



**South
Cambridgeshire
District Council**

Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Annex A

Appendix 2: Responding to Representations on Site Options

Contents	Site Options
1014	New Settlements 01, 02, 03, 04, 05
1036	Sawston 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, H3, H4, H5, H6
1071	Histon & Impington 13, 14, 15, 16, H2
1083	Cambourne 17, H1
1090	Great Shelford & Stapleford 18, 19, 20
1097	Cottenham 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27
1113	Fulbourn 28
1117	Linton 29
1119	Melbourn 30, 31, H7, H8
1133	Gamlingay 32, 33, 34
1140	Milton 35
1142	Swavesey 36
1146	Bassingbourn 37, 38, 39
1156	Girton 40
1159	Comberton 41, 42, 43, 44, H10
1178	Papworth Everard 45
1180	Willingham 46, 47
1184	Waterbeach 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, H9

Appendix 2: Responding to Representations on Site Options

The Issues & Options Report that was subject to consultation in July – September 2012 explored options for the amount of future housing that should be provided in the district over the next 20 years and where the new homes should be located. The consultation included 52 site options for housing that could be provided in varying ways from new settlements to smaller sites in villages.

As part of this first consultation, new sites were suggested for consideration. The Issues & Options 2 Report (Part 2) that was subject to consultation in January – February 2013 included 10 additional site options for housing.

This Appendix provides information on the number of representations received on each site option, a summary of the representations, and the Council's response and conclusion on each of the site options. In the conclusion for each site, this document identifies which site options are being allocated for development in the draft Local Plan.

Contents	Site Options
New Settlements	01, 02, 03, 04, 05
Sawston	06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, H3, H4, H5, H6
Histon & Impington	13, 14, 15, 16, H2
Cambourne	17, H1
Great Shelford & Stapleford	18, 19, 20
Cottenham	21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27
Fulbourn	28
Linton	29
Melbourn	30, 31, H7, H8
Gamlingay	32, 33, 34
Milton	35
Swavesey	36
Bassingbourn	37, 38, 39
Girton	40
Comberton	41, 42, 43, 44, H10
Papworth Everard	45
Willingham	46, 47
Waterbeach	48, 49, 50, 51, 52, H9

New Settlements

Settlement:	Extension to Northstowe		
Site Address:	Land north west of B1050, Station Road, Longstanton (Northstowe Reserve)		
SHLAA Reference:	Sites 242 and 273	Site Option Number:	01 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site already reserved for development • Good public transport links via Guided Bus • Would allow for flexibility in how Northstowe is developed <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlikely to lead to additional housing delivery at Northstowe either to 2031 or overall. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 57; Object: 13; Comment: 10</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 responses supported development at Northstowe. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If roads are upgraded, and infrastructure provided. • There is infrastructure to support development. • Site is already reserved for development. • Its inclusion in the Plan followed the examination of the potential for this area to contribute to the future growth of the new town. • Comberton Parish Council – has ability to maximise sustainability for developing in modern infrastructure. • Haslingfield Parish Council – support for flexibility it offers; • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first • Fen Ditton and Weston Colville Parish Councils – support; • Environment Agency – No objection to the allocation of these sites on the basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. • Homes and Communities Agency – support has already been expressed through the site's inclusion in the submitted Development Framework Document for Northstowe. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not secure dwellings in the plan period. Unclear how it would help given the trajectory in the South Cambs AMR. • Will not provide a sustainable development strategy. • Development should be focused on Longstanton, rather than making Northstowe even bigger. • Does not relate to the economic base of Cambridge. • A more robust strategy must refocus towards delivery of sustainable new homes at Cambridge and the villages. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be organic, led by market forces not driven by the state. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. Sewers crossing the site. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Any new settlement will require new static library provision on site. • Caldecote Parish Council – Northstowe and Waterbeach will have least impact on the surrounding area, and there is suitable infrastructure to support development • Croydon Parish Council – could be an option due to guided bus, but look at Cambourne and how much that has extended since the first plans. • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council – We broadly agree with the policy of concentration into new communities eg Waterbeach, Northstowe etc and the large villages with facilities and infrastructure. • Natural England – Development of this site should seek to maximise GI creation and enhancement opportunities, in line with the GI Strategy.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New town with high quality public transport links to Cambridge. • No loss of Green Belt. • Avoids land at risk of flooding – only a small part of the site is at risk of flooding. <p>Northstowe is located on the Guided Busway and has good public transport links to Cambridge.</p> <p>This site is currently identified in the Northstowe Area Action Plan as an area of longer term strategic reserve for residential development and local services. The site is included in the Framework Masterplan for the Northstowe development that is included in the Northstowe Development Framework Document endorsed by the Council in August 2012.</p> <p>It is not expected that this land will increase the overall number of homes at Northstowe, but the inclusion of this land would provide flexibility in the way the town is built. It is therefore included in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	New Town at Waterbeach (12,750 houses)		
Site Address:	Land north of Waterbeach		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 231	Site Option Number:	02 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuses previously developed land • Relatively close to Cambridge • Close to railway station • Large enough for two secondary schools <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Denny Abbey and landscape setting • Capacity of the A10 and A14 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 57; Object: 35; Comment: 13</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 431 responses indicated support for a new settlement at Waterbeach (no preference given for site 2 or 3) and 24 responses indicated objection. • 39 responses supported development at 'Waterbeach Barracks' and 1 objected. • 2 responses indicated specific support for this option. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to Cambridge, sustainable, uses previously developed land; • But need to upgrade the A10 and put better public transport in; • Babraham Parish Council: Waterbeach Barracks is ideal. We do not support any of the village sites. • Caldecote Parish Council – Support as least impact on the surrounding area, and there is suitable infrastructure to support development • Shepreth Parish Council - A new town at Waterbeach or further north would be the preferred option as suitable infrastructure would be built as part of the development thereby avoiding the overloading of existing infrastructure in the villages. • Cambridge City Council - Support the options being explored by South Cambridgeshire District Council, including Waterbeach, Bourn Airfield and an extension to Cambourne • Caxton Parish Council - Support due to the access into Cambridge, the railway station, and it is a brownfield site • Comberton Parish Council (supported by 307 questionnaire responses) - SCDC should favour development of New Towns (Waterbeach barracks), and / or New Villages (Bourn Airfield). Both of these have the ability to be built 'from scratch' on brown-field sites with access to good transport links and to incorporate district-wide affordable housing. Waterbeach clearly has better access to the anticipated jobs near the northern fringe job development area whilst Bourn Airfield could support jobs anticipated within Cambridge City via the A14/A428. • Croydon Parish Council – Support, brownfield land and takes 		

	<p>development to a less developed area of Cambridge locality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development • Provides for growth after 2031, large enough to provide its own services and facilities • Fen Ditton Parish Council – Support as brownfield land but car commuting risk to Horningsea Rd. New Science Park station and A14 proposals need integration • Proximity to the science park and developments to the north of the city (especially once the Chesterton station is completed) make it an attractive option for the high tech industries on which Cambridgeshire's jobs market relies • Could provide a cycling option to Cambridge • With the proviso that a full scenic impact study is done to protect Denny Abbey, and that there are suitable transport links, the provision of a new town settlement at Waterbeach would meet the requirements for well planned, sustainable housing as outlined in the Proposed Local Plan • Need to widen the A10 and compulsory purchase a number of houses. The road that goes out to Cambourne is dual carriageway. Surely it would be better in the long run to develop there • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first • With good transport links, this is a viable housing option. There is therefore no justification for further release of Green Belt land at the city fringe so "exceptional circumstances" do not apply • A new village at Waterbeach would not impact on existing residents and provide a greater number of homes • RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation –A sustainable and deliverable way to accommodate development during plan period and beyond. Dwelling capacity revised to 10,500. Deliver approximately 6,500 dwellings in plan period together with employment and social and physical infrastructure. Remaining dwelling capacity realised beyond 2031. Attributes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Close to Cambridge but not Green Belt; * Close to established employment in Northern Fringe and Cambridge Research Park, accessible by cycle and on foot; * Linked to Cambridge by rail and bus, both able to be significantly and viably enhanced; * Includes significant area of previously developed land; * Provides secure long-term future for MOD's landholding for which viable use needed. • It is important that the development is large enough to justify the transport improvements that should come with it • Additional park and ride services into Cambridge could run from
--	--

Waterbeach or from further up the A10

- Such a development would provide its own infrastructure, services, facilities and utilities and not rely upon those of existing villages which are under strain. The A14 is to be improved which would make the area suitable for the growth of traffic which comes with new development. Residents would have a sense of identity and would not feel that they were just tagged on to an existing community.

OBJECTIONS:

- Rather than a new town, why not a large retail park to bring employment to the area, and would not require infrastructure, doctors, schools etc
- Loss of green land, impact on character of village, loss of station if it moves to the north
- Adverse impact on fenland landscape
- Negative impacts on the A10 and junction with the A14
- Negative impact on setting of Denny Abbey
- Existing shops would close
- Would lead to extra traffic through the village
- New settlements will not provide a sustainable development strategy over the Plan period given long lead-in times, and local and strategic infrastructure issues. Challenge whether this Option would deliver required growth to 2031. It would place significant pressure on the delivery of Northstowe and compete with it.
- The three new settlement Options do not relate to the economic base of Cambridge. Future residents will rely on Cambridge to provide jobs, shopping and social functions. In this way new settlements will lead to more carbon usage and gas emissions which would be unsustainable when compared to development on the edge of Cambridge
- Object to a development focus on new settlements to deliver housing. They will not do so in the short or even medium term. South Cambridgeshire already has an identified housing shortfall; new homes are needed now to meet existing five-year housing land supply and affordable housing shortfalls.
- The local infrastructure (A10, A14 etc) cannot cope with a development of this scale. Some of the land has flooded in the past. This new development will turn into a rail commuter town for London and not serve Cambridgeshire's needs
- Would ruin local quality of life, and destroy the existing community. Villagers want to live in a village, not on the outskirts of a medium sized town
- English Heritage - Site Option 2 would not be acceptable as a new settlement at Waterbeach may encroach on the setting of Denny Abbey to the north, a scheduled monument. A key aspect of the appreciation of the significance of the abbey is its isolation and this can still be experienced in long views it affords across the surrounding flat landscape
- There is no need for so many new homes. The housing needs of the region can be satisfied without such development
- Development should be organic, led by market forces, not driven by the state
- There would be considerable risk of flooding in future, especially in the light of rapidly melting Arctic ice

- Loss of over 250ha of high quality agricultural land
 - Would turn this lovely village into a small town
 - Any development should provide affordable business premises for shops and offices. These should not be developer controlled otherwise they will not be affordable
 - Landbeach Parish Council – Local residents opposed. No need exists for a new settlement of this size. Housing needs can be satisfied without such development. The character of the area would be completely altered and see Waterbeach and Landbeach swamped. Communications links are already overloaded. Upgrading would be expensive, making delivery of a solution unlikely
 - Moving Waterbeach station to serve the new settlement would severely disadvantage existing residents
 - Milton would lose some of its sports fields
 - The Farmland Museum and Denny Abbey - Denny Abbey and the Farmland Museum occupy a site of unique historic significance. The surrounding countryside plays an essential part in defining the character of the site. The proposed development would surround the Abbey and Museum. Whilst the nearest buildings could be screened from view the essential character of the site would be lost because it would no longer be possible to fully understand its context and experience how it must have felt to live and work in such a remote setting. This sense of remoteness is still maintained today
 - The Wildlife Trust - Biological recording shows that the former airfield site is wildlife-rich and may be of County Wildlife Site standard. The nature conservation value of this area must be assessed and considered in decisions whether to create a new town. If possible, this area should not be allocated for development, particularly if development needs can be met in more environmentally sustainable locations
 - Waterbeach Parish Council - Would dominate existing settlement, Agricultural land grade 1. Susceptible to flooding and problems with water supply and sewage disposal. Possible contamination from previous military use. Another scheduled ancient monument nearby - Waterbeach Abbey. Transport infrastructure inadequate. Queuing vehicles for A10/A14 intersection extend to Waterbeach. Likelihood of delivering housing by 2031 is remote. Danger will detract from development at Northstowe - reserved land should be allocated. Expand Cambourne rather than third new town. Insufficient demand for either of Waterbeach options
 - Even with current usage A10 journey times in rush hours are very long. Traffic through Waterbeach, Horningsea and Fen Ditton towards Newmarket Road would increase. The railway is also already working at full capacity
- COMMENTS:**
- Waterbeach Waste Management Park – The WWMP could include Energy from Waste and/or other new waste management technologies and has potential to provide decentralised Combined Heat and Power (CHP) for local developments. WWMP have no objection to the allocations in principle, but would not wish to see development within these areas that could prejudice existing or future operations at the

	<p>WWMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth. Pumping stations and sewers crossing the site. The Waterbeach site falls within 400 metres of the WWTW • Depends whether infrastructure (especially A10 changes) can be provided at the right time and at the right level for the proposed new town to be able to function in a satisfactory way • Fulfils sustainability criteria by good access to main line rail with direct links to Cambridge and new station at Chesterton • Cambridge Past, Present and Future - A significant development should be seriously considered. It is outside the Green Belt but close enough to the city for good public transport links to be established (possibly a branch from the guided busway) • Cambridgeshire County Council - Any new settlement will require new static library provision on site. At Waterbeach (site 231) a large proportion of the site lies within the sand and gravel MSA. It should be identified in the Tier 1 assessment (within the SHLAA) as a 'strategic constraint'. It should also feature as a 'con' under the New Settlement site options. This element of the SHLAA Assessments needs to be re-visited and adequate consideration of the mineral resource needs to be taken into account. • Comberton Parish Council - Local residents to decide - but has good transport links to anticipated jobs • English Heritage - In any proposal for development opportunities for enhancement of Denny Abbey should be considered including a improved access to the monument. Master planning of development should also take account of the inherited features of the airfield and opportunities to reflect significant features within the development should be considered • Natural England - Waterbeach airfield supports habitats of significant local biodiversity interest, options which protect and enhance this whole area as open space/nature reserve would be preferred. Policy should recognise this and seek to ensure that allocation/development protects and enhances local biodiversity interest. Development should make significant contributions to the aims and aspirations of the Cambridgeshire GI Strategy and the Cambridgeshire BAP • Would bring benefits to Waterbeach in the way of enhanced public transport, local secondary school and other facilities associated with a town of this size • The National Trust - A potential opportunity exists to create a more direct access to the Wicken Vision to serve the informal open space needs of the growing population. Currently the River Cam provides a barrier. A new bridge and upgrading of the footpath network would serve the local community and help deliver strategic Green Infrastructure
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher in the search sequence than village options • Providing homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Potential to achieve high quality public transport. • No loss of Green Belt.

	<p>Development of a new town at Waterbeach during and beyond the plan period would provide for growth in a sustainable location high in the sustainable development sequence, close to Cambridge, with no loss of Green Belt, making use of extensive areas of brownfield land, and on land not at risk of flooding. The allocation would provide for continued growth beyond the plan period and so help reduce the need for a future review of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Impacts on Denny Abbey and the landscape are capable of mitigation as are impacts on biodiversity and on Waterbeach Village. The area identified to be reviewed through an Area Action Plan will deliver significant Green Infrastructure, to provide biodiversity mitigation and enhancement, and maintain the setting of Denny Abbey.</p> <p>The draft local plan does not allocate sites between the barracks and the village. Instead it proposes to extend the Green Belt in these areas, to help avoid coalescence with Waterbeach and help maintain its character as a freestanding village.</p> <p>The development of the barracks will enable a significant previously developed land resource to be utilised.</p> <p>The primary vehicular access will be to the A10 and not through the village. To provide for modal shift the town will be required to provide high quality rail, bus and cycle links including to Cambridge. Significant mitigation will be required to increase capacity on the A10 and at the junction with the A14. The town will have the significant benefit of a railway station providing links to Cambridge, London and the national rail network. The transport modelling identifies that development of a new town will still have significant impacts, but will achieve a higher modal share of non-car modes than a more dispersed development strategy. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy proposes a range of mitigation measures to address transport impacts in the area.</p> <p>A relocated railway station will need to remain convenient for the village, this is addressed in the draft plan.</p> <p>The new town will require a significant level of new infrastructure. The Council has worked with statutory providers and stakeholders to identify that issues are capable of being addressed. The long lead in time will enable issues to be explored further, particularly through the preparation of an Area Action Plan. Delivery of Northstowe will be well underway before development starts at Waterbeach.</p> <p>The promoters reduced the capacity of the site to 10,500 dwellings through their response to the Issues & Options consultation in July – September 2012. The Council considers the capacity should be reduced to 8-9000, to reflect a reduced major development site that ensures a sufficiently remote setting to Denny Abbey, and enables an appropriate development density, and provision of formal open space uses within the town.</p>
--	---

	<p>Subsequent to the Portfolioholder meeting of 11th June, the site area and policy were amended following site visits and discussions with English Heritage, with particular reference to the historic significance of Denny Abbey</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan, but with capacity reduced to 8-9000.</p>
--	---

Settlement:	Small New Town at Waterbeach (7,600 houses)		
Site Address:	Land north of Waterbeach (MOD only)		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 231 (part)	Site Option Number:	03 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less impact on landscape setting • Large enough for a secondary school • Reuses previously developed land • Relatively close to Cambridge <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less need/incentive to move Railway station and sewage works • Impact on Denny Abbey and landscape setting • Capacity of the A10 and A14 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 23; Object: 32; Comment: 18</p> <p>Questionnaire responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 431 responses indicated support for a new settlement at Waterbeach (no preference given for site 2 or 3) and 24 responses indicated objection. • 39 responses supported development at 'Waterbeach Barracks' and 1 objected. • 4 responses indicated specific support for this option. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An opportunity to reconsider the A10 option. • Opportunity to redevelop previously developed land. • Good access to mainline rail with links to new station at Chesterton. • Has existing employment nearby. • Could be delivered with a comprehensive approach to infrastructure. • Need to consider traffic impact on Horningsea and Fen Ditton. • Cambridge City Council - Support the options being explored by South Cambridgeshire District Council, including Waterbeach, Bourn Airfield and an extension to Cambourne; • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; • Babraham Parish Council: Waterbeach Barracks is ideal. We do not support any of the village sites. • Comberton Parish Council (supported by 307 questionnaire responses) - SCDC should favour development of New Towns (Waterbeach barracks), and / or New Villages (Bourn Airfield). Both of these have the ability to be built 'from scratch' on brown-field sites with access to good 		

transport links and to incorporate district-wide affordable housing. Waterbeach clearly has better access to the anticipated jobs near the northern fringe job development area whilst Bourn Airfield could support jobs anticipated within Cambridge City via the A14/A428.

