually be delivered, including confirmation of landowner agreement and an indication of sources of funding to enable delivery of these facilities. In the absence of the requested information these facilities will remain an undeliverable aspiration.	Noted It is too early in the process to define.
R21	13. Streets, Transport and Mobility	The draft Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan is a welcome and valuable document that clearly reflects the considerable amount of effort expended on it by a team of local people. Inevitably, there are some areas that would merit further consideration before the plan is finalised, one of the most significant being its approach to a strategic public transport policy for the village. It should be said at the outset that the plan does not appear to take a definite standpoint as to whether or not the provision of sustainable public transport can be viewed as part of a planning policy, or falls outside its remit. For example, Planning Objective 7 in the Vision Statement says that 'future development should also be accompanied by strong support for walking, cycling and improvement of public transportation for the village as a whole'. Policy FUL/18 regarding Sustainable Mobility also commits to 'contribute to improved bus provision, including additional high-quality and safe bus waiting areas'. On the other hand, 'Sustainable Mobility', including 'regular review of bus services to meet changing needs', is also listed later on as being merely an aspiration that does not fit with the plan objectives.	Opinion Noted The thoughts contained within this comprehensive response will be carefully considered. However transport management and service provision are not a matter for land use planning policy.

		<p>The point is arguable, but the fact is that the provision of sustainable public transport is critical to the evolution of Fulbourn as envisaged in the plan and should surely be viewed accordingly. After all, we are used to seeing new railway stations or, less so these days, upgraded roads being associated with major commercial and residential developments. Then there is the question of cycling and cycling infrastructure...</p> <p>As would be expected, much is made in the draft plan of provision for safe cycling and no-one would argue with this. However, the very high priority accorded to cycling chimes with the general position adopted by local government and the cycling lobby in this country, who seek to advance it as a universal solution for short and medium-distance travel for the majority of the population of every age and at all times of year. This is not the case in the real world, of course and nor will it ever be.</p> <p>The fact becomes ever clearer as you move beyond urban centres to villages whose distances from those centres are measured in terms of several miles, regardless of the existence of green cycle routes and the like. For example, many elderly residents, or mothers with young children, would not contemplate such a journey on a regular basis and a significant proportion of the rest of the population either can't cycle, or do not wish to do so. Surely it is logical therefore that if cycling infrastructure can be treated as an integral part of planning policy, so too should be a sustainable public transport service.</p> <p>However, every reference in the plan to public transport in strategic terms amounts to little more than broad statements of intent that do not suggest with any confidence a meaningful intention to secure for the village a service that will meet the future requirements of its residents. For example: 'Regular and reliable public bus services are important in avoiding isolation and assisting day-to-day life for all age groups. Improved bus frequencies and better bus waiting facilities will be encouraged, including the reinstatement of half-hourly bus services to Cambridge and new routes towards Newmarket' (13.8).</p> <p>Looking at the current state of public transport provision in Fulbourn, the village is not on the Guided Busway route and, in the perhaps unlikely event of the proposed Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro scheme coming to fruition, did not</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>have a proposed station when the scheme was first unveiled and to date this position has not altered.</p> <p>Setting aside the suggestion that Fulbourn Railway Station, on the outskirts of the village, could be re-opened in order to play some sort of role, we are left with the bus service, which currently consists largely of diesel double-deckers that negotiate their way through the village, sometimes with difficulty, in order to pick up few if any passengers at most times of the day. Without doubt more people would use the service if it were faster (currently about 50 minutes from the Pharmacy to Cambridge centre) and more frequent. There is also an often-expressed view, which doesn't help, that the service is unreliable – although Stagecoach would probably dispute this. It is a fact that many people from the village prefer to drive the short distance to the Babraham Road Park & Ride, where bus services to Addenbrooke's, the Railway Station and the City Centre are much more frequent, much quicker and generally reliable.</p> <p>Under these circumstances and even without a pandemic, the idea of a commercial entity (Stagecoach) and a cash-strapped County Council agreeing to expand village bus services on the present basis seems remote indeed and, in any case, would hardly constitute a vision for the next 10 years or more. In other words, the Neighbourhood Plan in its current form leaves the village as a hostage to fortune in terms of future public transport provision, with continuing contraction of services being the most likely outcome.</p> <p>There is only one alternative to this, which is to state a policy that will underline the strategic importance of public transport provision to the future development of Fulbourn and acknowledge the current shortcomings. It should declare the intention of the village to be proactive in establishing the means to seek a new and perhaps radical solution that successfully meets all requirements and objections. It certainly isn't the job of the Neighbourhood Plan to go further than this but, as a hypothetical example, such a solution could entail electric mini-buses providing frequent shuttle services between the village and an enhanced bus hub at Tesco and even the Babraham Road Park & Ride. Other nearby villages could also be served in this way.</p> <p>The important thing at this stage is not to let the opportunity to begin that strategic conversation slip. Otherwise, the future mobility needs of Fulbourn and its</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>population will not have been as well served by the Neighbourhood Plan as could have been the case.</p> <p>Finally, as a matter of accuracy, the Neighbourhood Plan should include the entire length of Manor Walk/Home End as one of the main routes used by both heavy and light traffic travelling to and from Balsham Road (13.2, 14.46, 14.65).</p> <p>Frequent hold-ups occur by Fulbourn Manor as heavy lorries negotiate their way past parked vehicles</p>	
R22	13. Streets, Transport and Mobility	<p>Regarding section 13 on transport. I was glad to read of the aspiration for 20mph throughout the village (or lower speed in the high street). This is consistent with much of cherry hinton and with the "direction of travel" for speed limits Nationally. The village pavements/roads are very narrow in some areas, such as Haggis Gap (an important access route to the library, health centre, school for children on the estate), also on Balsham Road, where not only has there been a recent significant traffic accident (wall knocked over on corner of Impett's/Home End/Balsham Road....could have been extremely serious/fatal if a pedestrian or cyclist had been involved). Balsham Road has a new development of affordable houses, with young families living there walking quite a long stretch of narrow pavement facing often very large vehicles. In conclusion it is the right thing to do to reduce the speed of traffic. I understand that arguments against this have been based on residents not wanting the associated signage to support it, arguing it is detrimental to village character, but this is clearly not as important as the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. If you are serious about the hierarchy of users (needs of pedestrians put before private car users) then the speed reduction to 20mph should be a priority. I think that decent crossings for children to be able to safely walk to school on their own should also be implemented (one on Haggis Gap for instance) and the consideration of one way systems around the village to make up for the narrow roads (be able to widen pavements for pedestrians/potentially add cycle lanes, add more trees etc).</p>	<p>Not a planning matter. Refer to Ful/16</p>
R24	13. Streets, Transport and Mobility	<p>Given the housing development within the village/Ida Darwin site etc, surely it is timely to start introducing traffic measures right now so that they are established for future additional traffic management.</p>	<p>Noted Refer to Ful/16</p>

