

Responses to “Questions to Histon and Impington Parish Council”.

4. Would the Parish Council please respond to the points made by various representors who object to Policy HIM04? These points include the opinion that the intention to restore Impington Mill should not be given priority over the rights of people living to the west to develop their property; that the Mill has not in the past been solely dependent on wind but has used an engine to provide supplementary power and that the covenant referred to in paragraph 5.44 is not designed to prevent further wind loss to the Mill. The question has also been raised as to how will this policy be implemented and who will advise the District Council on the application of the Molen-Biotoop methodology referred to in the policy.

Representations

Mrs Clare Taylor

We object to the section regarding the Windmill and its potential to lead to refusal of permission to build eg a dormer window in the surrounding area.

We feel that the Parish Council could have been more forthcoming with information for those who attended the consultation meeting about the windmill. An email list of those who attended was collected but not used. Many attendees will therefore not be aware of this final stage of the consultation.

Dr Charles Free

It is fair to take the operation of the windmill into account in assessing major developments in this area, but to give it precedence over everyone else to rescue it from historical contingency is draconian, unacceptable and unlikely to lead to the objective that the policy aims to achieve.

Vanessa Kelly

HIM04 elevates the rights of one private property owner over those of more than 600 others in the village. It is based on false assumptions.

South Cambs District Council

a) Welcomes policy to preserve the future of windmill. Policy states Molen Biotoop method to be used to assess impact. Are there alternative methods to do such an assessment?

b) Possible issue for SCDC, as the local planning authority, as to how it will implement this policy.

This policy was included as a response to calls from the community to protect the village character of Histon & Impington. Impington Mill is totemic in this regard. The current owner of the Mill did not initiate development of the policy.

The policy was rewritten following the consultation to address the concerns of residents living close to Impington Mill that it would unfairly constrain their ability to modify their properties. The policy now makes it clear that there are already substantial limitations on what residents might do to their properties from existing national and local rules and regulations. The policy now makes it clear that

development and redevelopment in the policy area will be supported provided that they comply with them and offers the Molen -Biotoop methodology as a simple means to determine whether or not that would be the case. It has been made clear that developments such as dormer windows which are within the wind shadow cast by existing buildings will not be constrained by the policy.

... that the intention to restore Impington Mill should not be given priority over the rights of people living to the west to develop their property

Priority is already given to the ability of the Mill to operate by existing national and local rules and regulations. Policy HIM04 enables residents to determine when such limitations would not apply.

... that the Mill has not in the past been solely dependent on wind but has used an engine to provide supplementary power

It is correct that the Mill has in the past used an engine to supplement wind power. However the existing national and local rules and regulations specifically address the protection of windmills so that they can continue to operate with wind power. Furthermore protection of the Impington Mill as a working wind mill was widely supported during the Regulation 14 consultation.

... that the covenant referred to in paragraph 5.44 is not designed to prevent further wind loss to the Mill

It is correct that the covenant does not refer specifically to the Windmill. It says:

3 ... Not more than one dwelling-house with or without suitable outbuildings shall be erected on any plot.

And later

8 The Purchaser his executors administrators and assigns shall not be entitled to any right of light or air which would restrict or interfere with the free use of any adjoining or neighbouring land of the Company for building or other propose.

The Parish Council agrees that the wording of 5.44 is overly specific. It proposes therefore to delete the second sentence thereof.

The question has also been raised as to how will this policy be implemented and who will advise the District Council on the application of the Molen-Biotoop methodology referred to in the policy.

The Molen-Biotoop methodology is offered because it is in use and applies simple principles of geometry to assessing the impact of any development or redevelopment on windflow to the Mill. Appendix II provides guidance on its use. It would be expected that anyone responsible for submitting drawings as a part of a planning application would find it straight forward to apply it.

<p>5. Would the Parish Council please respond to points made by various representors who consider that the wording of the Plan needs to be modified to refer to bridleways and the needs of equestrians?</p>
--

No representations were made on this topic during the preparation and drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan. The response below is our best efforts at this stage. It is understood that complying with the equestrian requirements can be costly, both initially and because of the commitment to continuing maintenance.

A response to the issues raised, point by point, is appended.

The Parish Council is open to enhancing the routes available to horse riders subject to practicality and balancing this with the reasonable interests of other parts of the community. Measures could include the creation of new public rights of way accepting that the costs would be borne by the County Council or the landowner and that significant areas of the parishes (particularly land owned by the County Council and other landowners) are covered by Section 31(6) designations and therefore not available for the creation of new rights of way.