- **Shepreth Parish Council** - A new town at Waterbeach or further north would be the preferred option as suitable infrastructure would be built as part of the development thereby avoiding the overloading of existing infrastructure in the villages.
- **Haslingfield Parish Council** – Option 3 is preferred to 2 and 4.
- **Fen Ditton Parish Council** – brownfield land, but car commuting risk on Horningsea Road needs solving;

OBJECTIONS:

- Problems with the A10, and impact on the road network. Upgrades required will cause road misery for years. Upgrades could impact on Milton sports fields.
- Too large for the area and significant infrastructure costs;
- Would compete with Northstowe.
- Houses should not be built on low lying land.
- Would create a town for London commuters.
- New settlements will not provide a sustainable development strategy over the Plan period and given the long lead-in times associated with new settlements, together with local and more strategic infrastructure issues, will not deliver required growth.
- Risks not being housing for jobs within local area, but dormitory housing for London commuters.
- A more robust strategy must refocus towards delivery of sustainable new homes at Cambridge and the villages.
- It would irreversibly change the character of the area.
- Would destroy over 250 hectares of high quality agricultural land.
- Preference for smaller development integrated with Waterbeach, e.g. a retirement village.
- **RLE and Defence infrastructure Organisation** – Option 3 not supported by landowners as would not deliver a comprehensive scheme, and will miss advantages of larger site.
 - * Significant ecological interests, difficult or impossible to mitigate.
 - * Developable area proportionally lower than larger scheme.
 - * Lower average densities and over estimation of capacity.
 - * Less sustainability advantages - no rail.
- **Landbeach Parish Council** - strongly opposes the proposed development. Housing needs can be met without development of this size. Alter character of the area, swamping Waterbeach and Landbeach.
- **Waterbeach Parish Council** - Agricultural land grade 1. Susceptible to flooding and problems with water supply and sewage disposal. Possible contamination from previous military use. Another scheduled ancient monument nearby. Transport infrastructure inadequate;
- **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council** – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first.
- **Weston Colville Parish Council** – Not appropriate for the area.
- **The Wildlife Trust** – Barracks site is of high environmental value, and may even be of County Wildlife Site standard. The nature conservation

value of this area must be assessed and considered in decisions whether to create a new town. If possible, this area should not be allocated for development, particularly if development needs can be met in more environmentally sustainable locations;

COMMENTS:

- Capacity likely to be lower than anticipated, due to water, forest or environmentally important for its flora and fauna.
- Consideration be given to the feasibility of constructing a footpath/cycleway along the route of the original causeway which connected Denny Abbey to Waterbeach.
- **Waterbeach Waste Management Park** – Site includes land that is within the waste management park's safeguarded area and therefore, whilst we have no objection to the allocations in principle, we would not wish to see any form of inappropriate development within these areas that could prejudice existing or future operations of the Waterbeach Waste Management Park.
- **The Farmland Museum and Denny Abbey** - Provided that very careful thought were given to screening and to the height, density and design of the buildings at the north end of this development the effect on the unique historically significant Abbey site could be quite small. Should consider a footpath / cycleway link from Denny Abbey to Waterbeach;
- **Anglian Water** - Anglian Water does not want to thwart development or apply a blanket embargo on all development within 400 metres of our sewage treatment works, however we must balance this with protecting our new and existing customers from the risk of nuisance / loss of amenity whilst allowing us to provide the essential sewage treatment service to our customers and for this reason we take a risk based approach. An initial assessment indicates the risk to be medium-high.
- **National Trust** - A potential opportunity exists to create a more direct access to the Wicken Vision to serve the informal open space needs of the growing population. Currently the River Cam provides a barrier. A new bridge and upgrading of the footpath network would serve the local community and help deliver strategic Green Infrastructure;
- **Cambridge Past, Present and Future** - paramount that possible development locations be evaluated in the light of sufficient transport infrastructure provision.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - a large proportion of the site lies within the sand and gravel MSA. Should be identified as a 'con' on the new settlement options.
- **English Heritage** - concerned that a potential new settlement at Waterbeach may encroach on the setting of Denny Abbey to the north, a scheduled monument which is open to the public. Site Option 3 may be capable of implementation while respecting the monument; however, this is subject to analysis of the setting of the monument. Improved access to the monument could also be explored.
- **Natural England** - aware that Waterbeach airfield supports habitats of significant local biodiversity interest, hence options which protect and enhance this whole area as open space/nature reserve would be preferred. Relevant policy should recognise this and seek to ensure that allocation/development protects and enhances the local biodiversity

	<p>interest of these sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babraham Parish Council: Waterbeach Barracks is ideal. We do not support any of the village sites. • Caldecote Parish Council – Northstowe and Waterbeach will have least impact on the surrounding area, and there is suitable infrastructure to support development; • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine – but has good transport links to anticipated jobs;
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response: See site 2 above.</p> <p>The Local Plan proposes to allocate a new town at Waterbeach, with the development area somewhere between options 2 and 3, and an area to be addressed by an area action plan similar to site 2.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate a new town at Waterbeach but based around the larger site area.</p>

Settlement:	Waterbeach		
Site Address:	Land north of Waterbeach (built area only)		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 231 (part only)	Site Option Number:	04 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less impact on landscape setting and Denny Abbey <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a large village extension unlikely to have critical mass to bring significant infrastructure improvements • Too small for a secondary school 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 27; Object: 14; Comment: 20</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 responses indicated specific support for this option. • 39 responses supported development at 'Waterbeach Barracks' and 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously developed site, would not replace wildlife areas; • If council were to commit to linking the transport network properly through local hubs this growth could be absorbed with smaller transport investment; • Caldecote Parish Council – Support as least impact on the surrounding area, and there is suitable infrastructure to support development; • Cambridge City Council - Support the options being explored by South Cambridgeshire District Council, including Waterbeach, Bourn Airfield and an extension to Cambourne; • Comberton Parish Council – Would allow re-development of brown field site - with opportunity for maximally sustainable development. But prefer Site Option 2; • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; • Fen Ditton Parish Council – Support as brownfield land but car commuting risk to Horningsea Rd. New Science Park station and A14 proposals need integration; • Support the redevelopment of the existing barracks area, possibly with small expansion. Existing sport/leisure facilities could be improved and enhanced to provide something beneficial to the wider Cambridge Area such as Wet and Wild, go karting, roller skating, ice skating, competition venue for athletics/swimming, dry ski slope etc 		

- **Landbeach Parish Council** – Support and would welcome innovative proposals that make full use of the existing facilities such as the golf course, swimming pool and green spaces;
- Waterbeach should have limited development only so as not to compete with Northstowe
- Limited development would replace the population lost by the regiment's move to Scotland and would protect / safeguard valuable facilities such as the swimming pool, golf course and fishing lake. The character of Waterbeach would not be destroyed;
- **Milton Parish Council** - A14 corridor full so no development along A14 corridor without significant upgrade in capacity of A14. Better to develop around Six Mile Bottom, dual Wilbraham Road to complete eastern ring round Cambridge, plus on under-used railway so easy high speed park and ride into Cambridge, plus easy to link to A11;
- Development on this scale would be reasonable, and would help support the local school, and shops
- Some local people would favour the creation of a retirement village that provides a community for elderly people. The proposed small development - (Site Option 4), could therefore have at its core the creation of a retirement village of some 200 dwellings together with its associated services to provide a positive environment for people to move into appropriately developed housing with potential to migrate from full independence to supervised care over time;
- Only sensible option if we are to maintain the character of Waterbeach as a village;
- The A10 and A14 will not support a significant increase in volume of traffic;
- **Waterbeach Parish Council** – No objection to development of the Barracks. The Parish Council is concerned at the impact Barracks closure will have on the viability of village facilities, businesses and primary school and feels development on this scale would help offset the loss of the military personnel and families. Support the community facilities at Barracks, i.e. golf course, swimming pool, lake, etc., being transferred to local authority control to secure public use and use of existing military buildings for employment purposes. Contrary to site options 2 and 3, the Parish Council regards this as realistic, achievable and sustainable;

OBJECTIONS:

- The smallest proposal will have a major impact on Waterbeach increasing the size by as much as 75%. However something needs to be proposed for the built area of the Barracks;
- New settlements will not provide a sustainable development strategy over the Plan period given long lead-in times, and local and strategic infrastructure issues. Challenge whether this Option would deliver required growth to 2031. It would place significant pressure on the delivery of Northstowe and compete with it;
- Too small to be worthwhile developing as a major contribution to the needs of the sub-region. This would waste the opportunity of fully using the Waterbeach site. Also, it would badly disrupt the local village which does not have enough infrastructure;

- Would ruin local quality of life, local transport (road and rail) inadequate;
- Too small to warrant investment in significant additional infrastructure, and schooling. Too much impact on existing communities without the extra infrastructure
- **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council** – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first;
- **RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation** - Support Waterbeach in principle. Option 4 is not feasible and is not supported by the landowners. It will not deliver the advantages of the comprehensive scheme. It represents a piecemeal solution which will not provide the viable future use for the MOD landholding which the Government's disposal strategy requires and would represent a lost opportunity to meet future needs in a sustainable manner. Key considerations:
 - * Not viable future for surplus MOD land - fragment landholding
 - * Significant hard standing and built structures contribute to suitability for development and viable alternative use
 - * No contribution to Cambridge needs unlike larger scheme
 - * Too small to deliver social infrastructure or public transport improvements - only large extension to Waterbeach

COMMENTS:

- **Waterbeach Waste Management Park** - The WWMP could include Energy from Waste and/or other new waste management technologies and has potential to provide decentralised Combined Heat and Power (CHP) for local developments. WWMP have no objection to the allocations in principle, but would not wish to see development within these areas that could prejudice existing or future operations at the WWMP
- **Anglian Water** - Major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth. Pumping stations and sewers crossing the site. The Waterbeach site falls within 400 metres of the WWTW
- Should consider new settlement at Waterbeach. Fulfils sustainability criteria by good access to main line rail with direct links to Cambridge and new station at Chesterton
- Development on the barracks is more desirable than other village sites as this land is already in use and not green belt. It would support local businesses after closure of the barracks. However, the junction of the A10 and A14 at Milton gets very congested at peak times, steps have to be made to make sure that the local road network can cope with the extra vehicles
- Smallest option would do least damage. Query if villagers would have access to golf course / lakes as now?
- **Cambridge Past, Present and Future** - A significant development should be seriously considered. It is outside the Green Belt but close enough to the city for good public transport links to be established (possibly a branch from the guided busway)
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Any new settlement will require new static library provision on site. At Waterbeach (site 231) a large proportion of the site lies within the sand and gravel MSA. It should be identified in the Tier 1 assessment (within the SHLAA) as a 'strategic

	<p>constraint'. It should also feature as a 'con' under the New Settlement site options. This element of the SHLAA Assessments needs to be re-visited and adequate consideration of the mineral resource needs to be taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the Barracks site is developed the open buffer between it and the village should be kept • Natural England - Waterbeach airfield supports habitats of significant local biodiversity interest, options which protect and enhance this whole area as open space/nature reserve would be preferred. Policy should recognise this and seek to ensure that allocation/development protects and enhances local biodiversity interest. Development should make significant contributions to the aims and aspirations of the Cambridgeshire GI Strategy and the Cambridgeshire BAP • The new development will not justify a new primary school, but would swamp the existing one which is now getting to be an over developed site • Site 4 makes sense but risks the development becoming a dormitory of Waterbeach. This would be mitigated if sites 48 and 49 were also developed but at the loss of Waterbeach boundaries. Better roads, lighting, paths and bus service would be needed with tasteful landscaping • The Farmland Museum and Denny Abbey - A development of this size and location would have little if any impact on Denny Abbey and the Farmland museum if appropriately screened. If this development were to go ahead could consideration be given to constructing a footpath/cycleway along the route of the original causeway which connected Denny Abbey to Waterbeach before the construction of the airfield? This could provide a safer, environmentally friendly access route away from the A10 and be of recreational value as well as recreating a route which is part of the history of Waterbeach • The National Trust - A potential opportunity exists to create a more direct access to the Wicken Vision to serve the informal open space needs of the growing population. Currently the River Cam provides a barrier. A new bridge and upgrading of the footpath network would serve the local community and help deliver strategic Green Infrastructure • If some of the existing buildings (e.g. Orchard Drive, Officers' mess and facilities e.g. golf course, RAF museum) were kept, the history and heritage of the site would not be lost. Careful integration of the site with the existing village needed. The effect on the A10 and railway would also be a big issue. Parking in the village by rail commuters is already a problem. The A10 is already at capacity. If this option were adopted, consider reconstructing the old causeway route to Denny Abbey as a cycleway/footpath
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>This site option was one of three proposed for land north of Waterbeach, including land previously in use as Waterbeach Barracks. The three site options proposed different site areas and capacities ranging from 930 to 12,750 dwellings. The draft Local Plan will allocate land for a new town at Waterbeach (see Site Option 2).</p>

	<p>Allocation of only the barracks site would provide less housing in the plan period than a new town, and would not benefit from the same level of infrastructure, as the barracks site would only deliver a large extension to a minor rural centre.</p> <p>Use of the site as part of a new town provides a better opportunity for the meeting the long term development needs of Cambridge area, as part of a sustainable development strategy.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Bourn Airfield New Village		
Site Address:	Bourn Airfield, Bourn		
SHLAA Reference:	Sites 057 and 238	Site Option Number:	05 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former airfield counts as reuse of previously developed land • Relatively close to Cambridge <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively poor links to Cambourne, especially to centre • May be too small for a secondary school • Would form a ribbon of development south of the A428 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 15; Object: 115; Comment: 10</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 422 responses indicated specific support for this option. 19 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already has the road improvements provided for Cambourne; • Good public transport; • Brownfield site; • Small new village option would not take as long to deliver as some other options; • Would need local provision of both primary and secondary education. • Babraham Parish Council – Support new village at Bourn Airfield. We do not support any of the village sites. • Milton Parish Council – conditional on upgraded Girton interchange for direct link to and from Huntingdon direction to A428 west. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. • Comberton Parish Council – brownfield site, good sustainability possible. • Comberton Parish Council (supported by 307 questionnaire responses) - SCDC should favour development of New Towns (Waterbeach barracks), and / or New Villages (Bourn Airfield). Both of these have the ability to be built 'from scratch' on brown-field sites with access to good transport links and to incorporate district-wide affordable housing. Waterbeach clearly has better access to the anticipated jobs near the northern fringe job development area whilst Bourn Airfield could support jobs anticipated within Cambridge City via the A14/A428. • Croydon Parish Council – Not as extension to Cambourne, make a definitive boundary. • Weston Colville Parish Council – Support; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would merge Cambourne with Caldecote, creating a ribbon of development along the A428; • Should not be allowed without duelling to the A1. • Would merge with the village of Bourn; 		

- Additional homes will add to congestion on the roads, including the bottleneck at Madingley Road;
- Traffic impact on surrounding villages, including Bourn.
- No cycle lanes between Cambourne and Hardwick;
- Insufficient public transport;
- Does not offer the rail opportunities of Waterbeach;
- Impact on local services and facilities, more pressure on Cambourne, as it would not be large enough to provide its own facilities;
- Difficulty in finding places in educational establishments for children;
- Impact on the Cambourne three village model.
- Would turn Cambourne into a town;
- Parking problems outside schools and shops;
- Lack of jobs in the immediate vicinity to provide local employment;
- Need for commuters to London to travel long distances to rail stations in Cambridge or St Neots;
- Another large construction site to cope with. Finish the existing planned Cambourne;
- Additional surface water run-off into Bourn Brook;
- Lack of sewage capacity, particularly at Uttons Drove;
- Impact on biodiversity, including badgers, grass snakes, slow worms and bat species;
- Increased pressure on local Green Infrastructure;
- A more robust strategy must refocus towards delivery of sustainable new homes at Cambridge and the villages. Larger strategic developments focussed to Cambridge, supported by development in the villages to meet local needs and sustain local employment and services;
- Not a sustainable location for Cambridge related growth.
- Bourn Parish Council – Not a sustainable site. Lack of local employment and overstretched local facilities. Would also lead to coalescence between Highfields Caldecote and Cambourne;
- Caldecote Parish Council – Ribbon development along A428, with impact on landscape. Infrastructure and transport at capacity. No employment. Loss of agricultural land;
- Cambourne Parish Council – Site is inappropriate. Would link adjoining villages. Should not be direct links with Cambourne, and should be self-contained with its own infrastructure;
- Hardwick Parish Council – Will lead to urban sprawl. Will overwhelm local services.
- Toft Parish Council – Opposed to option, due to size and lack of infrastructure.