		<p>Our village high street is a joy and we would want that preserved for the benefit of current and future generations so let's start to introduce a red tarmac zone 20 mph one way only access from the junction of Haggis Gap/Pierce Lane up to the T Junction with the High Street and then all through to the top of the High Street and out to School Lane making the top of the High Street opposite the Church is no entry. Make St Vigors Close, past the primary school and out onto School Lane no entry from School Lane - one way only from Haggis Gap as well to stop a rat run short cut. School Lane and Haggis Gap also for red zone and 20 mph limit.</p> <p>Apthorpe Street/Cow Lane could be retained as two way traffic but red tarmac and 20mph limit from the Greater Foxes junction to the T Junction with Pierce Lane and obviously no right turn entry to Peirce Lane from that direction.</p> <p>Buses and necessary delivery lorries to service the High Street would be able to access without the current tight struggles and bottlenecks. One way access would help cyclists reach the High Street more safely.</p>	
R25	13. Streets, Transport and Mobility	<p>Section 13 states that equal importance should be given to all road users. Active travel includes pedestrians, cyclists and Equestrians.</p> <p>There have been some near misses when crossing from hind loaders behind the nature reserve across Balsham Road to the footpath. It is a byway on one side and footpath on the other but it has been used by equestrians for over 40 years. Could a sign be placed there to say horses and pedestrians crossing?</p> <p>At the corner from the village to the Babraham Road there is a mirror. But there have been some near misses because the cars come round the bend. This has involved Equestrians and cyclists. Could there be a pedestrian crossing which could be reached from a person on horseback or from the ground?</p> <p>Section 7 of the vision statement enhance access to public transport services. Could the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians be considered in any changes.</p> <p>Because of the fragmented bridleway network equestrians have no choice but to use roads. Horse riders are one of the most vulnerable road users.</p>	Noted. Traffic signs are not the remit of the NP.

		<p>Horse riders inly have access to 22% of public rights of way. There have been many deaths of riders and horses due to vehicle collisions with horses. Could the footpaths to Great Wilbraham be upgraded to a bridleway? Footpaths number 95/4, 95/6, and 95/15 could be upgraded to bridleways reducing the need for equestrians to use the roads. They have been used for equestrian access but are not listed as bridleways There are large livery yards in Fulbourn with a large number of horses I am in my sixties and have ridden her for 50 years.</p>	
R30	Para 13.1	<p>I would suggest that the current lighting and state of the paths around the village are a danger to most people walking, especially at night. Older groups are already staying home as they are frightened of the dark streets both due to not being able to see and the unevenness of the paths.</p>	<p>Not a planning matter. Refer to Ful/16</p>
R02	High Street Congestion	<p>The congestion in the High Street continues to be a problem, which will be very difficult to resolve, but with an additional 313 dwellings on the horizon, it will need to be addressed very soon. I also worry that heavy goods lorries which travel along School Lane present a risk to the safety of school children.</p>	<p>Not a planning matter. Refer to Ful/16</p>
B01	Speed Limits	<p>Could we look at the speed limits between the railway crossing and Teversham.</p> <p>I personally have pulled 3 cars out the Dyke next to the farm. Also one Lady under a lorry one through the farm building and another through the house wall and one horse killed by a car speeding.</p> <p>Plus numerous Vehicles over a 100 mph.</p>	<p>Not a planning matter. Refer to Ful/16</p>
R01	Speed Limits	<p>Is there any possibility of adding a 20 mph. speed restriction throughout Fulbourn to the plans? Heavy goods vehicles are a real problem in the village and many are driven far too fast. A 20 mph speed restriction would also discourage cars from using the village as a short-cut to their destination.</p>	<p>Not a planning matter. Refer to Ful/16</p>