Also, where existing rights of way are reclassified, or new ones created, the rights of all users must be considered, and safe and secure access for all be maintained at all times.

As noted above, the Plan has not specifically addressed the interests of horse riders and equestrians as these were not raised during the time the Plan was formulated, nor in the consultations prior to the Regulation 16 stage.

The Parish Council notes that Policy HIM15 has a strong focus on walking and cycling routes within the built up areas of the villages. As such, simply widening the Policy to cover horse riding risks making the Policy impractical to apply.

Instead, it is suggested that the Parish Council seeks to develop a specific policy addressing the interests of horse riders and equestrians during the first Review of the Plan which allows time for consultation across the Community.

At the current stage, the Parish Council suggests Policy HIM15 could be amended by adding at the end of the last sentence (after "Maps 20 and 21."): "In doing this, the opportunity and practicality for also incorporating access for horse riders will be taken into account subject to the interests of all being respected."

<p>6. Table 4 of the Plan makes clear that several of the Local Green Spaces proposed in Policy HIM12 are in the Green Belt or Conservation Areas. Given that these sites are already protected by these designations, what additional local benefit would be gained by designating them as Local Green Spaces?</p>

The Planning Policy Guidance document of 2014 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space> states the following:

"If land is already protected by Green Belt policy [...], then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space.

"One potential benefit in areas where protection from development is the norm (eg villages included in the green belt) but where there could be exceptions is that the Local

Green Space designation could help to identify areas that are of particular importance to the local community.”

Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 37-010-20140306

Revision date: 06 03 2014”

This is precisely the case for Histon & Impington.

Thus, LGS designation highlights sites of special importance to the local community and also, in the supporting dossiers of information, documents the particular values to the community of each site.

Regarding sites within Conservation Areas

The protections against inappropriate developments are different for the two designations. Conservation Areas constrain the type of development, whereas the Local Green Spaces designation protects against development where none currently exists. The LGS sites within Conservation Areas have a special value to the community which is not reflected adequately amongst the broader heritage values of the particular Conservation Area.

The LGS designation provides clarity for the community, developer and decision maker alike.

7. Were the owners of each of the proposed Local Green Spaces contacted at an early stage as required by Planning Policy Guidance Reference ID: 37-019-20140306?

Yes.

Identification of sites for potential LGS designation took place between the first and second drafts of the NP. LGS landowners were consulted in a timely manner and had opportunities to make representations in respect of the proposals during the November 2018 consultation on the second draft. For each individual LGS, section 1.4 of its completed template (in the folder, “open spaces documents”) comments on the landowner’s awareness of, and support for LGS designation.

In the case of the Manor Park Field – Histon Wood LGS (V12) a small triangle within it is privately owned but the Parish Council was unsuccessful in its attempts to contact the owner, who lives elsewhere in the UK.

Two LGS sites in Draft 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan (Croft Close Set-Aside and Primrose Lane Playground) were excluded from the final version (Draft 3) as a result of discussions with the respective landowners.

8 Where will I find information as to the size of each of the proposed Local Green Spaces?

See following table:

		Area (ha)
V3	Greenleas (Farmstead Close) Community Space	0.4
V4	Northern Buxhall Farm	12
V5	Rowley's Field (Long Meadow)	4.3
V6	St. Audrey's Close Community Centre Green	0.1
V9	Cemetery	1.2
V10	Histon Village Green	0.7
V12	Manor Park Field and Histon Wood	6
V13	Girton Wood	2.8
V14	Infant School Field	0.3
V15	Peace Memorial	0.1
V16	Homefield Park	1.5
V18	Clay Close Lane Pocket Park	0.2
V19	Doctor's Close	0.8
V22	Crossing Keeper's Copse	1.7
V24	South Road Playground	0.2
V26	Impington Coppice	1.4
V33	Cawcutt's Lake and adjacent land	11.6 (lake covers 6ha of this)

Note on V4: The panhandle was not drawn at a specific width but depicted as wide enough for an effective corridor. Estimates of its size therefore depend how wide this needs to be.

The information is in "NP Open Space sites Summary V5 Spreadsheet" (<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/media/13582/np-open-spaces-summary-spreadsheet.xlsx>).

Column H provides, for each site, the area in hectares and summarises why it complies with the criterion "local in character and not an extensive tract of land".

9. Representor No. 67948 claims that land he owns is identified on Map 17 of the Plan as '*Other non-important [sic] Natural Habitat areas providing ecological connectivity*'. Does the Parish Council know which land this relates to? If so, is it true that no ecological survey has been undertaken of this site?