COMMENTS:

- Maintain significant separation with Upper Cambourne
- Will need to reconsider parking in Cambourne centre;
- Should development along the A428 be considered, surely Scotland Farm and Childerley Gate would appear suitable.
- Dry Drayton Parish Council - no objection in principal to the option of a new village on Bourn airfield, so long as appropriate provision is made to avoid a significant build-up in traffic through Dry Drayton.
- Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of

	<p>flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - Development should make significant contributions to the aims and aspirations of the Cambridgeshire GI Strategy and the Cambridgeshire BAP. • Middle Level Commissioners - The contents of one of your Council's previous consultation documents inferred that surface water disposal from the site would be to Bourn Brook. Confirmation that this is indeed the case will be required if this proposal proceeds. • Wildlife Trust - County Wildlife Site within the middle of this site must be protected, enhanced and expanded • Cambridgeshire County Council - Initial demographic forecasts suggest that there would be a requirement for a 5-6 form entry secondary school arising from the Bourn Airfield development. In the short term it would be possible to mitigate the impact of Bourn Airfield due to the close proximity to Comberton and Cambourne Village Colleges. However, these schools are both forecast to operate at capacity, and whilst there is some capacity for limited expansion neither could meet the demand of the Bourn Airfield development once completed. To meet the demand from the new development it would therefore be necessary to plan on the basis of splitting the community between two secondary schools. This would not be supported by the County Council, in its role as the Children's Services Authority, for planning and delivery of a new community as it would be detrimental to the development of community cohesion. Therefore, the County Council, in its role as the Children's Services Authority, would be unlikely to support the allocation of Bourn Airfield unless there was a policy requirement for appropriate secondary school provision to be delivered as part of the masterplan.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing homes relatively close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Potential to achieve high quality public transport. • Making best use of brownfield land. • No loss of Green Belt. • Avoids land at risk of flooding. <p>Development of a new town at Bourn Airfield during and beyond the plan period would provide for growth in a sustainable location high in the sustainable development sequence, relatively close to Cambridge, with no loss of Green Belt, making use of extensive areas of brownfield land, and on land not at risk of flooding. Drainage can be appropriately addressed, and the policy specifically requires consideration of impacts on Bourn Brook.</p> <p>The allocation would provide for continued growth beyond the plan period and so help reduce the need for a future review of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The scale of development, in conjunction with development at Cambourne</p>

	<p>West, provides an opportunity to support transport improvements to Cambridge. These would include bus segregation measures to Cambridge, addressing issues on Madingley Hill, and segregated cycle links to Cambridge and to Cambourne. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy considers a wide range of transport measures to address the development strategy.</p> <p>Development will support focused delivery of new infrastructure to support the new village, including a new secondary school, and other services and facilities commensurate with a Rural Centre, whilst not competing with Cambridge or Cambourne Village Centre. Employment opportunities will also be provided, in particular the former ThysennKrupp buildings provides an opportunity for employment redevelopment.</p> <p>The new village will require a significant level of new infrastructure. The Council has worked with statutory providers and stakeholders to identify that issues are capable of being addressed. The length of lead-in time for a new settlement will enable issues to be explored further, particularly through the preparation of an Area Action Plan. The development is also phased, with flexibility to be brought forward earlier if necessary to help the district maintain a five year housing land supply.</p> <p>Landscape impacts are capable of mitigation including avoiding creating the appearance of a ribbon of development south of the A428, and ensuring effective landscaped separation from Highfields Caldecote, Bourn, and Cambourne. Impacts on the County Wildlife Site can be appropriately addressed, and the site will provide opportunities for biodiversity mitigation and enhancement, and the delivery of Green Infrastructure. A larger Area Action Plan boundary has been included to enable opportunities outside the built development area to be fully explored.</p> <p>Following the Portfolioholder meeting of 11th June, the reduced capacity at Cambourne West was compensated for by bringing development at Bourn Airfield forward a year, development having been held back in the housing trajectory by two years to provide flexibility and ensure a 5 year supply of housing land.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Sawston

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land at Former Marley Tiles Site, Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 153	Site Option Number:	06 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact on landscape or townscape <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of employment land Potential noise nuisance from existing employment 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 17; Object: 4; Comment: 10</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 responses indicated specific support for this option. 4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any new build should use sites that avoid arable land. Brownfield land. No loss of Green Belt. It would be wrong to build in the Green Belt or on greenfield sites and leave this unused. Much better to build here than on a greenfield site or a Flood plain. Housing on these sites should be limited to the local community, not London commuters. Little landscape effect. Sawston has good facilities including secondary school. It is close to primary schools and play facilities. It would be a loss of employment land, but there appears to be sufficient other available employment land. There are already houses on two sides, so noise nuisance should not be significantly greater than for existing residents. We used to live nearby and did not find it noisy. Peterhouse owns land adjoining Site Option 6, which is similarly available for residential use and equally suitable for such use. The site backs onto existing housing: replacing the existing derelict factory unit with housing would improve the safety and security of these homes. Another advantage of this site is the relatively easy access to Babraham Road - a through route - with minimal new road construction; Sawston is sustainable location for growth as Rural Centre. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. Pampisford Parish Council - We support this area for residential development. Croydon Parish Council - Already on the edge of Sawston and using a brownfield site. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development 		

potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development.

OBJECTIONS:

- Object to loss of employment land. The village needs more jobs to support the current population let alone any increases. Should be promoting the village as a good employment location.
- Parts of the site are surrounded by factories / warehouses in an unattractive industrial area, away from the village centre and those seeking homes would avoid. These sites should continue to be considered 'employment land' and used for this purpose as the surrounding population increases.

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site.
- Scope for major development is limited by existing form of village. Consideration of cumulative impact with relocation Cambridge City Football Club to Sawston. Development on sites to the West of the High Street is constrained by flood plain. Primary schools at capacity, some capacity at Village College. Health centre slightly over design capacity. High Street needs regeneration, but doubtful achieved by large expansion. Shoppers largely dependent on cars. Insufficient parking and the High Street frequently congested with HGVs. Transport: 20 minute CITI7 service to Cambridge - busy at peak times and subject to frequent delays. Park and Ride services faster but increase traffic on A1301, Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Stapleford. Exacerbate congestion. Rail station 2 miles, not widely used.
- **Comberton Parish Council** - Local residents to determine. But it is a brown field site.
- **Duxford Parish Council** - Sawston is at risk of over development, and will attract investment away from villages.
- Worthy of further consideration. Although there is loss of employment land, this can be offset. (The Pampisford site is well related to the Sawston bypass and can provide employment opportunities for both Pampisford and Sawston). However, because of the location of these sites, residents could well be largely dependent on cars and with the proximity of Cambridge and its retail outlets, these sites might not contribute greatly to supporting and regenerating Sawston High Street.
- Development here would add to traffic accessing A1307 north of Babraham. There would have to improvements to this dangerous junction.
- Over dense proposal. It is unlikely that an already overburdened infrastructure (eg Medical Centre and primary schools) could cope. Would support a smaller-scale development, with an appropriate mix of

	private and affordable housing to meet the needs of the village.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Providing homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south. • Focus on more sustainable villages – Rural Centre • Making best use of brownfield land. • Site with parish council and local support. • Avoiding land at risk of flooding. <p>Part of larger Site Option 7 (I&O1) and H5 (I&O2). Site Option H5 is being allocated in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Reasons for its selection are addressed against that site.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land at Grove Road / West Way, Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 154	Site Option Number:	07 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact on landscape or townscape <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of employment land Potential noise nuisance from existing employment 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 16; Object: 5; Comment: 8</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 responses indicated specific support for this option. 4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brownfield land, outside Green Belt. Little landscape impact. Away from area of flood risk. Sawston has facilities, including a secondary school. Sufficient other employment land. Site can be considered as part of wider site with development potential. Should use empty properties in the district first. Need to ensure development is served by bus services. Croydon Parish Council – Brownfield land on the edge of a village. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of employment land. Large parts of site remain surrounded by industrial land, making it unattractive for development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of cumulative impact with relocation Cambridge City Football Club to Sawston. Primary School and health centre at capacity. Distance from Sawston High Street means that people may use their 		

	<p>cars.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large site that could provide housing and business uses. • Duxford Parish Council - Sawston is at risk of over development, and will attract investment away from villages. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Providing homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south. • Focus on more sustainable villages – Rural Centre • Making best use of brownfield land. • Site with parish council and local support. • Avoiding land at risk of flooding. <p>Part of larger Site Option H5 (I&O2) which is being allocated in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Reasons for its selection are addressed against that site.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 258	Site Option Number:	08 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope to improve existing village edge <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities • Loss of Green Belt 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 6; Object: 19; Comment: 10</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 response indicated specific support for this option, 1 objected. • 4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land owned by a charity, housing development particularly for low income families and singles would address social needs. • Site is on the village boundary and would have little adverse impact. Although some distance from the village centre, it is close to a local school and play facilities. • New houses have been built in this area before therefore an extension here seems appropriate. Sawston has few new build family homes and it would be good to see some four and five bed family homes built alongside affordable housing so that expanding families can stay locally. • Close to existent P&Ride. • Contributes to spread of development around Cambridge, taking away some of the burden from already hugely developed areas. There is not much development at Sawston and the village centre is not too far away from this site. In an area where there is a lot of green belt, so losing some of this would not be too detrimental. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on arable or Green Belt land should be avoided. There are more suitable options in the village which use land formally used by industry. • Invaluable green belt would be lost, leaving Sawston as an island between busy roads. • Schools at capacity. 		

- Impact on village nature. Having more houses in the area will ruin the appeal of the village.
- Traffic and loss of amenity.
- Too far from village centre.
- Loss of footpaths used by children and adults for walking in car-free environment. Traffic increase a danger to cyclists on Babraham Road, used by children on trip to school.
- Inadequate local infrastructure, would make Sawston into a dormitory village with housing mostly unaffordable by locals.
- Sawston is already big enough, childminders, nurseries etc are stretched to capacity (despite what sufficiency data may say). Sawston is verging on being a town and new houses will not help most people as they are all very expensive. Rent prices outweigh most wages and deposits to buy are unachievable for those having to rent.
- **Croydon Parish Council** – Leave the green belt alone.
- **Pampisford Parish Council** - Green belt land, loss of footpaths and recreational amenities. Extends Sawston housing to the Pampisford parish boundary. There is no easy access to the village centre except by already busy/congested roads.

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site.
- Would provide main access for site option 178 to south. Babraham Road is busy and additional traffic would make it busier. It has no controlled crossings. Development would generate extra traffic through Babraham and onto the main road to Cambridge via a junction with poor sight lines. With site 178 it would cause a significant loss of green belt. Could schools and medical facilities cope with this sort of growth? Parking for Village centre shops is at its limits at peak times, and no suitable alternatives are available.
- Scope for major development is limited by existing form of village. Consideration of cumulative impact with relocation Cambridge City Football Club to Sawston. Development on sites to the West of the High Street is constrained by flood plain. Primary schools at capacity, some capacity at Village College. Health centre slightly over design capacity. High Street needs regeneration, but doubtful achieved by large expansion. Shoppers largely dependent on cars. Insufficient parking and the High Street frequently congested with HGVs. Transport: 20 minute CITI7 service to Cambridge - busy at peak times and subject to frequent delays. Park and Ride services faster but increase traffic on A1301, Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Stapleford. Exacerbate congestion. Rail station 2 miles, not widely used.
- 20 minutes walk from the village centre, probably making car ownership a necessity and public transport facilities may need reviewing. However 335 rental properties are needed in Sawston and as this site is owned by two local charities this could be highly beneficial if about 139 rented housing trust dwellings were built. If it were joined to site option 9 vehicular access onto Sawston Road would be straightforward.
- **Duxford Parish Council** - Sawston is at risk of over development, and will attract investment away from villages.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council - Local residents to determine. Not preferred since it would erode green belt. • Use both Site options 8 and 9 - room for more dwellings and a road from Babraham Road, reducing traffic flow through the village or Linton Way. Green Belt restrictions but need for more housing is at all-time high. Include a shop and community room, or small pub or cafe so services are not so far away - one of the cons. In respects to the boundaries of Sawston Hall being respected, could hedgerows or fencing be put in place to separate that land. Need for a new primary school would be greater with an increased number of pupils. • Icknield Primary School – Development of Site Options 8 and 9, will result in a significant impact on the school; as any new housing in Sawston will affect school capacity within the village meaning that school building improvements and extensions will be required. As a forward thinking Governing Body we would like to express our wish to be involved, in the consultation and planning process which will address these issues and we ask you to contact the school directly at that time, with reasonable notice. • Developing these sites would give the opportunity to fund a new eastern road to link with either the A505 or the A1307 to take heavy traffic direct from the Babraham Road Industrial Estate out of Sawston village and also out of Babraham village. • Possibly - but no to south corner. • If this were developed as affordable housing it might have some merits. It would however cause additional traffic into Babraham Road, and would also give site access to a huge potential site including site option 9. Green belt and distance from village centre are serious problems.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge, • Provides homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south • Focus on a more sustainable villages – Rural Centre • Avoids land at risk of flooding <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 260 dwellings for the combined issues and options 1 sites 8 and 9. This is a lower figure than the 480 than the Issues and Options 1 consultation described as the total capacity of the two sites. The southern boundary of the site has been moved north and the capacity has been reduced to provide increased opportunity for landscaping mitigation, including for the setting of Sawston Hall. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The site assessment and SA have been updated to reflect a density of 30dph and the revised site boundary.</p> <p>Development of this site would has the potential to have a positive impact upon the landscape setting of Sawston provided the design makes a generous provision of land to ensure a soft green edge to the east. The site could also provide access from Babraham Road to Site Option 9 to the south, with cycle and pedestrian access at the south western corner of the</p>

	<p>site to link more directly to the village centre. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land east of Sawston		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 178	Site Option Number:	09 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope to improve existing village edge • Could provide additional space for primary school <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities • Loss of Green Belt • Need to respect setting of Sawston Hall 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 3; Object: 25; Comment: 9</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 responses about development in Sawston – 4 supporting and 5 objecting • 2 responses objecting to this option specifically. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need further housing in the village, particularly affordable. • Close to local schools and play facilities. • Potential to enhance setting of Sawston Hall. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt site. • Would lose green open space and paths, important to the village. • Loss of village identity and creation of urban sprawl. • There are alternative brownfield options in the village. • Building up to Pampisford boundary. • Schools and doctors at capacity. • Close to Sawston Hall. • Distance to village centre. • Increased traffic. • Will make village even more like dormitory settlement. • Croydon Parish Council – Leave Green Belt alone. 		