R02	Pedestrian and Cycle Ways	The improvement of pedestrian and cycle ways is vital, in particular those linking the Ida Darwin site to the village, although I envisage that vehicle transport will be used often from there regardless of the quality of pavements and cycleways, due to the distance to the village centre, and school.	Noted Refer to Ful/16
O08	Road Safety	As someone who keeps their horse at livery at a local business in Fulbourn and who is concerned about road safety, I would be very keen if horse /rider warning signs could be erected at bridle path crossings and at the entrance to Babraham Road in Fulbourn.	Noted Refer to Ful/16
R19	Para 13.3	I believe that the Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from a more holistic approach. It is important to recognise how action in one area can have undesired consequences in another, and that initiatives cannot be implemented in isolation. For example, traffic calming at the entrance to the village on the Balsham Road results in queuing traffic during the rush hour and presumably significant air pollution around the new housing development. At the other end of the village, the width restriction encourages motorists to use Pierce Lane to avoid waiting for the large volume of traffic leaving the village. Incidentally you state that 'Improvements planned to the road junction at Church Road, Teversham and Airport Way could lead to increased traffic levels along Teversham Road into Cow Lane in the village in the short to medium term.' (Section 13.3, p. 75) I very much doubt that motorists will negotiate the tight junction into Cow Lane. They are far more likely to proceed down Pierce Lane as they do now. to use Pierce Lane	Opinion noted
R19	Para 13.6	You state that the 'layout and interconnectivity of the streets and lanes enables residents to easily get around Fulbourn easily as pedestrians and cyclists'. (Section 13.6, p. 76) Whilst this is largely true, it is important to highlight the notable exceptions. For example, it is difficult for pedestrians to access the High Street from Pierce Lane. It is not just about crossing the High Street/Pierce Lane junction. Pedestrians have to cross Pierce Lane prior to that in order to stay on a pavement and cars often come too quickly round the bend.	Noted Refer to Ful/16

		<p>I would strongly support the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit. However, this would need to include all the main roads though the village. Otherwise, it just transfers the problem from one area to another. It is excellent that a Greenway is coming to Fulbourn. However it does not resolve the traffic issues for people whom live, walk, cycle and drive along Pierce Lane.</p> <p>I believe that much more could be said about transport within the plan given that you state that 'current traffic and heavy vehicles are ill-suited to the streets and lanes of the village'. (Section 9.7, p. 51) In my opinion, it is questionable whether equal importance should be given to all transport users particularly as it will be a long time before all vehicles cease to have a major impact on the environment. (Section 13, p. 75) However, it needs to be made much easier for motorists to use alternative methods of travel.</p> <p>Buses currently have a tortuous journey as they pass the junction between Haggis Gap and Pierce Lane and on into the High Street. A frequent local bus service is vital to ensure all residents can travel, but we also need to consider why it is actually used by so few people. It is ironic that it is quicker to cycle to the railway station and Cambridge city centre than it is to take the bus. Perhaps there is also a need for a more direct bus that does not stop so frequently, but this would not overcome the problem of the lack of a designated bus lane. Therefore, I was very surprised to see no mention of opening a railway station, which would solve many of the problems. In addition, there was no reference to developing park and ride facilities.</p> <p>You refer specifically to heavy vehicles serving the industrial premises and the grain mill. (Section 13.4, p. 75) I believe that this section should also include the large delivery lorries that trundle along Pierce Lane and other roads on their way to the Co-op.</p> <p>I appreciate that some of my remarks are focused on one specific part of the village, but I am most qualified to comment on that particular area. Furthermore, the hazards of that particular section of Pierce Lane were highlighted in the Parish</p>	
--	--	--	--

		Plan for Fulbourn, 2009, but never addressed. Safety has continued to be an issue. I fear this area may be sidelined again given the focus on the Greenway along Cow Lane.	
R16	Para 13.7	Creating a Cycle Greenway along Cow Lane and Apthorpe Street would be disastrous. The road is far too narrow and full of bends.	Noted
R33	Para 13.10	Repeats the first two sentences of 13.6, except that it adds the words "through new development".	Noted and amended
R16	Para 13.12	Too many pavements slope badly, this makes it difficult for wheelchairs and buggies. Improved Bus service should lessen use of cars.	Noted
S02	Policy FUL/18 – Sustainable Mobility	188. Part 1d – We would suggest that you could include a map into your Plan showing the existing network of footpaths and indicating where there are gaps which it would be good to fill to improve the connectivity of the parish. 189. You have not taken up our earlier comment to include within your Plan a policy to encourage the provision of electric charging points for the local community although mention is made of them in Chapter 14 on other aspirations of the Plan. You could take this opportunity to include them in a policy.	Noted Not considered to be within the scope of the NP Noted This is now included
S02	Policy FUL/19 – Safe Streets	190. Part 1 – It is not clear how this would be achieved? Presumably where there is new development proposals in the parish the street scene should not be changed to impact the character of that part of Fulbourn – following the principles set out in the VDG SPD? As currently worded, this is not clear.	Noted
S02	14. Other Aspirations of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan	191. This provides a good list of future aspirations within Fulbourn – some of the information is repeating what has already appeared in the main body of the Plan and some could be added to the supporting text of policies to better explain the reasoning for some criteria in policies in the Plan.	Noted We recognise that there may be some overlap but considered it important that the Aspirations were viewed in their entirety in one place