The response to this query is included in the response to the following query, No 10

10. What is the policy significance of the term '*Other non-important Natural Habitat areas providing ecological connectivity*'? I can find no reference to it in any policies of the Plan.

Policy significance

There is no policy significance to the term "*Other non-Important Natural Habitat areas providing ecological connectivity*". (Note that in Map 17, the "I" of "non-Important" is capitalised.)

The term is used solely in the legend to Map 17 to identify sites which are not proposed as "Important Natural Habitats" under the Plan but which have features which provide ecological connectivity.

Representor No. 67948's land

The Parish Council does not know which land Representor No. 67948 is referring to.

Ecological survey

No on-the-ground ecological surveys were undertaken. This is because the term "*Other non-Important Natural Habitat areas providing ecological connectivity*" has no policy significance with regard to the lands so identified. The term merely describes areas which are relevant to ecological connectivity but not designated as INH.

The areas "*Other non-Important Natural Habitat areas providing ecological connectivity*" were identified from features visible on remote sensing imagery that are known to contribute to such connectivity, combined with the on-the-ground knowledge of the resident experts listed in Cell E4 of the file NP OPEN SPACES SUMMARY SPREADSHEET in the sub-folder Open Spaces - General documents.

Function of map

Map 17 illustrates the position of the designated Important Natural Habitat (INH) areas relative to the ecological connectivity in the Plan Area, so the value of the INH-designated sites for connectivity can be visualised.

The map was included in response to SCDC advice that connectivity and ecological networks should be a key criterion for INH designation: "The emphasis should be on biodiversity, habitat connectivity (creating ecological networks), and priority habitats."

Appendix: response to questions raised by horse riders / equestrians

A Representation 68172 on Histon & Impington Neighbourhood Plan - Submission consultation by Barton & District Bridleways Group (Lesley Golding)

Page xi The Busway....public footpath cum cycleway alongside the Guided busway.

The path alongside the Guided Busway is in fact a Bridleway from Cambridge to St Ives and is therefore also accessible to equestrians.

Amend text to make it clear this is a Bridleway

Page S2, Priority 4 ...To develop a network of sustainable, accessible transport links within and around the villages to create safe and inviting routes for all and especially for pedestrians and cyclists.

Active Travel includes horse riding therefore 'horse riding' should be included along with cycling and walking. It should therefore read pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.

No change – horse riding can (and should) be accommodated but this is not “especially” sought in the same way as pedestrian and cycle routes are.

Page 16, Section 2.28 Walking & Cycling...Many residents enjoy being able to walk to the many facilities within the villages. Cycling is also preferred by many and 59% of respondents to the Big Community Survey in 2016 were in favour of improved cycle paths.

There are also many horse riders in the villages and had the question been asked whether they would like to see improved equestrian access I am sure they would also have responded in favour. Horse riders are happy to share paths with walkers and cyclists, as we do on the bridleways.

Sharing of paths, subject to the interests of all being respected, is welcomed and noted

Page 23, Section 4 Vision and Priorities, 4.2 (and 4.23) Any look to the future, as this Neighbourhood Plan does, must recognise the issues that underlie this satisfaction together with enduring concerns. These are: Maintaining the roads, cycleways and footways.

There is no mention of maintaining Public Rights of Way. This should also be included.

Add “Public Rights of Way” after “roads,” in §4.2; in §4.23 add “, ways” after “roads” in last sentence.

4.34

Develop and maintain a network of footpaths and cycleways within the community.

Paths should be Non Motorised User (NMU) paths to include walkers, cyclists, horse riders and other users.

Add “including Non Motorised User (NMU) paths” after “community”

Support the development of cycleways linking the community with adjacent villages and with Cambridge.

The bridleway network is fragmented and measures should be taken to address this. This should be seen as an opportunity to help join up the fragmented network. The statement also implies that only cyclists will be included. This is unacceptable and it should also include walkers, horse riders and other NMUs.

The County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) Statement of Action 2/5, which states that the County Council will consider measures that establish and enhance access to the Public Rights of Way network to facilitate health and well-being objectives, and Statement of Action 5/3, which sets out that the County Council will seek to deliver an improved bridleway network to enable greater safety of users and enhanced enjoyment.

The Neighbourhood Plan is complementary to the County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP).