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would access to the site be made? Church Lane, Plantation Road, Green Road not suitable. Babraham Road is a busy road, and would get busier. • County Highways opposed access onto Babraham Road for Stanley Webb Close site. • Would relate awkwardly to centre of village, as Church Lane narrows on approach to High Street. • Consider cumulative impact of relocation Cambridge City Football Club to Sawston. • Would exacerbate congestion. • Include a shop or community room, so services are not so far away. • Develop options 8 and 9 and a road from Babraham Road to reduce congestion. • Anglian Water – There is Capacity to serve the site. • Duxford Parish Council - Sawston is at risk of over development, and will attract investment away from villages. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. • Icknield Primary School – Development would impact on school capacity. We would like to be involved in planning process.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Providing homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south. • Focuses on a more sustainable village with high quality public transport links to Cambridge. • Avoids land at risk of flooding. <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 260 dwellings for the combined issues and options 1 sites 8 and 9. This is a lower figure than the 480 than the Issues and Options 1 consultation described as the total capacity of the two sites. The southern boundary of the site has been moved north and the capacity has been reduced to provide increased opportunity for landscaping mitigation, including for the setting of Sawston Hall. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The site assessment and SA have been updated to reflect a density of 30dph and the revised site boundary.</p> <p>Development of this site would has the potential to have a positive impact upon the landscape setting of Sawston provided the design makes a generous provision of land to ensure a soft green edge to the east. Development has the potential to impact on the setting of the Grade I Listed Sawston Hall. As a result a reduced scale of development is proposed on the northern part of the site, together with careful boundary treatment to the south to protect and enhance the setting of the Hall.</p> <p>Access to the site could be via a new junction to Babraham Road through Site Option 8, which is also being allocated in the draft Local Plan. Site</p>

	<p>available immediately and capable of delivering houses in the short-term.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate a smaller site for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Mill Lane, Sawston		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 230	Site Option Number:	10 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Close to local services and facilities <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited flood risk 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 6; Object: 26; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 responses about development in Sawston – 4 supporting and 5 objecting 1 response supported this option <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A good location particularly for social housing needs with little impact on other residents. Adjacent to or close to recreation and new green areas (Sawston Orchard). Agree with your assessment pros. Good access to local facilities and sustainable modes of transport. Sawston is a rural centre and has a significant number of facilities and services available. It has good quality public transport links to Cambridge. The site is not located within the Green Belt. It has been demonstrated and agreed by the Environment Agency that flooding and drainage can be dealt with adequately. The site is available, deliverable and sustainable, in addition it will not impact on the landscape of Sawston, it is therefore supported by both national and local planning policy. Flood risk needs mitigating, otherwise, seems beneficial. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building on arable or Green Belt land should be avoided. There are more suitable options in the village which use land formally used by industry. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous planning applications have been rejected for being on a flood plain. These sites flooded in 1947, 1968, 2001 and drains were flooded in winters 2006 and 2007, and drainage dykes overflowed. Brownfield sites are available (Government policy) - sites 153 & 154. Sewers regularly flood in Mill Lane. The existing sewage system is often unable to cope with its present demands so adding more properties would be unacceptable. Would increase flood risk downstream and in vicinity. I live nearby and watched the water running from the site into Mill Lane in 2001. • Fire station access would be impeded. • Density proposed is not commensurate to surroundings. • Sawston's amenities are already full to capacity - health centre, childcare, schools etc. • Mill Lane traffic to New Road would increase danger to students. • Road access is onto a very busy and already congested road. • Mill Lane is used by workers unable to park in the car park, which causes traffic flow problems and difficulties for the emergency services - the fire station is situated in Mill Lane. Building in and around the station will cause more problems. • No nearer the village centre than other options and further from primary schools. • Croydon Parish Council - Any land with a flood risk, however limited, should be avoided. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Scope for major development is limited by existing form of village. Consideration of cumulative impact with relocation Cambridge City Football Club to Sawston. Development on sites to the West of the High Street is constrained by flood plain. Primary schools at capacity, some capacity at Village College. Health centre slightly over design capacity. High Street needs regeneration, but doubtful achieved by large expansion. Shoppers largely dependent on cars. Insufficient parking and the High Street frequently congested with HGVs. Transport: 20 minute CIT17 service to Cambridge - busy at peak times and subject to frequent delays. Park and Ride services faster but increase traffic on A1301, Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Stapleford. Exacerbate congestion. Rail station 2 miles, not widely used. • Would need to respect setting of new community orchard. • Possibly, but not exceeding 30. • Duxford Parish Council - Sawston is at risk of over development, and will attract investment away from villages. • Comberton Parish Council - Local residents to determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Councils response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site does not use brownfield land • Does not avoid land at risk of flooding – Flood Zone 2. NPPF Sequential Test applied – other sites in Flood Zone 1 are available. <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting of Sawston by introducing built development into a small enclosed field visible from the</p>

	<p>west. Better sites are available in the district, including elsewhere in Sawston. Other sites are available which have less flood risk. The Sequential test in the NPPF means that the Council should look to these first.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land rear of 41 Mill Lane, Sawston		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 116	Site Option Number:	11 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on townscape and landscape setting Close to local services and facilities Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited flood risk 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 7; Object: 20; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 response indicated specific support for this option. 4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 10 minute walk of High Street. Good travel links. Limited impact on natural environment. Sawston Bypass would act as flood barrier from river. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt site. Loss of agricultural land. Flood Risk, sites in this area have previously flooded, could increase risk to surrounding properties, sequential test should be applied. There are more suitable sites elsewhere in the village. Fire Station access would be impeded. Mill lane to New Road Traffic would increase, danger to students. Mill Lane congested with parking. Impact on existing sewage system. Schools and doctors at capacity. Croydon Parish Council – any flood risk should be avoided. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider cumulative impact of relocation Cambridge City Football Club to Sawston. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would exacerbate congestion. • Duxford Parish Council - Sawston is at risk of over development, and will attract investment away from villages. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine; • Sawston Parish Council – Support for site going forward to next stage of assessment process. • Anglian Water – There is Capacity to serve the site.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site does not use brownfield land. • Does not avoid land at risk of flooding – Flood Zone 2. NPPF Sequential Test applied – other sites in Flood Zone 1 are available. <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting of Sawston by introducing built development into a small enclosed field. Better sites are available in the district, including elsewhere in Sawston. Other sites are available which have less flood risk. The Sequential test in the NPPF means that the Council should look to these first.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land between 66 and 68 Common Lane, Sawston		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 023	Site Option Number:	12 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on townscape and landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited flood risk 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 7; Object: 23; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses referenced this option specifically. 4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site option 12 and site option 11 would provide about 60 dwellings and are within a 10 minute walk of the High Street. "small is beautiful" and they would offer two pleasant unobtrusive developments of a modest nature that would complement the surrounding area without overwhelming it; They are surrounded by over 100 existing properties in Flood Zone 2 which are far enough from the river for it not to offer any flood danger. The Sawston bypass is on a bank that would act as a flood barrier. Any estimated flood risk could be eradicated by building up the land and if required by provision of drainage channels Agree with your assessment pros; Appears beneficial, but flood risk needs mitigating ; Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building on arable or Green Belt land should be avoided There are brownfield sites in the village that could be used; There are more suitable options in the village which use land formally used by industry; Previous planning applications have been rejected for being on a flood plain. These sites flooded in 1947, 1968, 2001 and drains were flooded in winters 2006 and 2007, and drainage dykes overflowed. Brownfield sites 		

are available (Government policy) - sites 153 & 154. Sewers regularly flood in Mill Lane;

- Our house is built up 2ft for flood plain purposes and Environment Agency advised no solid fences and holes needed in garden sheds to allow (flood) water to flow through. Sewerage rises in Common Lane when pumping station cannot cope;
- National Planning Policy Framework means it should only be considered if sites at lower risk of flooding (i.e. in Flood Zone 1) are not reasonably available. There are sufficient other options not at risk of flooding which should be developed first, in line with Government policy
- Fire station access would be impeded;
- Density proposed is not commensurate to surroundings.
- Schools and medical centre over subscribed;
- **Croydon Parish Council** - Any land with a flood risk, however limited, should be avoided;
- The sewers are already at capacity and regularly overflow in Mill Lane near the recreation ground;
- Mill Lane traffic to New Road would increase danger to students;
- It is a difficult turning into the top of Common Lane.
- This site is further from the primary schools than other proposed sites in east Sawston;
- There will already be road congestion between here and Trumpington, in view of the huge estate now being constructed there. Any additional traffic at this end will cause immense problems with the flow of vehicles;
- Traffic generation and parking. Common Lane already serves businesses with Heavy Lorries. Where will the excess cars park? Junction of Common lane with High Street is dangerous. Visibility is poor in Common Lane. Horses from the expanding riding stables are a hazard.
- Loss of privacy to adjoining dwellings particularly 66 Common Lane;
- Loss of green space and biodiversity;
- Vital to consider the total number of new dwellings in the village because of their combined impact;
- Loss of amenity open space of riding school and local farm and farm shop;

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Pumping stations and sewers crossing the site
- Scope for major development is limited by existing form of village. Consideration of cumulative impact with relocation Cambridge City Football Club to Sawston. Development on sites to the West of the High Street is constrained by flood plain. Primary schools at capacity, some capacity at Village College. Health centre slightly over design capacity. High Street needs regeneration, but doubtful achieved by large expansion. Shoppers largely dependent on cars. Insufficient parking and the High Street frequently congested with HGVs. Transport: 20 minute CIT17 service to Cambridge - busy at peak times and subject to frequent delays. Park and Ride services faster but increase traffic on A1301, Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Stapleford. Exacerbate congestion. Rail station 2 miles, not widely used.
- Heavy infilling between existing dwellings. Not against it but I feel it's not

	<p>really a viable development at the loss of some good green land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duxford Parish Council - Sawston is at risk of over development, and will attract investment away from villages. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not make best use of brownfield land. • Does not avoid land at risk of flooding – Flood Zone 2. NPPF Sequential Test applied – other sites in Flood Zone 1 are available. <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting of Sawston by introducing built development into a small enclosed field where it would be partly visible from the A1301. Better sites are available in the district, including elsewhere in Sawston. Other sites are available which have less flood risk. The Sequential test in the NPPF means that the Council should look to these first.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land at Dales Manor Business Park		
SHLAA Reference:	310	Site Option Number:	H3 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impact on landscape or townscape. • Would replace concrete batching and tarmac plants with benefits to local environment. • Previously developed land. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment land. • Potential noise nuisance from existing employment uses. • Not deliverable on its own. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 39; Object: 21; Comment: 22</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuse of brownfield land within the village so more suitable and less damaging than sites in the Green Belt. Replacement of unused warehouse units and does not result in loss of farmland. Benefit from redevelopment – tidy up an ugly part of the village. • Support the development of this site but it may conflict with the possible Cambridge City FC development. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Need more housing. • Support but serious consideration must be given to the mixing of residential and industrial traffic, the increased traffic flows along Babraham Road and from the proposed Cambridge City football stadium, and increased demand on already overstretched facilities in Sawston. • Support but road access is an issue – need to give due regard to traffic on Babraham Road. Will make Babraham Road very busy and without a number of zebra crossing would cut off those living to the north. • Sawston is a good and logical place to expand – good facilities and schools, close to main employment areas, and fairly good connections to village centre. New development will give jobs and possibly retail. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: support as reuse of brownfield site. • Support although fair distance from village amenities and need to consider mix of housing. • Village needs and influx of new residents to ensure continuing prosperity – so brownfield sites should be reused. • Infrastructure is key: support provided that existing infrastructure can cope and there is no adverse effect on the existing residents. • Least worst option but will still create extra traffic and water resource and displacement problems. • New homes will sit well within the area proposed and vastly improve a run-down industrial area. • Ideal for building as most road infrastructure in place (close to main 		

road) and has good access onto Babraham Road allowing traffic to leave without passing through Sawston village.

- Ok but all traffic will come down Babraham Road to leave the village or go through Babraham.
- Will bridge the gap between Sawston and Babraham and the new cycle path may get used more with new houses and investment in the Babraham science parks coming soon.
- Sawston Parish Council: more suitable as brownfield, proposed access through Wakelin Avenue would be unsuitable, need a separate link to Babraham Road, technical constraints such as foul sewer capacity should be investigated, need to consider cumulative effect on traffic generation from possible stadium and housing, need to ensure stadium would not result in undue noise and disturbance to nearby residential areas, should not exceed 100 dwellings, and should consider providing live-work units and industrial starter units.

OBJECTIONS:

- Aspec Precision Engineering: if Grove Road is used as the access to the site, there would be issues with HGV traffic to the industrial uses. The low water pressure would need to be improved.
- Access is the main constraint – Wakelin Avenue would be unable to cope with increase traffic so may need a separate link to Babraham Road.
- Loss of employment land that would be better kept for employment uses to create jobs for new residents. Need a greater range of appropriate employment opportunities in the village. Currently main employment area – less local jobs.
- Sawston cannot sustain any more houses (already overpopulated) – infrastructure could not cope, the site will not generate any more footfall to High Street shops.
- Would create too much traffic, road networks are poor, and would create hazardous traffic conditions (especially traffic onto Babraham Road which has been an issue for a number of years).
- Mixing industrial and residential uses is not a good idea – noise and heavy road traffic. May also effect the existing businesses in terms of crime, footfall and traffic.
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be retained for employment use as a contribution to the local economy.
- Where will the Cambridge City football stadium go? Proposal for new Cambridge City stadium here (not mentioned in this plan).
- Would severely compromise current standard of living, privacy and property values.
- Will create additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford.
- Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village.
- Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure.
- Uttlesford District Council: concerned about proposals for development south of Cambridge, especially in Sawston area due to potential impact

	<p>on the road network in the north of Uttlesford and particular around M11 (junction 9) where there is already congestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't see how you can build new homes when there isn't the money to upgrade existing properties to an approved government standard – draught proofing, cavity wall insulation. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: capacity available to serve proposed growth. • Sawston can perhaps cope with a small development such as this. • Development of all sites in Sawston (520 homes) would swamp all available facilities in the village, exacerbate existing under provision further and the cost of providing new facilities could be prohibitive. • Two site options on Dales Manor Business Park should be considered as one. • Any proposals would need to take account of cumulative impacts of traffic generation from new housing and proposal for Cambridge City football stadium. Also need to ensure noise / disturbance from stadium would not impact on nearby residential areas. • Consider including small convenience store, industrial starter units and / or live-work units on part of the site. • Capacity of foul sewer may be constraint. • Number of houses assigned to Babraham side of the village is excessive. • Need to consider traffic, parking, efficient drainage (especially flooding from additional hard surfaced areas) and provision of facilities in advance of development of site and in consultation with residents. • More care needed not to overcrowd these areas – is Sawston getting too big? • Will impose less on Green Belt but must improve parking at playing field, laybys for houses on Babraham Road, and restrict turning into Sunderland Avenue and along the link road. • Natural England: although support the re-use of underused or vacant sites in principle, development should only take place on sites that have low environmental and biological value. • Some of this site should be housing, but also support use of some of this site for Cambridge City football stadium providing the village with much needed sports facilities. • Until infrastructure guarantees available from responsible organisations, it is impossible to make realistic comments on possible development sites.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Providing homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south. • Focus on more sustainable villages – Rural Centre. • Making best use of brownfield land • Site with parish council and local support • Avoiding land at risk of flooding <p>Part of larger Site Option H5 (I&O2) which is being allocated in the draft</p>

	<p>Local Plan.</p> <p>Reasons for its selection are addressed against that site.</p> <p>Conclusion: Site Option H5, which incorporates site H3, is allocated for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land north of White Field Way		
SHLAA Reference:	311	Site Option Number:	H4 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Limited impact on landscape setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would preserve green foreground to Sawston if no built development adjoining the A1301. • Sawston has a good range of local services and facilities. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt. • Potential noise nuisance from A1301 and mainline railway. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 31; Object: 56; Comment: 13</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good access to Sawston and no impact on the village. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Need more housing. • Although this is on flood plain, access to the main road and village centre is better than other possible sites. • Support as long as the copse is protected and preserved (only one of three woodland walks in Sawston with open access) and also the row of trees across the site. • Sawston has a wide range of facilities and infrastructure to support growth. Close to main employment areas. Access is not a problem (most road infrastructure in place), has good transport links, immediate access to the bypass that would not generate much increase of traffic in the village. • Logical place to expand and good site for housing – noise would not be a problem as existing residents nearer to roads and railway, existing woodland screens site from nearby properties which could be extended, close to main employment areas. • Support although fair distance from village amenities and need to consider mix of housing. • Support provided that existing infrastructure can cope and there is no adverse effect on the existing residents. • Least worst option but will still create extra traffic and water resource and displacement problems. • Spicers (represented by Bidwells): site is available, viable and deliverable. Willing to work with SCDC and Parish Council to provide a development which will benefit the local community. • New development will give jobs and possibly retail. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Green Belt. • Unfair that requirements for providing housing for City's workforce ignores Sawston's Green Belt. • Site assessment is flawed – site is part of the flood plain and will 		

	<p>undoubtedly result in flooding problems if developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of all sites in Sawston (520 homes) would swamp all available facilities in the village, exacerbate existing under provision further and the cost of providing new facilities could be prohibitive. • Access and traffic problems – Whitefield Way is a private road with insufficient capacity, New Road and Mill Lane are not able to take additional traffic, will create extra pressure on Mill Lane / A1301 junction which has poor accident record, High Street will become congested, adjacent to busy and dangerous road junction, increased traffic noise, parking problems, use of road for construction vehicles would be dangerous and unreasonable, and residents would be subject to obnoxious fumes from increased traffic. • On rising land – would intrude into open countryside and create more urban approach to the village. • Greenfield site - loss of productive agricultural land and disruption to wildlife habitats provided by adjoining wood. • Poorly related to village centre – will encourage more cars on the High Street with already inadequate parking and would encourage London commuters due to easy access to Whittlesford station – development proposals should focus on meeting local housing needs and encouraging local businesses. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future: not a sensible site for housing as will fill in the green space between the village and the bypass, is isolated from the rest of the village, and land to south is subject to flooding that will be made worse by development of this site. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: loss of Green Belt. • Water provision to the site appears expensive and speculative and sewage disposal is at capacity and funding uncertain. • Infrastructure unable to cope – health centre is at maximum capacity, new school places will be needed, population is at saturation point, parking facilities are inadequate, no gas service. Need to consider utilities. • Disruption from new build would be detrimental to wellbeing of existing residents. • Access via a new road west of the tree line will ruin the use of this field for farming and will prevent the use of these trees from mitigating development in the Green Belt. • Harlton and Haslingfield Parish Councils: loss of Green Belt. • Important green space bisected by protected woodland – don't ruin our village. • Local area is being overdeveloped and housing being provided is small and overpriced – this will adversely affect the value of homes. • Do not agree with comments that there would be 'limited impact on landscape setting' and that development 'would preserve green foreground to Sawston'. Site is on rising land so prominent. • Any development must be in keeping with Whitefield Way – bungalows. New development will impact standard of living – privacy and light at nearby bungalows. • No jobs so why more houses – no companies employing in the village and Spicers has reduced its business. • 'Buffer zone' between bypass and urban edge – development of this site
--	---

would set a precedent that would lead to 'flood gate' of building along western edge of village with negative impacts for Sawston and the surrounding villages.