		192. Under 5 Sustainable mobility – We presume that bullet 3 refers to charging points for cycles and cars?	Noted
R13	14. Other Aspirations of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan	There is barely a mention of horse riding in the plan - and then only in the context of road use (p78). There are numerous horses and riders in the village and we would like to see a commitment to INCREASING the number of bridleways where horses can be ridden safely off- road. In particular please be aware that many cycle routes that have been built across Cambridgeshire take up verges that previously could be ridden on by horses - thereby forcing us to go into the road. Please make sure the Fulbourn plan avoids this by always leaving safe verges for riding.	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17
O14	14. Other Aspirations of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan	There are 'Community Aspirations' discussed in (EV 350 to EV 356 on specific proposed green space designations, EV 361, Green Spaces Review, and EV 362, Biodiversity in Fulbourn), , which do not appear to be covered in Section 14 of the Plan although some are listed below the Policies in Sections 6 to 9 of The Plan. It is suggested that Section 14 of The Plan needs to be extended to include a summary of the key 'Aspirations' outlined in the Evidence Documents.	Noted We recognise that there may be some overlap but considered it important that the Aspirations were viewed in their entirety in one place
R07	Para 14.5&14.65	No mention of badly needed cycle parking in High Street. This has shown up during Covid-19 pandemic, existing arrangements are completely inadequate. Requires doubling as a minimum.	Opinion noted
R16	Para 14.5-14.9	The High Street: Could the present Car Sales be moved out of the High Street and the site turned into an Oasis with colourful tubs and with plenty of seating for young and older villagers to rest after shopping, before their return journeys and plenty of space for the safe parking of bicycles which would hopefully help to reduce the demand for car parking in the congested High Street. The space would also be well away from traffic pollution, especially important for young children in buggies.	Opinion noted It is outside the scope of the NP to determine the suitability of businesses
R30	Para 14.10 &14.16	Preservation of current assets does not include the Victorian pumping station garden or preservation of the old school which is one of few buildings in the	Noted

		country that has links to the first world war being used as a VAD hospital which saw many prominent village people being involved and it would be a shame to see it go under if it was to fall outside any future school development.	The Victoria Pumping House garden is already a registered local green space within the SCDC system. The Old School has been included on a list of potential village assets
R07	Para 14.47	This clause says it is possible that Cambridge Airport may be re-developed. Marshall Group is no longer lead by the family but by money barons who have decided to sell. The plan is for 12,000 houses and 5 million ft2 of commercial floor space. A high percentage of the traffic will require access to the A11 and London. At present this access is provided by Cherry Hinton High street or Teversham and Fulbourn. Our village should be talking to Teversham to agree a 7.5 tonne limit from Airport Way and requesting a Fulbourn by-pass starting from the Cambridge Road roundabout. This should run south of Fulbourn to the Balsham Road, similar to the by-pass at Longstanton for Northstowe which only has 10,000 houses. Waiting until 2030 will not produce the correct result.	Opinion noted Outside the scope of the NP
R17	Para 14.47	<i>Re comment suggestion for a Fulbourn by-pass starting from the Cambridge Road roundabout but I am not clear where that roundabout is, As a resident in Balsham Road where the flow of HGV's is horrendous, I am completely in agreement with a by-pass. I wonder how much traffic would be removed from Balsham Road if the following were possible:- at present, HGV's from Newmarket can peel off the A14 to join the A11 towards Stansted airport and London. However, HGV's travelling from Northampton on the A14 via Cambridge - how do they join the A11, except through Fulbourn. If my supposition is correct, a fly-over East of Quy near the aforementioned junction of the south and west A14 and A11 divide would enable them to stay on a major road instead of driving through Fulbourn. Obviously a survey would be required as I don't know where the HGV's coming into Fulbourn from the Charterhouse Bridge direction have come from - do they come through Balsham as well or from the direction of London?.</i>	Opinion noted Outside the scope of the NP