Page 33, Priority 4 Getting Around. Priority 4 ...To develop a network of sustainable, accessible transport links within and around the villages to create safe and inviting routes for all and especially for pedestrians and cyclists. This should also include equestrians and read: especially for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.

The intent is to create safe and inviting routes for all. This includes horse riders. There was not an appreciable voice for giving special status to horse riders during the consultation in the way there was for pedestrians and cyclists.

Page 35, Section 5 Priorities, 5.7 This guide is guided by 4 fundamental principles, one of which is Sustainable Community. This is related in a broad community interest in improving biodiversity, maximising energy efficiency and the use of renewable, and enabling safe and easy walking and cycling.

Active Travel includes horse riding therefore 'horse riding' should be included along with cycling and walking. It should therefore read walking, cycling and horse riding.

The paragraph refers to areas of broad community interest; horse riding and stabling was not prominent in the consultation responses.

Page 79 Policy

Should read 'Cyclists to and from the bridleway alongside the Guided Busway.' It is not a cycleway, but a bridleway which is an NMU path.

Retain "cycleway" for ease of understanding by the general community but after "cycleway" add "(the bridleway)"

Page 83 Vibrant Community

5.129 Residents in the plan area make use of the following green infrastructure resources:

- Areas of green spaces outside the village envelope but well connected via walking routes from the villages centres.

Connections should be made available to horse riders and cyclists as well as walkers. There should be inclusion for all, not just certain user groups.

Noted

The rural footpath network comprising both footpath and permissive paths.

There is no mention here of bridleways and byways. It should read the Rights of Way network.

Add an additional bullet to read "The Rights of Way network"

Walking and cycling routes which provide connections between areas of green infrastructure and to and from residential areas.

There are also many livery stables and horse riders in Histon who make use of any green areas of infrastructure that they can access. Horse riding should also be added to the users of local routes.

Covered by the proposed additional bullet

5.131 Vibrant Community Policies

Protect and seek to enhance the walking and cycling route network.

It is unacceptable that horse riders are not included in this policy.

The Cambs RoWIP (Rights of Way Improvement Plan) states that the bridleway network is inadequate, fragmented and in need of improvement. Every shared pedestrian / cycle path further fragments that network.

The need for a policy covering the needs of horse riders did not emerge as the Plan was developed and consulted upon until now. The current policies would not easily be modified to cover horse riding. A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

Page 90, 5.136 Bypass Farm Safe and direct off-road pedestrian/cyclist access is provided.

Why are horse riders not included in this access? Is there a legitimate reason to exclude them?

If Bypass Farm is to be a destination for horse riders, there will need to be provision on site for avoiding conflicts between horses and those using the site and accessing it by other means. No detailed plans for this site are known to have been formulated: adding access for horse riders as a prerequisite under the Plan could adversely affect the viability of any proposals. Currently there is, for example, very little use by horse riders of the B1049 through the villages.

Page 118, 5.188 Walking & Cycling Routes

This title should be changed to add Equestrians Policy

The need for a policy covering the needs of horse riders did not emerge as the Plan was developed and consulted upon until now. This Policy could not be modified to cover horse riding without a major re-write.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

However:

It is noted that the respondee has indicated that they would like to see horse riding on many of the aspirational walking and cycling routes shown on Maps 20 and 21.

The Policy could be amended to state the opportunity and practicality for also incorporating access for horse riders will be taken into account subject to the interests of all being respected.

If required by the Examiner, this ambition could also be added to the summary and a paragraph explaining that in developing access routes outside the development framework the interests of equestrians will also be taken into account.

HIM15– Requires development proposals to design in walking and cycling links to provide easy access to existing walking and cycling routes.

And horse riding/horse riders.

The need for a policy covering the needs of horse riders did not emerge as the Plan was developed and consulted upon until now. This Policy could not be modified to cover horse riding without a major re-write.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

Seeks to protect and enhance the network of walking and cycling routes.

And horse riding.

The need for a policy covering the needs of horse riders did not emerge as the Plan was developed and consulted upon until now. This Policy could not be modified to cover horse riding without a major re-write.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

Context and reasoned justification

5.191 The Community is surrounded by the green belt and although there are many public footpaths and permissive footpaths to the west, this is not replicated in other directions. This limits opportunities for leisure walking and access to nature.

5.192 It is furthermore noted that communities with high levels of walking and cycling are healthier as a result of the direct physical activity and of the increased opportunities for social engagement and access to nature.

Horse riding also should be included here. Many horse riders are women, and particularly older women, who might otherwise not take exercise. Horse riding is also good for mental health and relieving stress.