- Will create additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford.
- Power lines across the proposed site.
- Sawston is becoming an unattractive place to live – devaluing properties.
- Sawston Parish Council: White Field Way is a private road with insufficient capacity to act as access for additional dwellings, New Road and Mill Lane are not able to take additional traffic, Highways Authority objected to planning application for starter business units on land adjacent to Spicers due to safety at this junction, Green Belt, rising land so development would intrude into the countryside and create urban approach to village, loss of agricultural land, and located on a chalk aquifer.
- Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village.
- Will become a commuter village as employment opportunities are in Cambridge not Sawston.
- Predominantly chalk – if the site is developed, where will the water go? Protected groundwater area.
- Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure.
- 'Would preserve green foreground to Sawston if no built development adjoining the A1301' but if this site were developed there may be subsequent proposals to develop adjoining land.
- Don't see how you can build new homes when there isn't the money to upgrade existing properties to an approved government standard – draught proofing, cavity wall insulation.
- Uttlesford District Council: concerned about proposals for development south of Cambridge, especially in Sawston area due to potential impact on the road network in the north of Uttlesford and particular around M11 (junction 9) where there is already congestion.

COMMENTS:

- Anglian Water: capacity available to serve the proposed growth but sewers crossing the site.
- Cambridgeshire County Council: access should be provided off Mill Lane rather than A1307. The capacity and safety of the Mill Lane / A1307 junction should be looked at as part of any transport assessment of the site.
- English Heritage: concerned that there is no justification for removal of land from the Green Belt. Development of this site would set a precedent for Sawston to expand out to the bypass which would be detrimental to the relationship between the village and bypass.
- Village needs an influx of new residents to ensure continuing prosperity.
- Will impose less on Green Belt but must improve parking at playing field, laybys for houses on Babraham Road, and restrict turning into Sunderland Avenue and along the link road.
- Natural England: site is in the Green Belt

<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on a more sustainable village – Rural Centre. • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Providing homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south. • Does not make best use of brownfield land. • Loss of Green Belt. <p>Site was identified as having development potential. However, the site falls within an area where development would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions, by having a detrimental impact upon the setting of Sawston. The tree belt running north to south through the middle of the site is protected by a Tree Preservation Order. This makes access to the eastern part of the site difficult as White Field Way which is a private road and not suitable. Development on the eastern part of the site, whilst more capable of being integrated into the landscape setting, would not relate well to the existing built-up area, creating a promontory of backland development. Development west of the tree belt would be very prominent and closer to the A1301, which would present noise issues.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Former Marley Tiles site, Dale Manor Business Park		
SHLAA Reference:	312	Site Option Number:	H5 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact on landscape or townscape Includes new employment development with potential to more than replace any jobs lost. Sawston has a good range of local services and facilities. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of employment land. Potential noise nuisance from existing employment uses. Distance from local services and facilities. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 41; Object: 19; Comment: 21</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reuse of brownfield land within the village so more suitable than sites in the Green Belt. Benefit from redevelopment. Support the development of this site but it may conflict with the possible Cambridge City FC development. Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Need more housing. Campaign to Protect Rural England: support as reuse of brownfield site. Support but road access is an issue – need to give due regard to traffic on Babraham Road. Will make Babraham Road very busy and without a number of zebra crossing would cut off those living to the north. Sawston is a logical place to expand as wide range of facilities, infrastructure and schools, and is close to main employment areas. New development will give jobs and possibly retail. Support although fair distance from village amenities and need to consider mix of housing. Village needs and influx of new residents to ensure continuing prosperity – so brownfield sites should be reused. Infrastructure is key: support provided that existing infrastructure can cope and there is no adverse effect on the existing residents. Worthy of further investigation as although not close to village centre, proposal does include potential for employment uses which would replace some of jobs lost. Least worst option but will still create extra traffic and water resource and displacement problems. New homes will sit well within the area proposed and vastly improve a run-down industrial area. Good for housing but also for the Cambridge City football ground which will give the village extra sports facilities. Support provided that only Dales Manor Business Park is chosen for housing development in Sawston – this would increase the population by at least 500 people and this is as much as the infrastructure could 		

support.

- Ideal for building as most road infrastructure in place and has good access onto Babraham Road allowing traffic to leave without causing extra congestion in the village centre.
- Sawston Parish Council: more suitable as brownfield, proposed access through Wakelin Avenue would be unsuitable, need a separate link to Babraham Road, technical constraints such as foul sewer capacity should be investigated, need to consider cumulative effect on traffic generation from possible stadium and housing, need to ensure stadium would not result in undue noise and disturbance to nearby residential areas, should not exceed 100 dwellings, and should consider providing live-work units and industrial starter units.
- Ok but all traffic will come down Babraham Road to leave the village or go through Babraham.
- Will bridge the gap between Sawston and Babraham and the new cycle path may get used more with new houses and investment in the Babraham science parks coming soon.

OBJECTIONS:

- Aspec Precision Engineering: if Grove Road is used as the access to the site, there would be issues with HGV traffic to the industrial uses. The low water pressure would need to be improved.
- Access is the main constraint – Wakelin Avenue would be unable to cope with increase traffic so may need a separate link to Babraham Road.
- Loss of employment land that would be better kept for employment uses to create jobs for new residents. Need a greater range of appropriate employment opportunities in the village. May also affect the existing businesses in terms of crime, footfall and traffic.
- Sawston cannot sustain any more houses – such a large development that would increase the housing stock by 10% is not required, maximum of 100 homes on H3 and H5, infrastructure could not cope, already overpopulated.
- Serious consideration must be given to increased traffic flows along Babraham Road as well as additional traffic generated by proposed football stadium.
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be retained for employment use as a contribution to the local economy.
- Concerns about traffic – would create too much traffic on an already busy road (Babraham Road), road networks are poor, development would create hazardous traffic conditions, Wakelin Avenue is unsuitable for access.
- Where will the Cambridge City football stadium go?
- Implications of contaminated land for new residents.
- Will impact on amenity of neighbouring residential areas – overlooking so existing privacy would be compromised.
- Will create additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford.
- Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure.
- Don't see how you can build new homes when there isn't the money to

	<p>upgrade existing properties to an approved government standard – draught proofing, cavity wall insulation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing homes for commuters working elsewhere. • Uttlesford District Council: concerned about proposals for development south of Cambridge, especially in Sawston area due to potential impact on the road network in the north of Uttlesford and particular around M11 (junction 9) where there is already congestion. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: Sewers crossing the site. Infrastructure and / or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Development of all sites in Sawston (520 homes) would swamp all available facilities in the village, exacerbate existing under provision further and the cost of providing new facilities could be prohibitive. • Two site options on Dales Manor Business Park should be considered as one. • Capacity of foul sewer may be constraint. • Any proposals would need to take account of cumulative impacts of traffic generation from new housing and proposal for Cambridge City football stadium. Also need to ensure noise / disturbance from stadium would not impact on nearby residential areas. • Consider including small convenience store, industrial starter units and / or live-work units on part of the site. • Number of houses assigned to Babraham side of the village is excessive. • Need to consider traffic, parking, efficient drainage (especially flooding from additional hard surfaced areas) and provision of facilities in advance of development of site and in consultation with residents. • More care needed not to overcrowd these areas. • Will impose less on Green Belt but must improve parking at playing field, laybys for houses on Babraham Road, and restrict turning into Sunderland Avenue and along the link road. • Natural England: although support the re-use of underused or vacant sites in principle, development should only take place on sites that have low environmental and biological value. • Until infrastructure guarantees available from responsible organisations, it is impossible to make realistic comments on possible development sites. • Endurance Estates & Salmon Harvester (represented by Savills): sustainable opportunity delivering housing and jobs on previously developed land. Comments on cons – loss of employment: existing low density employment uses will be replaced with higher density B1 uses that will provide a greater number of jobs; distance from services and facilities – small element of retail proposed within the development.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on a more sustainable village – Rural Centre. • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Providing homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south. • Making best use of brownfield land.

- Site with parish council and local support.
- Avoiding land at risk of flooding.

Expected completions during the plan period are 200 dwellings. This is a lower figure than the 260 subject to consultation, the site has a net developable area of 6.6 ha, at 30 dph this would deliver 200 dwellings allowing for some new employment development. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 1 and 2, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The site assessment and SA have been updated to reflect a density of 30dph. The sustainability appraisal of the site remains a sound assessment of the site.

The site will enable redevelopment of existing employment sites, providing light industrial and office uses, with a higher density of employment than on the site historically. The site is capable of integrating development into the village with minimal impacts through careful design and provides the opportunity to create a significant landscape buffer along the eastern boundary of the site where it adjoins farmland to provide a soft green village edge. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution to any highway works required to mitigate the impact of development on the eastern flank of Sawston and additional local school capacity.

Conclusion:

Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.

Settlement:	Sawston		
Site Address:	Land north of Babraham Road		
SHLAA Reference:	313 (2012 SHLAA Site 076)	Site Option Number:	H6 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting. Potential to create new soft green edge to the village. Sawston has a good range of local services and facilities. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt. Potential noise nuisance from existing employment uses. Distance from local services and facilities. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 28; Object: 39; Comment: 17</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support this option else you won't meet your 5 year targets. Logical place to expand. Sawston - good facilities and schools. Good access to village. Good option because no loss of employment land. Low impact and close to main employment areas (Science Parks etc). Will support more services and maybe jobs which is good. Least worse of the options in Sawston but implications for traffic and school capacities. Support but concerns at access to site – need zebra crossings. Would tidy up ugly part of Sawston and bridge the gap between Sawston and Babraham. Could get increased use of new cycle path to Babraham. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village needs an influx of new residents to help ensure its continuing prosperity but not this option. Uttlesford District Council concerned at development proposals south of Cambridge and especially all housing options in Sawston – impact on wider road network- impact on already congested M11. Loss of Green Belt land. Prefer brownfield land. Does not meet very special circumstances NPPF says is needed to take land out of green belt. Sawston, Haslingfield and Harlton Parish Councils object to loss of Green Belt. RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation object to release of green belt land. Village will merge with Cambridge. Sets a precedent for more release of green belt. Increased traffic congestion and make more difficult to commute into Cambridge – already gridlocked at peak times. More development will ruin unique character of village. Loss of agricultural land. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on protected groundwater area. • Sawston Parish Council – Development would result in loss of agricultural land and chalk aquifer. • Land in Babraham parish – need change of boundary. Keeps separation between the villages. • Why build new when no money to upgrade old properties? • Detrimental impact on local amenity provision - schools and doctors near capacity. • Impact on safety of residents due to increased vehicular traffic. Babraham Rd already busy. Local road infrastructure cannot cope. Car parking in village a problem. • Need to take into account impact of Cambridge City Club football stadium – increased traffic – need transport Masterplan. • Object to Sawston sites due to additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford. • Detrimental impact on village character and views of village from south. • Overdevelopment. • Water pressure - Aspec Precision Engineering Ltd mention problems of low water pressure. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England notes that situated at distance from any local service centre and facilities which will increase dependence on use of the private car. • Anglian Water - capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Concern at number of houses allocated to site and all others in Sawston – will swamp village. • Why Sawston and Melbourn and not other villages like Foxton, Orwell or Harston? • Concern that local village services will not meet demand – already over stretched. • This site could be part used and in conjunction with sites 158 and 278 to east of Sawston, could provide a coherent edge to village.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on more sustainable villages – Rural Centre. • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Providing homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south. • Avoiding land at risk of flooding. <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 80 dwellings. This is a lower figure than the 110 dwellings subject to consultation. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The sustainability appraisal of the site remains a sound assessment of the site.</p> <p>Although this site lies within the Green Belt, development here has the potential to have a positive impact upon the landscape setting of Sawston, provided the design makes a generous provision of land to ensure a soft green edge to the east. When considered together with the site South of Babraham Road, this site has the potential to round-off the eastern edge of</p>

	<p>the village, softening the current abrupt urban edge. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution to any highway works required to mitigate the impact of development on the eastern flank of Sawston and additional local school capacity.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Histon & Impington

Settlement:	Histon		
Site Address:	Land at Buxhall Farm, Glebe Way, Histon		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 133	Site Option Number:	13 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Distance from local services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 4; Object: 215; Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses referenced this option specifically. 1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Histon and Impington second best served settlement in the district. Good public transport links, close to Cambridge. Opportunity to provide non-residential uses on-site. Impact on purposes of the Green Belt less than many other sites. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt. Loss of valuable agricultural land. Loss of green open space for residents for walking, and wildlife. Detrimental impact on rural character, village will become a town. Increased risk of flooding. Water shortage during summer months. Land is not suitable for building on, as there are beds of shale below the surface soil. Increased pollution, noise, light. Traffic congestion, B1049 over capacity at peak periods. Should be no access onto Mill Lane. Poor public transport, made worse since guided bus opened. Distant from village centre, would cause extra congestion on High Street. Land would be better used for a community centre, additional school, 		

	<p>playgrounds, and other amenities village desperately needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on local schools, health, and community facilities, already at capacity. • Orchard Park, Northstowe already planned, so why build in the village? Waterbeach Barracks also under investigation for development. • Contrary to Minerals and Waste Plan. • Histon and Impington Parish Council – Strongly objects to proposal. Suggested capacity of 250, whereas, with 12.44 hectares, applicants proposed 400 would appear to be closer to what might be expected. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. • Croydon Parish Council – Leave green belt alone. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditions should be in place to see hedgerows planted around the adjacent remaining open fields and other farmland bird friendly measures as a minimum. • Anglian Water – There is Capacity to serve the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on a more sustainable village – Rural Centre. • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Does not make best use of brownfield land. • Loss of Green Belt. <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. This assessment acknowledged that development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. There is a clear edge to the built up part of the village in this location, beyond which the village becomes more sporadic with linear development in long plots. Development in this location would have a detrimental impact on the rural character. The assessment acknowledged that with careful design and landscaping it should be possible to provide mitigation, but negative impacts would remain. There are other sites available in the district which would avoid these impacts.</p> <p>In addition to capacity issues for local primary school education, the Education Authority advise that this site would not be a suitable location for a new school as the site is over 2 miles (the statutory walking distance for primary aged pupils) from some parts of the village.</p> <p>There are more sustainable options available for allocation.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Impington		
Site Address:	Land rear of 49-71 Impington Lane, Impington		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 112 (part)	Site Option Number:	14 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 4; Object: 25; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation links are good from this area with the guided busway and regular buses, and closeness to employment centres. • Small site, minimal loss of green belt, may benefit existing villagers. • Possible extra strain on council services (eg bin collections). An already bad bus service made worse. When the A14 is blocked all traffic comes through the village. • Appointments at Doctors surgery and dental practice already hard to come by. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will cause traffic danger to children attending the village college. • Loss of valuable fertile land; the loss of wildlife habitat. The area is wildlife rich - identified to date are bats, lizards, deer, birds of prey, toads, foxes and goldfinches. • The Unwins site was historically important to Histon/Impington so the land should be used as a park/wildlife garden to be enjoyed by all. • Histon/Impington should remain as villages and not become a new town. • Additional traffic volumes and congestion resulting from development as far out as Cottenham and Willingham - especially on the B1049, and particularly at the junction of the B1049 with the A14. • Development will result in an unacceptable erosion of Green Belt. • Significant increased risk of flooding. 		