R18	Para 14.47	Concern regarding the ever increasing numbers of heavy lorries driving through the village, not only up the village High Street but along Station Rd., Balsham Rd & Doggett's Lane which is also having an impact on the state of the road surfaces.	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17
R16	Para 14.47	<p>One of the biggest challenges Fulbourn is facing is the increasing traffic. Currently there are too many HGV's and through traffic as noted in Section 14.47. The roads don't feel safe, especially for children and the elderly and with increased growth both in and around Fulbourn this will only get worse.</p> <p>I agree with introducing a 20mph limit through the whole village but this must be strictly enforced or measures taken to force traffic to slow down by means of speed reducing measures. Ideally, traffic should be routed round the outskirts of the village rather than through the village. This would improve the noise, fumes and overall feel of the village and encourage more cycling and walking. Currently I don't feel safe walking or cycling on some roads in Fulbourn.</p> <p>Measures should also be taken to reduce parking on roads. Some areas of Fulbourn are dangerous eg, the junction of Haggis Gap and Pierce Lane, near the piano shop. There can be several cars and vans parked on this stretch and with further development planned for additional dwellings, this will get worse unless off road parking is provided.</p> <p>Small shuttle buses could be used instead of half empty double decker buses which are too big for Fulbourn's roads and cause issues in the village centre and surrounding roads like Pierce Lane. The shuttle buses could circulate frequently through the village and drop people at Tesco where they can get an onward bus to Cambridge.</p> <p>If we can resist further housing developments in and around Fulbourn this would help to maintain the feel of a village rather than a small town. Also, the right to bid on village assets should they come up for sale is important - eg, the pub garden. Most people, I believe, were against the sale of the back section of the pub garden and we lost a hugely valuable asset for socialising and fund raising</p>	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17

		<p>activities. If I am understanding the section on Community Facilities (p72 - Community Aspirations) correctly, perhaps this could have been avoided.</p> <p>Overall, to maintain the character of Fulbourn this plan seems like a good start and I hope positive changes can start to be made soon.</p>	
R30	Para 14.51/52	<p>Whilst slowing some traffic raised platforms do have a negative effect on emergency vehicles of which I have experience of. The cost of chassis repairs is great and also this is reflected in response times by the Ambulance service. With careful consideration a one way system could be operated within the village. 20 mile limits don't work as with other limits unless there is enforcement.</p>	Noted
R30	Para 14.62	<p>Every home needs the facility to charge an electric vehicle if the Govt targets are to be met. This means that those homes with on street parking need to be accommodated, not an easy task.</p>	Opinion noted
R07	Para 14.62&14.64	<p>Improved maintenance of existing cycle routes are badly needed. Examples are deeply rutted pavements by tree roots and overhanging branches which cause whiplash across the face.</p> <p>In the village several footways are already badly encroached by irresponsible residents allowing their hedges and shrubs to grow across pavement. In some places as much as 1/3 width has been lost which causes pram pushers and pedestrians to walk on vehicle highway.</p>	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17
R17	Para 14.62&14.64	<p>The new pavement in Balsham Road leading to the new house at Armistice Close (?) is in a terrible state, as are some other pavements in Fulbourn - residents should be made to keep "their" pavement clear for other residents to pass.</p>	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17
R07	Para 14.65	<p>We need a 7.5 tonne max weight lorries in High Street, except for delivery.</p>	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17
R07	Para 14.66	<p>Existing speed measures are poorly maintained leading to the current situation of pot-holed pinch points. We much prefer speed indicators with sad/happy faces,</p>	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17

		these produce positive results without causing a traffic tail-back. Good example at Swaffham Road, Burwell. 20mph speed limit desirable but impracticable due to the numbers of passing cyclists who travel at 30mph and have no intention to slowing down especially through the High Street.	
R17	Para 14.66	Traffic travelling along Cambridge Road, Dogget Lane and Balsham Road are totally ignoring the speed limit - something MUST be done.	Opinion noted Refer to Ful/17
R07	Para 14.68	No mention of DoT Design Guide Manual for Streets. There are junctions which fail to meet visibility splays to clause 7.7 and table 7.1.	Opinion noted Outside the scope of the NP
R28	Para 14.69-14.72	I have a specific comment concerning the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan. I have read it carefully and much of it is good. However there is a major omission. This concerns that lack of EASILY accessible public open space. I am aware that the current recreational space is less than recommended for a village the size of Fulbourn and that there is a plan to make a small increase to the size of the recreation ground. I am Strongly in support of this although as I am 76 and I do not play team games for which the 'rec' makes provision. The good health of everyone in Fulbourn is important. However, there is very poor provision for WIDE AREA PUBLIC OPEN SPACE . There are small grassy areas amongst the quite densely packed houses, but there is virtually no large scale open space to provide for those people like myself who need, and long-for, a substantial area close to the village which would provide for informal recreation on a large scale . We live in a confined space especially considering the population of Fulbourn. There is a large area of open space around Fulbourn which is not accessible to residents as it private and mostly intensively cultivated arable land. And the small amount of woodland near the nature reserve is mostly privately owned and NOT accessible. (I have been asked to leave it). In comparison, Fulbourn has very poor open space provision compared with the City where it is possible to walk from Granchester to Waterbeach across wide open public spaces close to where people live.	Opinion noted