Noted.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

Intent

5.193. When new development happens in the Plan Area, we wish for walking and cycling routes to be designed in so that:

Horse riding should be included here.

It is inappropriate to include the reference here when such developments could be well inside the development framework (eg at the School Hill Site).

(i) The users of the development can easily access the existing network of walking and cycling routes in the community and

Horse riding should be included here.

Reference can be made to horse riding here without impacting on the proposed Policy.

(ii) Where possible, walking and cycling opportunities for the wider communities are enhanced.

Horse riding should be included here.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan. The suggested reference to horse riding does not fit well with the currently proposed Policy.

Development proposals shall:

Incorporate, where applicable, easy and safe walking and cycling routes or linkages so as to maximise opportunities for convenient non-vehicular access to one or more of the two village centres.

Horse riding should be included here.

Currently the two village centres have no provision for accommodating horses and until now it did not appear to be the demand for horse riding through these busy areas.
A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

Where possible, enhance walking and cycling routes for the wider community.

Horse riding should be included here.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

Where applicable, opportunities will be sought for new or improved walking and cycling routes in line with the walking and cycling routes shown in Maps 20 and 21.

Horse riding should be included here.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

5.195 Application, evidence and links/map

In addition to the provision of easy and safe walking routes and cycling routes or linkages as a component of development activities, the Policy seeks new or improved Walking and cycling routes as shown in maps 20 and 21 and summarised in Table 6: Schedule of Walking and Cycling routes.

Horse riding should be included in the narrative here, wherever there are references to walking and cycling routes.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

Table 7: HIM15 Schedule of Walking and cycling routes.

Horse riding should be included here.

A policy covering horse riding and stabling could be devised but would require community consultation. It could be developed for the first Review of the Plan.

HIM19 Station Site

Page 142 Encourages the development of a connection through the site to Vision Park for cyclists and pedestrians.

Page 143 A through footpath /cycleway to allow access to Vision Park should be provided.

Horse riders should not be excluded from these routes as they could provide important connections, particularly as the Guided Bus Bridleway runs at the back of Vision Park.

Vision Park is a private site. It is not known if the owners would or would not welcome horse riders onto this commercial, office and industrial park. It is unclear what destination horse riders are seeking within Vision Park.

POLICIES (*sic – reference is to Projects*)

P2 Creation of a more extensive cycle path network. PC to ensure that all new development includes new cycle paths. PC will also explore options for creating new paths in partnership with landowners.

Horse riders should be included in any new paths created. At Cambourne there was a perimeter bridleway created around the new development. This is also planned for Bourne Airfield village.

Propose adding “In doing this, the PC will additionally explore options for improving the provision of paths accessible to horse riders, including taking account of potential conflicts and fragmentation that arises from shared pedestrian / cycle use.”

P15 Ensuring footways, cycle paths and roads remain in an acceptable condition. PC to work with relevant owners/authorities to ensure footways/footpaths, cycle paths and roads are adequately maintained so they are safe to use as intended and are in good repair.

This should include all Public Rights of Way, rather than just footpaths. Bridleways, byways etc should also be included.

Change “cycle paths and roads” to “cycle paths, Rights of Way and roads”

P16 Explore opportunities to extend footpath network. PC to engage with landowners with a view to securing permissive rights on their properties.

This should be the PROW network and not limited to footpaths. Horse riders, as a vulnerable road user, should be included on these paths, also to help with the fragmented bridleway network. Other villages such as Madingley, Over, Swavesey have comprehensive plans to extend the PROW network, including creating new bridleways and upgrading footpaths to bridleways.

A separate Project to cover the aspirations of equestrians would provide better focus.

Village Design Guide Page 10, 5.1 Improve access and provide additional pedestrian connections between the village and the countryside. This should be for all Non Motorised Users NMUs, including equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and others.

Village Design Guide text: not relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan

Page 11, 6.4 There should be strong emphasis on cycling routes. This should be for all Non Motorised Users NMUs, including equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and others.

Village Design Guide text: not relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan

Page 13, 7.5b Links and opportunities for extending the cycle connections should be provided, especially cycling through the sites to encourage cycling to Cambridge and Vision Park. This should be for all Non Motorised Users NMUs, including equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and others.