- Loss of amenity, privacy and sunlight to adjacent properties.
- The loss of employment land to housing has resulted in increased vehicle movements in and out of the Villages.
- Inadequate local facilities to cope with increase in housing.
- Northstowe should be developed further.
- The rural character of an area will be altered with another cul-de-sac. Buses for existing residents are already much reduced - how can we provide for more people? The walk to the busway stop is too far for general use by most people in the village. Infants school oversubscribed for Sept 2012.
- Make into a nature reserve.
- Village that is losing its character and is in danger of becoming a suburb or Cambridge.
- Impington Lane is regularly backed up well beyond the entrance to Merrington Place and it can take 10-15 minutes to get through the lights at the main crossroads.
- The schools and doctors surgery are at capacity and whilst you could build a second school, that begins to divide a community and turn a village into a town.
- Impacts on Conservation Area and village character.
- **Croydon Parish Council** – No leave the Green Belt alone.
- **Histon & Impington Parish Council** - Council strongly objects to inclusion of site for possible development:- Green Belt - no exceptional reason to remove site. Historic and important site - location of Unwins work on hybridisation (world first) - should be preserved. Not possible to achieve visibility splays. Increase problems with pedestrian safety - major access route for students at Impington Village College. Loss of fauna/flora/biodiversity - award winning area to the rear of the Merrington Place development. Inadequate village infrastructure (schools, GPs) etc. Archaeology - Merrington Place showed significant finds. Gain of 25 homes does not outweigh these considerations.
- Site has previously been considered by an Inspector for development who concluded that there were no exceptional circumstances to amend the Green Belt boundary. Question suitability of highway access. A larger proposal in this location would be out of character given existing development along this part of Impington Lane.

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth.
- **Comberton Parish Council** – Local residents to determine.
- Despite loss of Green belt this site looks like a sensible infill to the village.
- Generally object to development here. In some circumstances (eg. for key workers, sheltered accommodation, community workers), housing may benefit the village.
- Support Site Options 14 & 15 for housing but as part of a bigger site. The sites are enclosed visually. The revised site including Site Options 14 & 15 increase the site area to 3.193ha and the dwelling capacity to 96 dwellings at 30dph or 112 dwellings at 35dph. The Flood Risk, Drainage and Highways reports attached demonstrate that these important issues can be properly dealt with and the Site Options are deliverable and would

	not increase flood risk or generate inappropriate vehicular traffic.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Focuses on a more sustainable village – Rural Centre. <p>Adjoins Site Option 15, presenting the opportunity for a comprehensive development.</p> <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 25 dwellings (for the combined sites 14 and 15. This is a lower figure than the 35 dwellings that the Issues & Options 1 consultation describes as the total capacity of the two sites. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The sustainability appraisal of the site remains a sound assessment of the site.</p> <p>Although currently in the Green Belt, the site is capable of integrating development into the village with minimal impacts to the historic and natural environment, landscape and townscape through careful design. It can be designed to mitigate impact on the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings, and to create a significant landscape buffer along the boundary of the site to provide a soft green village edge. The site avoids areas of flood zones 2 and 3 to the north. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution to any necessary additional capacity in local schools.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Impington		
Site Address:	Land north of Impington Lane, Impington		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 114 (part)	Site Option Number:	15 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 1; Object: 17; Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 response objected to this site. • 1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Risk, Drainage and Highways issues can be properly dealt with. • Environment Agency - - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt. • Histon and Impington should remain a village rather than a town. • Additional traffic congestion. • Site access is inadequate, Impington Lane is busy with School Children • Increased flood risk. • Increased pollution. • Infrastructure, services and facilities at capacity. • Loss of biodiversity. • Loss of employment land has resulted in increased vehicle movements in and out of the village. • Not in character with the area, detrimental impact on rural character; • Part of piecemeal development proposals north of Impington Lane, which should be addressed as a whole. • Northstowe already planned, so why build in the village? • Histon and Impington Parish Council – Strongly objects to proposal. Historic and important site, should be preserved. Merrington Place showed significant archaeological finds. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. • Croydon Parish Council – Leave green belt alone. 		

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – There is Capacity to serve the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge. • Focuses on a more sustainable village – Rural Centre. <p>Adjoins Site Option 14, presenting the opportunity for a comprehensive development.</p> <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 25 dwellings (for the combined sites 14 and 15. This is a lower figure than the 35 dwellings that the Issues & Options 1 consultation describes as the total capacity of the two sites. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The sustainability appraisal of the site remains a sound assessment of the site.</p> <p>Although currently in the Green Belt, the site is capable of integrating development into the village with minimal impacts to the historic and natural environment, landscape and townscape through careful design. It can be designed to mitigate impact on the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings, and to create a significant landscape buffer along the boundary of the site to provide a soft green village edge. The site avoids areas of flood zones 2 and 3 to the north. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution to any necessary additional capacity in local schools.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Impington		
Site Address:	Land at SCA Packaging Ltd, Villa Road, Impington		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 046	Site Option Number:	16 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope to improve local environment • Reuses previously developed land <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment land (but disused) • Flood risk to small part of site • Access arrangements 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 11; Object: 3; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation links are good from this area with the guided busway and regular buses, and closeness to employment centres. • Agree with your assessment pros. • Support option 16 for development, which lies immediately to the north of our client's site. This site is brownfield in nature and in a good location with regards to existing services and facilities. With regards to the access arrangements which have been identified as being an issue in relation to the development of this site these matters can be addressed if our client's site, immediately south were developed in tandem. This would result in bringing forward two sites, one brownfield, to provide for housing development to meet the needs of the District. • Could enhance the village and surrounding environment if well planned. • Reuses previously developed land. • Within cycling distance of existing employment sites. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Histon/Impington should remain as villages and not become a new town. Additional traffic volumes and congestion resulting from development as 		

	<p>far out as Cottenham and Willingham - especially on the B1049, and particularly at the junction of the B1049 with the A14. Development will result in an unacceptable erosion of Green Belt. Loss of valuable agricultural land. Significant increased risk of flooding. The loss of employment land to housing has resulted in increased vehicle movements in and out of the Villages. Inadequate local facilities to cope with increase in housing. Northstowe should be developed further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awkward access. Should be retained as an employment site. • Object to development at site options 13, 14, 15 and 16 for the following reasons: loss of Green Belt land; massive increase in traffic causing gridlock and a danger to school children; more rat-running through an already over-crowded village; possible extra strain on council services (eg bin collections); an already bad bus service made worse; when the A14 is blocked all traffic comes through the village; schools and doctors surgeries are not big enough now; if our neighbourly village increases in size it may become a soulless town. With Northstowe being built the extra strain on resources is unnecessary. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least it's a brown site but flooding risk. • Site should remain as employment land however large vehicles using Villa Road could become a problem. If it becomes residential then the number of vehicles will increase but be smaller and quieter. The hedgerows and scrub on and close to the site need to be managed sensitively. • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Histon & Impington Parish Council - This site is already under development with 72 dwellings (2 more than Issues and Options). • Croydon Parish Council - General support for reuse of land, but avoid building on the area of flood risk. • Site Option 16 has the benefit of planning permission and is no longer a Site Option but a commitment.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response: Planning permission (S/0809/12) was granted in September 2012 for 72 dwellings with vehicular access, public open space, car parking, associated landscaping, and infrastructure.</p> <p>In determining the application, the Council concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the development framework of a Rural Centre. • The loss of employment land and use of the site for residential purposes is considered acceptable given a marketing campaign in accordance with Policy ET/6 and an apparent lack of commercial interest in the premises. Planning permission to demolish the buildings had already been approved (S/2530/11) and the buildings have been demolished. • The layout, scale, form, design, details, and materials of the development are considered to preserve the character and appearance of the area. • The traffic generation from the proposal is not considered to result in a significant increase in the level of traffic from the existing lawful use. • Although the site lies partly within flood zones 1, 2 and 3, the public open

	<p>space would be situated within flood zones 2 and 3 (medium and high risk) and the dwellings would be situated within flood zone 1 (low risk).</p> <p>Conclusion: Existing Commitment. Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Histon		
Site Address:	Former Bishops Hardware Store, Station Road		
SHLAA Reference:	308	Site Option Number:	H2 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment could improve local townscape and environment. • Adjacent to guided bus. • Good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance from local services and facilities. • Potential for noise nuisance from guided busway. • Potential loss of retail floorspace. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 30; Object: 5; Comment: 14</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good use of brownfield site within the village, ideal commute to City, improves townscape of the area, and near to local services and facilities, science park, guided bus. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. • Support as the land needs to be developed and makes sense to use it rather than Green Belt, but concerned about school places as any new development will put pressure on already oversubscribed schools in Histon. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be considered as part of the larger station development proposed as PC1 but if this is not taken forward, then this site should proceed on its own but with the lower end of the housing range proposed. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: support use of this brownfield site. • Small site that could be absorbed by the village and not have a great impact on present village life – 10 dwellings would not be too intrusive. • Histon & Impington Parish Council: supports redevelopment of this site within the regeneration proposals (PC1). • Mitre Property Development (represented by Januarys): support the site being considered as 'more sustainable site with development potential' as site is currently a wasted opportunity in need of remediation and improvement. Do not believe there are any 'cons' with promoting this site for housing development. • Oakington & Westwick Parish Council: support as it is a very good use of this land. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object as development of this site for residential will limit the scope of the parish council plan and put further pressure on community resources such as schools. • More suitable for business regeneration to compliment possible redevelopment of the station site – more local employment is needed around this commercial and transport hub. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Feel Histon is already quite packed. • Support mixed use development (as proposed by Parish Council) but not just housing. Development should include small businesses, start-up businesses, retail units and possibly a hotel. • Natural England: although support the reuse of underused or vacant sites in principle, development should only take place on sites that have low environmental and biological value. • Should have a maximum of 6 houses.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on more sustainable villages – Rural Centre. • Making best use of brownfield land. • Site with parish council and local support. • No loss of Green Belt. • Avoiding land at risk of flooding. <p>Site with development potential. Site within the built-up area of Histon, adjacent to Guided Busway stop, within an area proposed by Histon and Impington Parish Council for redevelopment for mixed uses to rejuvenate the area. Redevelopment of this site could have a positive impact on the townscape setting of Histon by replacing the retail buildings in disrepair and areas of car parking with a sensitively designed scheme. Redevelopment of this site could also include ground floor retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, or community uses. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation. Site available immediately and capable of delivering houses in the short-term.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Include site in the area addressed by the 'Station' area policy, proposed by Histon and Impington Parish Council.</p>

Cambourne

Settlement:	Cambourne		
Site Address:	Land west of Lower Cambourne and the Cambourne Business Park, bounded to the north by the A428 and to the west by the A1198 (Swansley Wood)		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 239	Site Option Number:	17 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to services and facilities in Cambourne including new secondary school <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to improve internal linkages within Cambourne • Landscape impact could be mitigated by a reduced site area 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 22; Object: 112; Comment: 12</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 responses supported this site, 3 objected. • 16 responses supported development at Cambourne, 11 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural extension to existing development; • Large enough to make a difference, deliverable in the near term; • Excellent access to new secondary school and other existing infrastructure; • Would help make settlement more sustainable by creating greater demand for rapid public transport to Cambridge; • Could add to and enhance infrastructure, including education and health; • Site well defined between roads; • Cambourne is not yet complete, there is space in the settlement centre for additional community facilities and commercial buildings; • Suitable site access could be achieved, including from the A1198; • Cambridge City Council - The City Council supports the options being explored by South Cambridgeshire District Council at this stage, including Waterbeach, Bourn Airfield and an extension to Cambourne; • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; • Milton Parish Council – Conditionally support, only if A428 is dualled to St.Neots; • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first; 		

OBJECTIONS:

- Loss of agricultural land;
- Impact on the Countryside and landscape, will bring site nearer to surrounding villages;
- Would create ribbon of development along A428 if developed with Bourn Airfield;
- Too few open areas planned for any development east or west;
- Add to surface water flows to Caxton and Bourn Brook;
- Lack of local facilities, shops etc;
- Too far from Cambridge;
- There are few local jobs;
- Any new site should provide affordable business opportunities;
- Will increase commuting by car, adding to congestion, particularly on A428 , A1198 and Madingley Road;
- No cycle lanes between Cambourne and Hardwick;
- Need to address public transport, too expensive and long journey times;
- Parking in Cambourne already a problem. Additional traffic and noise;
- Schools & health services already under pressure.
- Could require two additional primary schools rather than one;
- Difficult to integrate with existing village, this was not part of the masterplan;
- Will harm sense of community;
- Loss of village feel, will become a town;
- Need to let existing planned Cambourne become established;
- Construction would cause disruption to residents;
- Site considered before and rejected;
- Sewage system could not cope with additional development;
- Should be more flexibility to build in Group and infill villages;
- Building new self sustaining villages preferable;
- Other less developed areas should now contribute more;
- Arrington Parish Council – Object. A1198 already very busy, would not be able to take further development;
- Bourn Parish Council – Would overstretch existing services, and increase commuter traffic;
- Caldecote Parish Council – Residents were strongly opposed to Bourn and Cambourne options.
- Caxton Parish Council – Insufficient services, road, water and drainage infrastructure inadequate. Amenities and employment not delivered;
- Cambourne Parish Council - Concern was raised about the viability of providing the infrastructure required on site without reliance on the existing Village. A428 would need upgrading to Caxton Roundabout;
- Croydon Parish Council – Gross over development of the original Cambourne site.

COMMENTS:

- Better transport links at city edge;
- Need to address traffic speeds and safety;
- Should not develop this site and Bourn Airfield together due to impact on A428;
- A swimming pool should be included;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better parking, with more spaces per house; • Provide studios and workshops; • Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required; • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine; • Papworth Everard Parish Council – Natural barrier of the A428 should be observed.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on more sustainable villages – Rural Centre • Potential to deliver significant public transport improvements • No loss of Green Belt. • Avoids land at risk of flooding. <p>The local plan proposes a smaller site that was subject to consultation in the issues and option report. This will help mitigate wider landscape impacts, and avoid creating a ribbon of development along the A428, and to provide effective landscaped separation from Caxton. The boundary will ensure that the fourth linked village sits comfortably in its setting and retains a green foreground and long views across the open area which will remain to the west of Cambourne between the A1198 and A428. The importance of keeping land open in this locality was previously identified by the inspector who dismissed an appeal for one of the new town options considered in the run up to the approval of the original Cambourne outline planning permission because of its prominence in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Development of an additional village at Cambourne during the plan period would provide for growth in a sustainable location high in the sustainable development sequence, close to Cambridge, with no loss of Green Belt, and on land not at risk of flooding. Drainage issues are capable of mitigation.</p> <p>The development would provide additional services and facilities including for primary and early years education and via additional development in Cambourne town centre. The site is capable of being effectively integrated with Cambourne particularly by making use of the access road to the Business Park and development will make the location of Cambourne Village College more central to the village. Land currently part of the business park is proposed for residential development, but an equivalent area of employment land will be delivered on the northern part of the Cambourne West site. This will be accessible from Sheepfold Lane. This will maintain employment opportunities in the village.</p> <p>Transport impacts are capable of mitigation in conjunction with development at Bourn Airfield. These would include bus segregation measures to Cambridge, addressing issues on Madingley Hill, and segregated cycle links to Cambridge. Wider transport issues are also being considered through the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Subsequent to the Portfolioholder Meeting of 11th June, the capacity of the site was reduced from 1500 to 1200 dwellings, the site boundary was not changed. Topography and the development pattern of Cambourne suggest that more of the Major Development area will need to remain open or be</p>