		<p>In addition, the recreational space provided by the Rec and the Nature Reserve serves the eastern side of the village but is unavailable at the WESTERN end of the village. Indeed a public footpath linking the Cambridge Rd and the Hinton Rd along the western edge of the built-up was removed a few years ago even though it provided for a link, away from traffic pollution, in an excellent circular walk.</p> <p>A small area of the Nature reserve is now quite heavily used and the meadows trampled despite it being a nature reserve; its more of a public park and is well used for this. This exemplifies my argument for the provision of similar open access land but on a large scale outside the built up area of Fulbourn but close to it. The nearest facility of this sort is Wandlebury but to which, for most people , especially the elderly, requires a car ride or two bus journeys. Something similar to Wandlebury but very close to Fulbourn (say a short walk) would be WONDERFUL and hugely beneficial for the mental and physical health of the people of Fulbourn. I have a COMPLAINT about the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan is that this kind of most important recreational facility has been ignored: As if the planners want residents and children in particular to be deprived of such a vital facilities.</p> <p>It is government policy to promote open recreation areas and there are numerous Institutions which would support a project to provide such a grand scheme (grand because residents of Fulbourn deserve that) Not only the government . but also such Institutions as the Open Spaces Society, The Woodland Trust and those that support the provision of informal exercise facilities.</p> <p>In the hopes of getting more fresh air.</p>	
R07	Para 14.71&14.72	<p>Recreation space should be provided in other areas of the village, unfortunately the Recreation Ground is on one side of the village and it is undesirable to allow young children to visit on their own. Consideration should be given to area between Caraway and Bird Farm Roads. Also Parish Council should be taking steps to find another site.</p>	Opinion noted
R07	Para 14.76	<p>We should be aware that in future electric charging points may not be required for all cars. Self charging is already provided by some manufacturers. Does anyone know what happened to the alternator?</p>	Opinion noted

R30	Para 14.78	Current ditches need to be maintained, this is not happening at the moment and they are silted up.	Noted
R07	Para 14.78	Water run off not fully maintained in the highways, soakaways are never cleaned and grips in our country roads are completely ignored by local council. The ancient drainage ditch system to the north of the village is not managed and allowed to become blocked. Adjacent to Pierce Lane, Cow Lane and Teversham Road, for example. No mention of foul sewer treatment in village. What facilities do Anglian Water require for the future? We already have some experience of electricity utility requirements, due to the poor supply at the Fulbourn Centre. We have been alarmed at the lack of consideration for the village cyclists and pedestrians in this plan, can some rectification be applied before completion of the consultation period.	Noted See Ful/17
R17	Para 14.78	The house where I used to live was flooded simply because the Authorities and possibly Farmers did not ensure that all drainage channels were maintained to allow the flow of water to reach its destination instead of flooding. The same applies to the village of Fulbourn.	Noted
R18	Para 14.78	Re. poor land drainage due to drains, gutters & soakaways not being cleaned or maintained. In particular the high street gutters & pavements are full of leaves / debris & never swept clean.	Noted
R07	Para 14.79	14.79 EV511 and EV512 not listed in Appendix 1- what are their details?	14.79 EV511 and EV512 not listed in Appendix 1- what are their details? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reference to 512 in para 14.79, page 89 is an error and should be deleted from the text. EV511 is listed within 'Appendix1, Evidence Base

			contents'. The document is 'ONS Regional Labour Market Statistics in the UK, Nov2019' and the reference to it is on Page 97 within the Employment section of Appendix 1
R02	Lighting	Village lighting concerns me. Since the removal of the yellow sodium lighting and installation of the lower-level lighting, I find certain areas of the village are badly illuminated, causing difficulties walking in the dark, and making me feel less secure. I see that low level lighting is discussed in the plan but would be concerned that future development includes adequate levels of lighting to ensure that pedestrians, especially those who are in the higher age brackets are able to use walkways in the dark.	Noted See Ful/17
S02	15. Delivery Priorities	<p>193. Through preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan a number of spending priorities have been identified by the community to improve the lives of people living and working in the parish. Both the Local Plan and national planning guidance recognises that not all developments will be able to sustain all policy requirements expected of it. Where planning obligations are negotiated on the grounds of viability some infrastructure requirements need to be given a greater level of priority than others and in some cases contributions towards the lower priority items may ultimately not be secured. This Delivery Priorities list is therefore a helpful guide to the District Council when considering viability as part of the decision making process.</p> <p>194. However, what the list cannot be used for is to redistribute section 106 funds necessary to satisfy one element of the Local Plan in order to increase the level of contribution required under another (i.e. it would not be possible for the Council to decide not to secure an allotment contribution in order to provide a</p>	Noted See section 16

		greater level of funding than the development requires towards a new Health Centre). Furthermore, the list is not sufficiently clear in its current form. For example, the list makes no mention of children's play areas, education and libraries	
S02	16. Implementing the Plan	195. You may wish to mention here how the Plan is to be monitored. An example of wording was provided by the examiner of the Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan – ‘Monitoring and Review 1.54 The Parish Council acknowledge that circumstances may change within the Plan period. In addition, some policies will work better than others. On this basis the Parish Council will review the effectiveness of the Plan's policies on an annual basis 1.55 Where appropriate the Parish Council will consider either a full or a partial review of the Plan. This will be based around the monitoring information gathered, any revisions which may arise with the Local Plan and any broader changed circumstances which may arise’	Noted See section 16
R07	Para 15.03	Has a ‘Community Infrastructure Levy’ been considered for some of these items (also applies to Para 12.06).	Opinion noted Outside the scope of the NP
S02	Appendix 1	This is much too detailed for inclusion in the Plan and it's recommended that, if it's considered necessary to include a list of evidence documents then they are restricted to those that are directly related to content in the Plan.	Noted
R07	Appendix 1	Appendix 1 should contain a description of a Section 106 agreement, village lay people will not know.	Noted Included within glossary
S03	Whole Plan	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, but do not currently have capacity to provide detailed comments. We would refer you to our detailed guidance on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your plan, which can be found here: < https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/ >.	Noted