Village Design Guide text: not relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan

REASONS TO INCLUDE EQUESTRIANS in the HIMNP and VDG ☑ In 2017 the equestrian industry excluding the racing industry, contributed £4.3bn to the economy and is the second largest rural employer. ☑ The equestrian industry relies on a network of safe, off road access to the countryside. ☑ It was established at a Cambridgeshire County Council Planning meeting that, with good design, it costs no more to provide access for equestrians. ☑ Horses safely and happily share paths less than 3m wide all over the country. ☑ No report ever of any injury to a third party on any RoW by a horse. ☑ The Cambs RoWIP (Rights of Way Improvement Plan) states that the bridleway network is inadequate, fragmented and in need of improvement. Every shared pedestrian / cycle path further fragments that network. ☑ The majority of cyclists are male (78% : Sustrans) whereas the majority of horse riders are female (BHS). ☑ Horse riding has mental and physical health benefits. Older women particularly participate in this activity, where they may not otherwise exercise. ☑ Horse riders are a vulnerable road user, in the same way as walkers and cyclists. Equestrian accident statistics In the UK the period November 2010 to March 2019 road incidents involving horses : 43 humans died 315 horses died 3757 incidents were reported to the British Horse Society (BHS) although it is believed that this represents only 10% of the actual incidents. The East of England is one of the regions with the highest accident rate.

Cambridgeshire County Council has a Local Transport Policy (LTP), which sets out their transport objectives, policies and strategy for the county. A sister document of the LTP is the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). The County Council updated its ROWIP in 2016 in line with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. You may wish to consult this document when drafting policies dealing with Non-Motorised Users (NMU) and the Public Rights of Way network.

<https://cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-road-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/localtransport-plan>

Particular interest should be given to Policies SOA1 'Making the Countryside More Accessible', SOA2 'A Safer Activity', SOA3 '57,000 New homes', SOA4 'Knowing what's out there', SOA5 'Filling in the Gaps', and SOA8 'A Better Countryside Environment' – all of which include the need for access for equestrians.

ROUTES (maps 20 and 21 are attached, along with an OS map of the area with the routes from maps 20/21 shown, Horse rider's wish list of routes and showing where horses are stabled locally).

The aspirational routes on Maps 20 and 21 of NP

Route A from A14 old NIAB farm road into the back of Impington, near the Windmill. This would be a very useful route for equestrians as it could potentially link up to the Whitehouse Lane to Histon Road footpath, which would provide a link to Eddington. From Eddington, Coton can be easily reached and it would also link to Barton and Comberton Greenways.

Noted

Route B from Mill Lane Farm northwards. This would be a very useful route for equestrians as it would link up to the Landbeach permissive access paths (Ref 31/PF01). There are horses kept a livery at Mill Lane Farm on this route.

Noted

Route C from A14 old NIAB farm road into the back of Impington, near the Jam Factory. Similar to route A, this would be a very useful route for equestrians as it could potentially link up to the Whitehouse Lane to Histon Road footpath, which would provide a link to Eddington. From Eddington, Coton can be easily reached and it would also link to Barton and Comberton Greenways. This route would also link up to the Guided Bus bridleway. There are many horse kept at livery close to the routes of C and E.

Noted

Route D from route C near NIAB motorway bridge to Impington Hotel. An important link for equestrians as it links to the Guided Bus bridleway, providing a very desirable circular route for equestrians.

Noted

Route E from route C near NIAB motorway bridge to New Road, Impington. An important link for equestrians as it links to the Guided Bus bridleway, providing a very desirable circular route for equestrians. This route also links with footpath (127/4, 99/1) and bridleway (127/20, 99/16). There are many horse kept at livery close to the routes of C and E.

Noted

Route F from the Guided Busway, at Millfield Farm to Milton Road, Manor Farm This would be a very desirable route at the back of Impington, which along with route G would provide a very desirable circular route for equestrians. It would also provide a circular route and link to the Mere Way Byway (135/3, 162/3), although this would require some roadwork.

Noted

Route G (1) from Milton Road, Manor Farm to Meadow Farm on bridleway (127/2) This route would provide a nice linking route for equestrians from bridleway (127/2) to Guns Lane bridleway (127/5). Along with route F and the Guided Busway this would provide a very desirable circular route for equestrians. There are horses kept a livery at Mill Lane Farm on this route.

Noted

Suggested Equestrian Aspirational Routes Route 1 (part of Route G) from Milton Road, Manor Farm to Meadow Farm on bridleway (127/2) This route would provide a nice linking route for equestrians from bridleway (127/2) to Guns Lane bridleway (127/5).

Noted

Route 2 A route behind Histon Manor and Abbey Farm, which I think is already used by horse riders by permission.