	<p>used for water management features and therefore the capacity has been reduced from a total of 1,500 dwellings, including the land in the business park, to 1,200 dwellings.</p> <p>The policy was also refined to clarify the nature of transport access through the business park, and that residential development can only come forward once replacement employment land is secured in Cambourne west. The area of employment land was corrected to 8.1 hectares, to reflect the area within the business park.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Cambourne		
Site Address:	Land at Cambourne Business Park		
SHLAA Reference:	303	Site Option Number:	H1 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site within village already allocated for development. • No adverse landscape or townscape impacts. • Land has been allocated for many years without being developed for employment. • Close to services and facilities, including new secondary school. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment land. • Difficult to integrate with residential neighbourhoods of Cambourne. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 19; Object: 20; Comment: 18</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already allocated for development, is within a village that is growing, is near services and facilities, has access to roads (including A428), includes modern infrastructure, and is not on green belt land. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. • The land is unused, so use it! • Caldecote Parish Council: natural expansion to existing development and there are sufficient facilities to accommodate new residents. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: no objection as the site has been allocated for many years without being developed for employment uses. • Development Securities (represented by Carter Jonas): Cambourne provides high level of services and facilities and the site is a short walk from a frequent bus service, no significant townscape, biodiversity or heritage constraints, vacant so available now, and infrastructure in place for business park. • Cambourne is a new settlement so sensible site for development, provided that local services are expanded to meet the extra demand. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council: should be preserved for local employment (office or light industrial use) given lack of facilities in Cambourne. • Cambourne Parish Council: site is needed for employment opportunities, is detached from the rest of Cambourne and so would be difficult to integrate it with existing residential areas, there is not sufficient surplus infrastructure, existing transport problems, and the access road would be unsuitable. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be retained for business use as delivering sustainability means providing jobs in Cambourne for residents to walk or cycle to. After a slow start, business take up is accelerating, so to use this for housing is short-sighted. • Cambourne need not be extended any more than it is – there are other villages that should be looked at that may be suitable for development 		

	<p>and which have not been entirely exhausted of their development potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land was designated for employment and building housing on this land would simply confirm that the original plan is not sustainable and the original dream has failed. Make it attractive for businesses to come and they will come – we must reverse the commute into Cambridge. • Harcourt Developments & Martin Grant Homes (represented by Savills): should be retained for employment use as replacing employment with housing will not assist in increasing the sustainability of Cambourne, instead it will merely increase out commuting. Need a comprehensive long term vision for Cambourne that achieves sustainability. • Should be retained for employment uses as Cambourne needs more local employment not housing – Cambourne is already large enough, original 3000 houses has already been exceeded, infrastructure has not kept up with continual expansion so cannot support any further housing, site would not integrate well, access road is not considered suitable as was considered unsuitable for access to secondary school, need more employment to reduce commuting into Cambridge, ratio of jobs to residents would be worsened if site used for additional housing, and character of the business park would be adversely affected by introduction of housing. • No further development should take place at Cambourne until the A428 is duelled. More housing will cause unnecessary congestion. • RLW Estates & Defence Infrastructure Organisation (represented by Boyer Planning): object on the basis of loss of employment potential and consequent sustainability concerns. • Cambourne appears to be a soft target for planners as it is still a work in progress – should not result in it becoming a victim of further expansion simply because more established villages are able to repel development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: sewage treatment works may require capacity enhancement. Infrastructure and / or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Existing building in progress so more care needed to ensure that areas are not overcrowded. • Surely increased economic and population growth will mean that this land will finally be used for employment purposes. • Whaddon Parish Council: further development at Cambourne will increase traffic on the A1198 and create further road noise for the residents of Whaddon.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>The site is proposed to be redeveloped as part of a new West Cambourne. The site is proposed to be redeveloped for residential, with employment uses relocated to an alternative location on the west Cambourne site. This will mean the level of employment provision is maintained.</p> <p>This will enable the more effective integration of Cambourne West with the rest of Cambourne. It will support use of the business park access road for access, making the village college more central to the village.</p>

	Conclusion: Include in new West Cambourne site.
--	---

Great Shelford & Stapleford

Settlement:	Great Shelford		
Site Address:	Land off Cambridge Road, Great Shelford		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 005	Site Option Number:	18 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape and Green Belt <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible noise and lighting nuisance from Rugby Club Some distance from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 7; Object: 10; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses referenced this option specifically. 6 responses supported development in Great Shelford and Stapleford. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation links are good from this area with regular buses, and closeness to employment centres. Good access to local facilities, as well as being well located in terms of access to sustainable modes of transport. The development at Clay Farm will further enhance the facilities in the local area, providing local shops, facilities and amenity space. Effectively this is infill. Can act as justification for proper segregated cycleway between Shelford and Trumpington. It has been proven at appeal that the Shelford Rugby Club floodlighting will not impact on the amenity of any new residents, and any proposed development will not impact on the viability of the rugby club. In terms of the impact on landscape and the Green Belt, agree with the Local Plan Issues and Options Report which states that the site will have limited impact on landscape and Green Belt. The site is available, deliverable and sustainable. Support the summary assessment for Stapleford and Shelford. It includes some sustainable development that will preserve the rural characteristics of the villages and the existing borders as well as ensuring the green belt remains largely intact. There is no need make further inroads into the green belt in Shelford and Stapleford. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis 		

	<p>that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development.</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is Green Belt. • Adjacent to the Great Kneighton development. • It will destroy the existing character of the area. • The site has been previously rejected on appeal. • Access is not ideal; the site is not within walking distance of local services. This site is about a mile from the nearest shops. • It would be another step in becoming part of Cambridge rather than Great Shelford. • To many houses already in this area, loss of amenity, water run off considerations, traffic increase and increase in noise and light pollution • Increase in traffic and accompanying impact on safety for pedestrians, especially for children walking to school. • If developed it would surely represent the loss of playing field land. • Good site but density too great for a dormitory suburb of Cambridge. • Should preserve the rural character of the villages, preserve farmland for food production, preserve the Green Belt, and maintain the quality of life in the villages. • Great Shelford Parish Council - The Parish Council has laid its objections to development on this site in response to S/0079/12/FL. The site is too remote from services in the village. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Potential housing developments at Great Shelford/Stapleford would increase traffic on Hinton Way. This would create a safety hazard at the junction with Coppice Avenue. A 2007 study of highways issues at this junction identified the following problems: poor visibility; it does not meet County Council policy relating to its geometry; Coppice Avenue does not have turning space for any vehicle. • Croydon Parish Council – Any impact or loss of the Green Belt must be avoided. • Sport England - Concern that residential development could result in complaints regarding the use of the adjoining rugby club site re noise, floodlighting, traffic etc. and would prejudice the potential for future expansion of the club.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site with limited development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. It would change the linear character of this area of village, and result in further encroachment of development into the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village. There are other sites available in the district which would avoid these impacts.</p> <p>There are potential noise issues from the adjacent Shelford Rugby Club,</p>

	<p>which includes a social club as well as sports pitches. Also issues with artificial lighting. The Highways Authority has concerns that it is not possible to achieve safe access to the site and the access link to the public highway is unsuitable to serve the number of units that are being proposed.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Great Shelford		
Site Address:	29 - 35 and 32 London Road, Great Shelford		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 187	Site Option Number:	19 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential. Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Scope to improve local environment • Reuses previously developed land <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of local employment unless firm can relocate 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 13; Object: 6; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 responses supported this option specifically. • 6 responses supported development in Great Shelford and Stapleford. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing developed site. • Infill site, close to services. • Might improve aesthetics of the village. • Existing business may have unsuitable traffic movements by large vehicles onto busy road. • Need a recreation facility in the area. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. • Stapleford Parish Council – Support. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has already been sufficient development in the village. • Increased traffic, and impact on pedestrian safety. • Impact on rural character of the village. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing has to be balanced against loss of employment land. • Access issues -junction with Coppice Avenue has poor visibility and does not meet county standards. • Anglian Water – There is Capacity to serve the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. 		

<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response: The Council's planning committee in December 2012 resolved to grant two outline planning permissions (S/1727/12 & S/1728/12) which together would provide up to 22 dwellings with associated parking and landscaping.</p> <p>In determining the application, the Council concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the development framework of a Rural Centre. • Residential development on this site is considered to be acceptable in principle, but only if the proposed new site for the relocation of the existing commercial use to Duxford (S/1726/12) is permitted. Existing jobs and local employment opportunities would therefore be protected ensuring the aims of Policy ET/6 would not be compromised. <p>Conclusion: Existing Commitment. Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Settlement:	Stapleford		
Site Address:	Granta Terrace, Stapleford		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 186	Site Option Number:	20 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Scope to improve local environment • Reuses previously developed land <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of local employment unless firm can relocate as it hopes 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 18; Object: 6; Comment:5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 responses supported this option specifically. • 6 responses supported development in Great Shelford and Stapleford. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation links are good from this area with regular buses, and closeness to employment centres. • Sites 19 and 20 have development potential as at present already developed for manufacturing/haulage businesses that have many unsuitable traffic movements by large vehicles onto a busy road. • Will remove HGVs from the village. • Obvious infill site close to services. • Existing industry anomalous in a residential area and should be relocated to allow more housing. • Small development that may actually enhance conditions for nearby residents. • Should be accompanied by additional recreational space which in Stapleford is only around 50% of the space recommended for a village approaching 1800 residents. • The question of maintaining employment sites is tricky in this particular case as Welch's intention is to move to a site in Duxford so there would be no loss of jobs to the District, but there would be within Stapleford itself. • Support as no loss of Green Belt. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welch's site should be retained for local employment. • Object to further development in Stapleford, due to resulting increase in traffic and impact on safety for pedestrians, especially for children walking to school. Further development would also change the rural character of the village. • Objects to inclusion of all proposed development sites in Great Shelford & Stapleford. • We need to ensure that we retain a variety of employment sites in Shelford and Stapleford. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • This site could be developed for housing but this has to be balanced against the loss of employment land. • Potential housing developments at Great Shelford/Stapleford would increase traffic on Hinton Way. This would create a safety hazard at the junction with Coppice Avenue. A 2007 study of highways issues at this junction identified the following problems: poor visibility; it does not meet County Council policy relating to its geometry; Coppice Avenue does not have turning space for any vehicle. • Croydon Parish Council - In the centre of housing already, so dependent on the company's ability to relocate, a possibility.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response: The Council's planning committee in December 2012 resolved to grant outline planning permission (S/1725/12) for 44 dwellings with associated open space, parking and landscaping.</p> <p>In determining the application, the Council concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the development framework of a Rural Centre. • Residential development on this site is considered to be acceptable in principle, but only if the proposed new site for the relocation of the existing commercial use to Duxford (S/1726/12) is permitted. Existing jobs and local employment opportunities would therefore be protected ensuring the aims of Policy ET/6 would not be compromised. • Although the southern part of the site, running parallel with the River Granta, lies within an area of high flood risk, the illustrative layout indicated that this area would be designated as public open space. <p>Conclusion: Existing Commitment. Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Cottenham

Settlement:	Cottenham		
Site Address:	Land at the junction of Long Drove and Beach Road, Cottenham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 234	Site Option Number:	21 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Good accessibility to employment locations <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt Encroachment into countryside On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 4; Object: 9; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses related to this site. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent planning application found there to be no technical reasons why the site cannot be developed. Can accommodate 47 dwellings rather than 35. Not in Green Belt. Contribute to wider housing needs around Cambridge. Would not encroach into views of local countryside landscape. Not distant from services and facilities. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt. Previously rejected, due to impact on rural character, why is this being reconsidered? Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. Rampton Parish Council – Infrastructure limits will cause problems. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to consider connections with village, further employment should also be considered. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Cottenham Parish Council – Site is not in Green Belt. Acceptable site, but wish to explore a bigger plan. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response: Planning permission (S/2509/12) was granted in February 2013 for 47 dwellings, garages, public open space, landscaping, vehicular access and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>In determining the application, the Council concluded that the changing policy context provided by the NPPF and emerging Local Plan would overcome the sustainability concerns that were included as a reason for refusal of the previous planning application considered on this site (S/2317/11). In considering the sustainability characteristics of Cottenham, the Village Classification Report concluded that the settlement could be given the higher status of a Rural Centre, and this was included as an option in the public consultation on Issues & Options undertaken in July – September 2012. The site was assessed as being a site with development potential through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and was included as a Site Option in the Issues & Options consultation. The Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply and the NPPF requires the delivery of sustainable development; therefore this development adjoining the village framework in one of the more sustainable villages would be consistent with the emerging status of the site in the new Local Plan and the guidance in the NPPF.</p> <p>Conclusion: Existing Commitment. Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Cottenham		
Site Address:	Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 260	Site Option Number:	22 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 11; Object: 6; Comment: 8</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses related to this site. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation links are good from this area, and closeness to employment centres. This is not breaking any obvious planning rules of green belt, lack of transport and amenities. Cottenham is one of the most sustainable villages in South Cambridgeshire, as evidenced by the Council's Village Category Assessment. Although the site is on the edge of the village, it abuts existing residential development to the east, and is accordingly a logical extension to the village, which would not create isolated encroachment into the countryside. Development can be effectively screened to minimise impact on the existing community and views from Oakington Road. Outside Green Belt. The development will help meet affordable housing need. The site is an unencumbered greenfield site. The development can be delivered in the short-term; the larger strategic sites are likely to be longer and more uncertain in delivery. S106 contributions will help offer community benefits. Access is achievable from Oakington Road and there are no known drainage problems. The site is available for development and is unused at the present time. This is an excellent site for development. It lies at the edge of the village and has very good accessibility to all schools (10 mins walk), bus stop (3 mins) and a solar lit cycle route to Histon. No use is being made of the site (it hasn't been used for a number of years), and is immediately available for development. On the edge of the village these plots are not large enough to adversely impact on the village. The 30 mph speed limit could be moved further out. Traffic likely to leave the village heading out towards the A14. At the moment they are not attractive plots being unused and overgrown. A well planned development could improve this area of the village. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development 		

potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development.

OBJECTIONS:

- Histon/Impington should remain as villages and not become a new town. Additional traffic volumes and congestion resulting from development as far out as Cottenham and Willingham - especially on the B1049, and particularly at the junction of the B1049 with the A14.
- Object, South Cambs should consider Land to the Rear of High Street, Cottenham as a potential residential allocation.
- **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council** - In each of the sites in question the Parish Council has operated on the principle that green belt land should not be compromised, that heritage buildings should not be compromised and that villages should not be allowed to creep towards one another. Where brownfield land is available it should be used first.
- **Rampton Parish Council** - Infrastructure limits (schools, traffic) will cause problems.
- Development of this site would have an "adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. Development of this site, with its long plot depth would result in a cul-de-sac that is out of character with the rest of Cottenham and thus have a detrimental impact on the character of this linear approach to the village."

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. Sewers crossing the site.
- **Comberton Parish Council** – Local residents to determine.
- **Cottenham Parish Council** - Options 22 and 23 (SHLAA 260 and 003). The parish council has no difficulty with the broad location but the scale of the proposed development needs consideration in that 175 dwellings would swamp the existing residential area of Orchard Close + The Rowells and the north west section includes an old orchard which CPC would like to see retained/rejuvenated. Furthermore, neither this nor any other development of similar size will be acceptable to Cottenham PC without a master plan for the village which includes significant addition to the infrastructure and job creation.
- This is more suitable than option 23 due to its relative proximity to the existing village edge, a closer alignment with the aspirations of the Cottenham Village Design Group could be achieved if these sites were considered together.
- Regarding Cottenham Sites 21 – 27 if these sites were brought forward successful connections into the village must be made, as their ability to take part in village life is important. A part of these areas be could be brought forward for further employment as any of these would be a

	<p>reasonable location for an area of high quality business premises, those currently available in Broad lane and on Twentypence Road are more industrial in nature and so large for the actual employment they generate, this could be mitigated by some further employment land on the South of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croydon Parish Council – Sounds a good option. • Propose smaller site suitable for development. In ownership of two landowners (remainder of site owned by 4 landowners). Plot of 4.5 acres, regular shape, with road frontage. Unused for a number of years. Access outside 30mph limit. No constraints. Easily accessible to all facilities in village - 10 minutes walk to all schools, 3 minutes to nearest bus stop, 10 minutes to High Street. Safer cycle path to Histon and Guided Busway. Accessible to surrounding villages, A14 and M11. Cottenham appropriate settlement for development - lively, vibrant, good employment, facilities, services, shops and schools to meet everyday needs. Village status may be upgraded to Rural Centre.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Whilst identified as a development option, development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. Development of this site, with its long plot depth would result in a cul-de-sac that is out of character with the rest of Cottenham and thus have a detrimental impact on the character of this linear approach to the village. Other sites are available in the district which would avoid these impacts.</p> <p>Primary Schools in Cottenham have already been expanded beyond the ideal size. The education needs of further allocations cannot be accommodated in the village.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Cottenham		
Site Address:	The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 003	Site Option Number:	23 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 6; Object: 6; Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 response supported this site. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cottenham is one of the most sustainable villages in South Cambridgeshire. Logical extension to the village. Can be delivered in the short term. Good transport links. Close to employment areas. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. Detracts from rather than supports site 22. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. Rampton Parish Council - Infrastructure limits (schools, traffic) will cause problems. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options 22 more suitable due to proximity to village edge. Would be suitable location for additional employment. Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. Cottenham Parish Council - no difficulty with the broad location but the scale of the proposed development needs consideration, 175 dwellings 		