		<p>For further advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer, and if appropriate your local Historic Environment Record <https://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/Gateway/CHR/>.</p> <p>There is also helpful guidance on a number of topics related to the production of neighbourhood plans and their evidence base available on Locality's website: <https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/>, which you may find useful.</p> <p>To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p>	
S04	Whole Plan	<p>National Grid Assets Following a review of the above document we have identified the following National Grid assets as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary: Electricity Transmission Asset Description Gas Transmission Pipeline, route: GREAT WILBRAHAM TO WHITWELL A plan showing details and locations of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that the plan is illustrative only.</p> <p>National Grid also provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p>	Noted
R08	Whole Plan	Just what Fulbourn needs to both protect the village character and its continuing existence as a separate village.	Noted
R15	Whole Plan	I consider that the Plan is a comprehensive and well-researched document, which I am happy to endorse in its entirety.	Noted

R29	Whole Plan	<p>I appreciate that the Plan contents are very severely restricted by the Regulations under which it has been prepared. I expect that my opinion will be unwelcome, but I think it is a point of view which needs to be put forward. So - although I am happy with Objectives 1 to 6, I think the Plan is actually “back to front”. The final Objective, no 8, referring to “... the challenge of climate change” should come first -and be radically strengthened! Simply “Recognising...” “promoting...” and “supporting...” is completely inadequate. Future generations would be horrified to think that was all Fulbourn could do! Remember the old slogan “What did you do in the war daddy?” – the world is faced with a crisis of war-like proportions, quite literally existential, and the next 10 years – the Plan timetable – could well be make or break. Those of us not in climate change denial must surely play our part, and of THE critical areas (Transport, Heating and Eating) it is Transport where the Plan can have an effect – because Local Authorities have considerable control over this. And as changes to the use of roads are very apparent, this brings the Plan’s effects – as a response to the climate crisis -straight to the public’s attention. I believe Objective no 7 is far too weak, I suggest the Plan should state bluntly that policy is to give priority to walking and cycling over motoring. And that every effort will be made to get this policy implemented by the Local Highways Authority. Given the change in attitudes to “Active Travel” which Covid has produced, this shift is perfectly ripe for implementation.</p> <p>Examples of the measures which the Highways Authority could take, on behalf of the Village, to carry out this policy are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introducing a 15 or even 10mph speed limit in the High Street. A 20mph speed limit on all other village roads. Re-allocating the parking bay (1 car length) by the Co-op entrance from cars to bikes (see pic1 separately emailed to the Parish Clerk [below] for how this can be done!) Putting up “Unsuitable for HGV” signs on all but a minimum of genuine through routes. Genuinely segregating cyclists from motor traffic – may mean removal of on-street parking - (see separately emailed pic2 for how this can be done!) Widening footways to at least 1.5m (allows wheelchair + accompanying pedestrian, and mobility scooters) 	Noted

		<p>More dropped kerbs on footways – in the many places where these are missing. All these actions would have the additional advantage of making the village a much more pleasant place, and help to improve the fitness and well being of villagers.</p> <p>I know that bold proposals such as these would be unpopular with many. But hard decisions have to be taken, and I don't believe that "Carrying on as usual" is an option, given that scientific opinion considers the planet to be on "red alert "</p>	
R32	Whole Plan	Thanks to all who have contributed.	Noted
R33	Whole Plan	<p>I have been unable to read the whole document - that constitutes a comment in itself as I believe that effort should be put into making the document shorter, and its language more precise, if at all possible.</p> <p>Page numbers below reflect the pagination of the pdf document, not the page numbers displayed within the document which don't count the cover.</p>	Noted
R23	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 1	<p>It should be acknowledged that existing parts of the parish are already separated from the village of Fulbourn and would consider themselves to form part of Cherry Hinton/Cambridge. For example the properties at the lower end of Fulbourn Old Drift - The Grove, The Firs and Railway Cottage have to cross through another parish council (Teversham) in order to access Fulbourn parish by foot, cycle, or motor vehicle. The residents here have little in common with the village of Fulbourn and would probably never use any of the village facilities (medical, social or educational). The same could be said for the residents who live on the Beechwoods estate - who I suspect would feel no connection with the village of Fulbourn whatsoever.</p> <p>Green Belt land within this area (which is apart from the village of Fulbourn) has already been heavily developed i.e. the large Tesco Superstore, Petrol Station, Click and Collect facility, and Car Park. The Green Belt land in this area is not particularly attractive given the location of the Fulbourn Grid (electric substation) which has been recently extended. It is difficult to see how development of this Green Belt land in this area for necessary houses, would have any impact</p>	Noted