Noted

Route 3 Upgrade of Footpath (127/4, 99/1) from Girton to Histon to a bridleway. Part of this route is included in Route E.

Noted

Route 4 NIAB motorway bridge to Whitehouse Lane Footpath.

Outside the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Note the Darwin Green developer is currently consulting on proposals for this area ahead of submitting a planning application.

Route 5 Whitehouse Lane footpath to Thornton Road Girton.

Outside the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Note the Darwin Green developer is currently consulting on proposals for this area ahead of submitting a planning application.

Route 6 Whitehouse Lane to NIAB motorway bridge, very similar to Route 4. This would be a very useful route for equestrians as it could potentially link up to the Whitehouse Lane to Histon Road footpath, which would provide a link to Eddington. From Eddington, Coton can be easily reached and it would also link to Barton and Comberton Greenways. This route would also link up to the Guided Bus bridleway.

Outside the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Note the Darwin Green developer is currently consulting on proposals for this area ahead of submitting a planning application.

B Other Representations

68203 Individual	<p>Guided Busway is continually referred to and cycleway/pedestrians. This is a bridleway and therefore accessible to horse riders.</p> <p>Noted – propose correcting the reference in the Plan.</p> <p>Frequently ride through Histon - no mention of horse riders in report - many of cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Noted. Both in and outside the development framework there are far more pedestrians and cyclists active than horse riders.</p> <p>Horse riders are vulnerable road users, and would prefer to avoid traveling on roads - only made possible with access to safe and suitable off road tracks (NMO paths). Horse riders forgotten in village planning - most vulnerable. Horse riders have access to roads, byways and bridleways - horse riders allowed access to cyclists on bridleways and there has been no report of injury to a third party by a horse.</p> <p>Policy HIM15 could be amended to take into account the opportunity and practicality for also incorporating access for horse riders on the routes identified in Maps 20 and 21.</p> <p>Many bridleways/byways split by ever-growing road structure - no choice but to travel on busy roads. Number of deaths shows important to provide safe routes for equestrians.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Please do reconsider the wording used throughout this report to consider bridleways and equestrians.</p>
------------------	---

	<p>Content to do so where appropriate.</p>
<p>68175 British Horse Society</p>	<p>On behalf of the British Horse Society, I fully support the comments contained in the response made by Lesley Golding of Barton and District Bridleways Group. (Representation nos. 68167 - 68174)</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Please will you ensure that the needs of equestrians (both riders and carriage drivers) are included in the final Histon and Impington NP.</p> <p>The Parish Council is open to developing a policy specifically addressing equestrian routes and access. This would require consultation with both the equestrian and the wider community and is therefore suited for incorporation at the time of the first Review of the Plan.</p> <p>In the meantime, the wording used throughout the Plan could be amended with reference to consider bridleways and equestrians where appropriate to do so without compromising on the original intent.</p> <p>Policy HIM15 could be amended by adding at the end of the last sentence (after "Maps 20 and 21."): "In doing this, the opportunity and practicality for also incorporating access for horse riders will be taken into account subject to the interests of all being respected."</p>
<p>68169 Barton & District Bridleways Group (Lesley Golding)</p>	<p>Suggested amendment to para 5.7 of the Plan to include horse riding.</p> <p>Propose para 5.7 remains unchanged as it refers to "broad community interest".</p> <p>This does not exclude equestrian interests being considered – just as parking is not mentioned in para 5.7 but is considered in the Plan.</p>
<p>68170 Barton & District Bridleways Group (Lesley Golding)</p>	<p>Suggested revised wording to policy to read ' Cyclists to and from the bridleway alongside the Guided Busway'. It is not a cycleway but a bridleway which is a non motorised user path.</p> <p>As suggested above: retain "cycleway" for ease of understanding by the general community but after "cycleway" add "(the bridleway)"</p>
<p>68171 Barton & District Bridleways Group (Lesley Golding)</p>	<p>Suggested amendments to the Plan to include equestrians</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p>68242 BDW Cambridgeshire represented by Bidwells (Miss Alison Wright)</p>	<p>Policy HIM15 Walking and Cycling Routes - Map 20</p> <p>BDW control land know as Darwin Green 2/3 - allocated in Local Plan. BDW in process of preparing application for this site.</p> <p>Policy SS/2 of Local Plan states Countryside Enhancement Strategy will be prepared to include public access enhancements including access via existing A14 overbridge to connect to wider public rights of way.</p> <p>Map 20 of Plan includes aspirational routes which llink from Darwin Green 2/3 site over existing A14 overbridge and along existing farm tracks to Impington.</p> <p>BDW supportive in principle of aspirational rout - mindful of this in preparing planning application, details and alignment to be confirmed and agreed with landowners concerned.</p> <div data-bbox="453 763 1390 801" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Noted</div>
<p>68239 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mrs Sara Anderson)</p>	<p>HIM15- Walking & Cycling Routes</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council, as landowner, is willing to work with the local community, where appropriate, to support the inclusion of easy and safe walking and cycling routes or linkages to maximise opportunities for convenient non-vehicular access to one of the two village centre and/or other parts of the Community as part of a wider future development of its land assets.</p> <div data-bbox="453 1193 1390 1232" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Noted</div>
<p>68185 Chivers Farms Ltd represented by Bidwells (Rob Hopwood)</p>	<p>Policy HIM15 Walking and Cycling Routes</p> <p>Chivers Farms Limited is supportive of improving and maintaining walking and cycling links within the village. Page 32 of MDVD seeks a proposed pedestrian and cycle link through our client's land to connect with village's existing footpath/cycle network maximising opportunities for convenient nonvehicular access and providing easy and safe routes to Impington village centre. The client would welcome opportunity to discuss improving connectivity links within village.</p> <div data-bbox="453 1664 1390 1702" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Noted</div> <p>Chivers Farms Limited supports principle of enhancing walking and cycling routes for wider community. Proposed walking and cycling route shown in MDVD, seeks to provide good permeability and connectivity to and from village of Impington for proposed and existing residents to access open space, amenity and play spaces. This in turn would contribute to maintaining a strong sense of community and ensuring there are safe and sustainable modes of transport. Chivers farms Limited is willing to look at this further with the Parish Council.</p>