		whastover upon the village of Fulbourn which is already 'de facto' separated from it.	
R09	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 2	The waterworks site would be better not developed	Opinion noted
R20	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 2	I'm concerned by the development of the Old Waterworks site off Teversham Road. It is too big a development for the area and will increase the flooding risk, plus traffic flow through the village, and negatively impact quality of life for existing Fulbourn residents.	Noted Already has outline planning permission
R10	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 2	The village life could/would/should be enhanced by smaller detached new houses for those village residents downsizing & wishing to stay in the village	Noted
R12	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 2	Will there be a new school build to facilitate the increase in number of students? Will the playpark be enlarged/improved/new one build to encourage children to outdoor play? One of the issues at the playpark is that it's muddy, this makes it difficult for children to play, walk or run, especially when it's wet or damp.	Noted
R23	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 2	The prospect for the children of existing villagers to remain within the parish is narrow as high prices mean ownership is unachievable for many. Consideration should be given to building more affordable houses within the parish. A diverse housing stock is required including a number of one bedroom starter properties.	Noted The policies are in line with District housing needs
R23	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 3	If there are 4500 jobs within the parish, then there is an obligation upon the parish to provide housing nearby so that employers can walk or cycle to work and therefore not contributing to traffic congestion and increased vehicle emissions. The parish must look forward 50-75 years and the end of the reliance upon the car and resulting traffic congestion. Those of us who live in the parish close to Yarrow Road and Gazelle Way know how congested the roads were before lockdown. Although we are currently living through a pandemic, and car usage and congestion has fallen considerably - it would be unrealistic to suspect that once the current situation ends this present state of affairs will continue. The	Noted

		reality is that after any world crisis, business usually returns to normal, with only a marginal change in peoples behaviours. We have to face the challenge of reducing emissions and traffic congestion now. The only way to end that is to build more houses within the parish now.housing stock is required including a number of one bedroom starter properties.	
R09	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 4	I would like to see a better surgery	Noted Supports Ful/16
R11	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 4	Agree strongly that the surgery needs updating	Noted Supports Ful/16
R10	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 4	Required in the village: cash machine; bigger café/bistro aimed at residents; fresh fish shop; bakery; more allotments; train station with car and bike parking	Noted Outside scope of NP
R12	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 4	Fulbourn would benefit from tarmacked walking paths. With lots of people going for walks because of COVID-19 restrictions the paths around and within the Fen Nature Reserve became very muddy and difficult to walk on. If tarmacked the paths could be also used for cycling, scooting or roller skating.	Noted
R23	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 4	How will you make the community amenities and facilities accessible to those in Fulbourn Old Drift and the Beechwoods estates? We currently have no buy in to community facilities. Do all community facilities have to be located in village or could some not be provided for in other areas of the parish? There is enough Green Belt land on the outskirts to provide a recreational park, community orchard or allotments. Admittedly, the relocation of the Fulbourn Hospital Social Club will provide some facilities for this part of the parish.	Noted
R09	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 5	A reliable bus service from the village into Cambridge should be a priority	Noted See Community Aspirations
R10	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 5	Required in the village: FOC parking for shops; one-way system for the High Street and connected area/streets; new up-to date Medical Centre & appropriate parking	Opinion noted

R11	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 5	Agree but significant improvements required to footpaths which in a lot of cases are very poorly maintained and extremely dangerous.	Noted
R13	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 5	The Firs, Fulbourn Old Drift is a 20 home site occupied by elderly people - some in their 80's. the access road - which also leads to the Railway cottage and Cantelupe farmhouse - is the only way in and out of this area. This road is in a dreadful state with no footpath or street lighting. The county council are conducting emergency repairs to dozens of potholes which is only a temporary measure as within a few months they have to come back to fill new potholes. A while ago there was a nasty accident when an elderly lady hit a pothole on her bicycle and suffered nasty facial injuries! Please take these comments in account within your objective "SAFE STREETS FOR ALL RESIDENTS".	Noted Supports Ful/17
R14	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 5	I support the vision and objectives contained in the plan ... I believe the NP should clearly state a hierarchy of road users to be considered in street design as follows: pedestrians; cyclists; public transport; car sharing/clubs; private vehicles. The NP currently seeks to "meet the needs of all transport users, whether vehicular, pedestrian, cycle, etc", implying equal priority to all. There's now many years of research and experience showing that if you don't prioritise pedestrians and cyclists, cars will dominate, discouraging walking and cycling leading to more driving and a vicious circle. Interconnected streets and network design are important for pedestrians and cyclists but lead to 'rat running' by drivers. I support the NP aspiration for the High Street, and one measure that could support both this and safer streets is restricting private vehicular access through the high street at peak periods (allowing public transport and emergency vehicles only), and potentially other key routes through the village such as Haggis Gap. The aim is to reduce vehicular traffic in the centre of the village by directing it to the periphery, enhancing the village environment and safety. Likewise, restricting vehicular traffic around the school at drop-off times would seem to be an obvious improvement. There are routes that our family would like to cycle but do not due to safety fears, particularly the roads to Teversham and the Wilbrahams. Including safe, off-road cycle/running/bridle ways to neighbouring villages would be a worthy aspiration to include within the plans vision.	Noted Supports Ful/17 Supports 'Community Aspirations'

R23	Ex.Sum. – Obj. 5	The Cambridge to Ipswich Rail link runs through the parish and consideration should be given to a station to enable easy access into the centre of Cambridge.	Noted