	<p>Noted</p>
<p>68172 Barton & District Bridleways Group (Lesley Golding)</p>	<p>Policy HIM15 Walking and Cycling Routes + Maps 20 and 21</p> <p>Policy should include consideration of horse riding /horse riders.</p> <p>Policy HIM15 has a strong focus on walking and cycling routes within the built up areas of the villages. As such, simply widening the Policy to cover horse riding risks making the Policy challenging to apply.</p> <p>The Parish Council is open to developing a policy specifically addressing equestrian routes and access. This would require consultation with both the equestrian and the wider community and is therefore suited for incorporation at the time of the first Review of the Plan.</p> <p>In the meantime, the wording used throughout the Plan could be amended with reference to consider bridleways and equestrians where appropriate to do so without compromising on the original intent.</p> <p>Policy HIM15 could be amended by adding at the end of the last sentence (after “Maps 20 and 21.”): “In doing this, the opportunity and practicality for also incorporating access for horse riders will be taken into account subject to the interests of all being respected.”</p> <p>Supporting text should mention needs of horse riders.</p> <p>Noted: the wording used throughout the Plan could be amended with reference to consider bridleways and equestrians where appropriate to do so without compromising on the original intent.</p> <p>Map included with submission showing where horses are stable locally and wish list of routes for horse riders on Map 20 and 21 of Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>This is a useful contribution and could be a starting point for developing a policy focused on equestrians.</p>
<p>67934 Mrs Christine Few</p>	<p>Horse rider who has ridden in South Cambridgeshire for 45 years - do not think horse riders are considered in local plans.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Realise horses not allowed on cycleways but busier roads now making riding more dangerous. Riders wish to be off road but to access off-road tracks need to get to them safely.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>Need as much provision for horse riders as for cyclists - horses should have legal access to cycle routes. Request pelican crossings to enable horse riders to cross roads. Works on Guided Bus Route where horses, cyclists and pedestrians share access road.</p> <p>Noted. Making reference in the Plan to the Guided Busway bridleway may assist. There are, however, many more cyclists than equestrians in the villages and the Plan needs to recognise this.</p> <p>Few bridleways in Histon and Impington area.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Need to consider horse riders in future planning.</p> <p>If supported by the Community, a policy aimed at equestrians could be developed for incorporation on the first Review of the Plan.</p>
<p>68713 Barton & District Bridleways Group (Lesley Golding)</p>	<p>Policy HIM19 Station Site</p> <p>Need for consideration of these routes for horse riders not just footpath/cyclepath.</p> <p>Vision Park is a private site. It is not known if the owners would or would not welcome horse riders onto this commercial, office and industrial park. It is unclear what destination horse riders are seeking within Vision Park.</p>