	<p>would swamp the existing residential area of Orchard Close and The Rowells. The north west section includes an old orchard which CPC would like to see retained/rejuvenated. Cottenham Parish council want to see a masterplan for the village.</p>
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Whilst identified as a development option, development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham as development of this site, with its long plot depth, would result in a backland cul-de-sac that is out of character with the rest of Cottenham and contrary to the aims of the Village Design Statement.</p> <p>Primary Schools in Cottenham have already been expanded beyond the ideal size. The education needs of further allocations cannot be accommodated in the village.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Cottenham		
Site Address:	Land south of Ellis Close and East of Oakington Road, Cottenham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 129	Site Option Number:	24 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting of Listed Buildings On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 6; Object: 5; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 response supported this site. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation links are good from this area, and closeness to employment centres. Support as located within one of the more sustainable villages in the district. Cottenham has been put forward for promotion to a Rural Centre. This site offers good development potential. A residential development will contribute towards local need as well as the wider housing targets in Cambridge and support the vitality and viability of local services and facilities. Sympathetic development may be possible. Spreads development of the area and puts some of it in a place with good alternative transport means - bus, cycle, foot. People here do not have to rely upon cars due to proximity to Cambridge. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse affects to landscape and within green belt. Object, South Cambs should consider Land to the Rear of High Street, Cottenham as a potential residential allocation. Histon/Impington should remain as villages and not become a new town. Additional traffic volumes and congestion resulting from development as far out as Cottenham and Willingham - especially on the B1049, and particularly at the junction of the B1049 with the A14. Development will result in an unacceptable erosion of Green Belt. Loss of valuable 		

	<p>agricultural land. Significant increased risk of flooding. The loss of employment land to housing has resulted in increased vehicle movements in and out of the Villages. Inadequate local facilities to cope with increase in housing. Northstowe should be developed further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham Parish Council - All sites recommended on Histon Road options 24,25,26,27 are in the Green-Belt and thus unacceptable and unworthy of consideration as 'sustainable' sites. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council - In each of the sites in question the Parish Council has operated on the principle that green belt land should not be compromised, that heritage buildings should not be compromised and that villages should not be allowed to creep towards one another. Where brownfield land is available it should be used first. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • The site is within the Green Belt, although this issue is not picked up in the 'constraints' summary. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Site option 24 is a more suitable site for a larger scale development than sites 23 and 22, although in the Green Belt. The benefit of the site in creating a coordinated village 'shape' outweighs the loss of the Green Belt here. A con of the site is noted as being impact on the listed building which must be the Almshouses on Rampton Road but it is not thought that there would be much impact due to the distance. • Regarding Cottenham Sites 21 – 27 if these sites were brought forward successful connections into the village must be made, as their ability to take part in village life is important. A part of these areas could be brought forward for further employment as any of these would be a reasonable location for an area of high quality business premises, those currently available in Broad lane and on Twentypence Road are more industrial in nature and so large for the actual employment they generate, this could be mitigated by some further employment land on the South of the village.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Identified as a site with limited development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. The site forms an important part of the setting of several Grade II Listed Buildings - adverse effect as northern edge of site obscures rural context, views and backdrop for these buildings. Loss of High Grade agricultural land – Grade 1. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. The character of this part of the village is largely linear along Histon Road, with long rear gardens. It is in a prominent location and would create a large area of residential development in a cul-de-sac, which would alter and detract from the character of this largely linear settlement. It would be of a scale which would be detrimental to the rural character and setting of the village and have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location.</p>

	<p>Primary Schools in Cottenham have already been expanded beyond the ideal size. The education needs of further allocations cannot be accommodated in the village.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Cottenham		
Site Address:	Land off Histon Road, Cottenham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 123	Site Option Number:	25 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 5; Object: 4; Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses related to this site. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cottenham is one of the most sustainable villages in South Cambridgeshire. Logical extension to the village. Can be delivered in the short term. Environment Agency - We would have no objection to the allocation of these sites on the basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to rear of High Street should be considered instead. Extension of development into the Green Belt. Impact on B1049. Loss of agricultural land. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More appropriate if reviewed with adjoining sites. Connections with the village would need to be considered. Could also consider employment opportunities. Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. Cambridgeshire County Council – Note that the site is in the Green Belt, although not mentioned in site summary. Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. Cottenham Parish Council – In the Green Belt, unworthy for any consideration as sustainable sites. 		
Council's Response and Conclusion:	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Identified as a site with limited development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Loss of High Grade agricultural land – Grade 1. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. The character of this part of the village is</p>		

linear, with long rear gardens. Development of this site would create a large area of residential development in a cul-de-sac, which would alter the character of this largely ribbon settlement. It is in a prominent location and would be of a scale which would alter the current rural character and setting of the village and impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location.

Primary Schools in Cottenham have already been expanded beyond the ideal size. The education needs of further allocations cannot be accommodated in the village.

Conclusion:

Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.

Settlement:	Cottenham		
Site Address:	Land to the rear of 34 - 46 Histon Road, Cottenham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 263	Site Option Number:	26 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential. Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 2; Object: 4; Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses related to this site. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council - In each of the sites in question the Parish Council has operated on the principle that green belt land should not be compromised, that heritage buildings should not be compromised and that villages should not be allowed to creep towards one another. Where brownfield land is available it should be used first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional traffic volumes on B1049, impact on Histon and Impington. Unacceptable erosion of Green Belt. Loss of valuable agricultural land. Significant increased risk of flooding. The loss of employment land to housing has resulted in increased vehicle movements in and out of the Villages. Inadequate local facilities to cope with increase in housing. Northstowe should be developed further. South Cambs should consider Land to the Rear of High Street, Cottenham as a potential residential allocation. The proposal would not consolidate the development of the village...It would be a clear extension of development into the Green Belt behind the ribbon of housing on the north western side of Histon Road, and it would be separated by a field from the boundary of existing housing to the north east. Cottenham Parish Council - All sites recommended on Histon Road options 24,25,26,27 are in the Green-Belt and thus unacceptable and 		

	<p>unworthy of consideration as 'sustainable' sites.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • The site is within the Green Belt, although this issue is not picked up in the 'constraints' summary. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Options 25 and 26 together would be more appropriate if they could be reviewed together with 24 adjacent. • Regarding Cottenham Sites 21 – 27 if these sites were brought forward successful connections into the village must be made, as their ability to take part in village life is important. A part of these areas be could be brought forward for further employment as any of these would be a reasonable location for an area of high quality business premises, those currently available in Broad lane and on Twentypence Road are more industrial in nature and so large for the actual employment they generate, this could be mitigated by some further employment land on the South of the village.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Identified as a site with limited development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Loss of High Grade agricultural land – Grade 1. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. The character of this part of the village is linear, with long rear gardens. Development of this site would create a large area of residential development in a cul-de-sac, which would alter the character of this largely ribbon settlement. It is in a prominent location and would be of a scale which would alter the current rural character and setting of the village and impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location.</p> <p>Primary Schools in Cottenham have already been expanded beyond the ideal size. The education needs of further allocations cannot be accommodated in the village.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Cottenham		
Site Address:	Cottenham Sawmills, Cottenham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 124	Site Option Number:	27 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities Loss of employment 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 3; Object: 5; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses related to this site. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously developed land, not in agricultural use. Potential to create a softer settlement edge with the countryside. Can be delivered in the short term. The most sustainable option in Cottenham. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of employment. Land to rear of High Street should be considered instead. Extension of development into the Green Belt. Impact on B1049. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More appropriate if reviewed with adjoining sites. Connections with the village would need to be considered. Could also consider employment opportunities. Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. Cambridgeshire County Council – Note that the site is in the Green Belt, although not mentioned in site summary. Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. Cottenham Parish Council – In the Green Belt, unworthy for any consideration as sustainable sites. 		

<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>The SHLAA assessment and Sustainability Appraisal have been revised in light of comments received from the objector, but this does not change the overall conclusion that this is a site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Although there are potentially beneficial impacts on townscape and landscape, and noise environment from the removal of the sawmill, development of a site in this location would itself have significant townscape and landscape impacts as it is a large backland development in the linear part of the village. No spare capacity into the main drain system.</p> <p>Primary Schools in Cottenham have already been expanded beyond the ideal size. The education needs of further allocations cannot be accommodated in the village.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Fulbourn

Settlement:	Fulbourn		
Site Address:	Land off Station Road, Fulbourn		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 074	Site Option Number:	28 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential. Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Limited impact on landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt • Access concerns near level crossing and via Conservation Area • Impact on Conservation Area and Listed Buildings 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 3; Object: 81; Comment:6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 response supported this option specifically. • 4 responses supported development in Fulbourn, 4 objected <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, all issues can be overcome with a low density scheme, careful design and landscaping. • Green Belt - the surrounding properties and railway line mean that this site no longer assists in providing any separation between Fulbourn and Stow-cum-Quy. Large swathes of open space running both through and around the site will lessen any impact on openness. • Noise - a landscaped area to the north would create both a visual barrier and an acoustic barrier to prevent unacceptable noise impacts from railway and industrial estate. Access - the main access to this site will be from Church Lane and early indications from Network Rail are positive regarding some access off Station Road. • Heritage - a well-designed and lower density scheme could ensure that the impact on the listed buildings and significant views is minimised. • Biodiversity - consider that there would be no significant biodiversity impact from developing the site. Mature trees along edge will remain as part of any development. • Flooding and drainage - a full flood risk assessment would accompany a planning application. • Utilities - the developer agrees to assess utilities capacity and implement mitigation if required. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site 		

(i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development.

- **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support.**

OBJECTIONS:

- Loss of Green Belt would destroy rural character.
- Conservation Area borders the site on three sides and Listed Buildings.
- Accessed via Church Lane which is a dangerous blind turning (opposite the grave yard) or either an opening adjacent to the rail line in Station Road. The access from Station Road is next to a level crossing and just below a blind hill crest. There would be a significant rise in traffic on narrow roads already extremely congested. Heavy vehicles. Cycling dangerous.
- Increased traffic in the village.
- Current educational and health provision is inadequate for an increase in numbers.
- Site has been previously rejected for development four times.
- Fulbourn cannot sustain further development. Lack of infrastructure to serve development.
- Lack of school places. The primary school is small and there is no room for expansion without compromising on playing space for the children. Based on 1.3 children per household, 184 dwellings would require doubling of the size of school from 240 to 480.
- There are currently water supply / pressure problems in this area.
- Loss of amenity.
- Noise and light pollution.
- Land is important to the character of Fulbourn and its historic rural setting and this has been confirmed at numerous reviews. The way the open countryside penetrates right into the heart of the village between Station Road, Church lane, Apthorpe Street and Cox's Drove is an important feature and should be retained.
- This option is not spatially the best site for development in the village.
- Harm to rural character of village.
- It provides views from the village streets into the countryside.
- SHLAA Site 162 is the most appropriate and suitable site for residential development purposes in Fulbourn. The reasons are: the site is not Green Belt land; spatially, the site is the most appropriately located for residential development in Fulbourn; the site has a contiguous relationship with the existing village framework and can be sensitively integrated with the natural and built framework of the village with limited impact on the existing landscape and townscape character, as is recognised in the Local Plan Inspectors Report (2004); the site is suitable, available and achievable in order to deliver a high quality residential development proposal in Fulbourn.
- Parking is very limited in village.
- Flooding on Station Road which is lower than the land being proposed to be developed. Drainage already major issue and run-off would exacerbate flood risk.
- Development would take away the beauty and historic landscape value of the area which is integral to the village. The wildlife value of the area would diminish. Loss of high grade agricultural land in question.

	<p>Insufficient evidence that there would be sufficient water supply to service additional development and wildlife sites long term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will additional homes be absorbed, already allowed Windmill (100) and Ida Darwin (275) homes. • Would the Health Centre be able to cope with the amount of new patients requiring their services? • Land is a barrier to Marshall's Airport and A14. Preserves setting and special character of Fulbourn. Rural Centre but facilities not consistent with status. Already lots development planned. • Potential that increased traffic may damage dry flint walling around the church. Site of archaeological interest as close to the village historical centre. • Would have an effect on the village's agricultural economy and farming-related businesses and so pose a threat to much needed employment opportunities, already scarce outside of the nearby city. • One of the proposed advantages is 'Close to local services and facilities'. However, the scale of the development means the distance from the dwellings to the High Street would be a long walk and the use of cars would be apparent. Therefore this pro must be discounted. • Fulbourn Parish Council - Object to all the options considered by SHLAA including site option 28. FPC is opposed to changes to the Green Belt around the village and between the village and Cherry Hinton in order to retain the environment and ambiance of Fulbourn and to protect the open countryside which extends into built up areas of the village. This land brings the countryside into the heart of the village, a feature which the Parish Plan and Parish Action Plan seek to retain. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site. • Releasing land from the Green Belt should be a last resort. • Major car conflicts have occurred since 8 additional dwellings were built • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • The scale of the development is at odds with the proposed re-classification of the village (Issue 13), which seems to suggest that it is incapable of taking further substantial development due to a lack of sustainable infrastructure; i.e. a lack of a suitable shopping area within the centre of the village and a lack of schools. By default, a smaller site or the development of this site for alternative purposes might be more appropriate. • In view of the considerable need for more affordable housing in the village, 'exception sites' close to the village centre should be developed to provide low cost housing, including rented accommodation. Best site is the land to the west of Station Road which could become a large area of housing. An access road, presently cut off short, has already been laid down to this area, past the existing dwellings. It might also be suitable for a new, greatly enlarged and independent Health Centre, to cater for increased population. • The Wildlife Trust - Any development in this location must consider impacts on the nearby Fulbourn Fen SSSI and nature reserve, as this forms the nearest accessible green space, but is a site that is susceptible
--	---

	<p>to inappropriate recreational uses and has a finite capacity to support visitors without damage to its important wildlife.</p>
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Adverse effect to setting of Conservation Area due to loss of significant open countryside. Major adverse effect on the setting of several Grade II and one Grade II* Listed Buildings within the Conservation Area if the site were to be developed due to obstruction of significant views and loss of countryside context. Potential vibration, noise and odour issues from adjoining railway line and industrial buildings. There have been reports of flooding close to the site.</p> <p>It would not be possible to achieve satisfactory safe access to the south of the site due to historic constraints or north of the site due to proximity to the railway crossing. Promoters have not demonstrated that alternative access could be achieved.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Linton

Settlement:	Linton		
Site Address:	Land east of Station Road, Linton		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 152	Site Option Number:	29 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuses previously developed land <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment land • Located south of the A1307 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 4; Object: 2; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 responses supported this option specifically. • 4 responses supported development in Linton. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously developed site. • No overriding planning constraints. • Safe highway access can be delivered. • No material impact on employment provision. • Environment Agency - We would have no objection to the allocation of these sites on the basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment land. • Poor access to Linton, acknowledged by special policy area restricting residential development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If at all possible site should be maintained for industrial use. • Site is cut off from village facilities by the A1307. • Not opposed if social housing. • Linton Parish Council - In principle not opposed to this site for social housing reserved for local residents provided access issues to the A1307 can be resolved and the concerns of local residents can be met. In general LPC favours the planned development of the larger sites as a more effective and sustainable method of meeting housing needs and targets. • Hildersham Parish Council - felt unable to comment on the broader picture, but would have no objection to the proposed development at Linton. • Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to 		

	<p>serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. Setting of a Grade II Listed cottage would be adversely affected due to loss of wooded backdrop and due to higher ground levels. Development of this site would have a neutral effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Linton because of the mix of uses on the site. The setting of the listed building could be enhanced by sensitively designed development on the site and the removal of the industrial neighbour. Potential noise and odour risk from adjoining industrial premises.</p> <p>Within the Linton Special Policy Area (Policy CH/10) – Policy seeks to restrict further residential development to the south of the A1307 due to the segregation from the main part of the village and further development in this area would not be sustainable. It is proposed to retain such a policy in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Melbourn

Settlement:	Melbourn		
Site Address:	36 New Road, Melbourn		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 235	Site Option Number:	30 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well screened site, limited landscape impact Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 8; Object: 1; Comment: 3</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses referenced this option specifically. 2 responses supported development in Melbourn, 2 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small development which helps to fulfil housing need to support demand for those working on science park; Minimal disruption, reasonable infrastructure; Could be developed with adjacent site 31; The walking distances to all services and facilities is very reasonable, including Meldreth train station. The site provides an excellent opportunity to deliver quality housing in a sustainable location on a site that has a good relationship with the village framework; Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrington Parish Council - Support the site options to the north and east of Cambridge. The A1198, already a very busy road, would not be able to take further traffic from developments south of Cambridge; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The combination of site options 30 and 31 would create a new development of a disproportionately large size. Development in that location should be limited to either site option 30 or site option 31 and if further development is required in Melbourn an alternative site should 		

	<p>be found;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Whilst located in a Minor Rural Centre, opportunities provided by the site warrant its allocation.</p> <p>The front of this site lies between existing built development and the rear part is contained by the existing cemetery and well screened from the south by hedgerows, tree belts and plantations. Site capable of integrating development into the village with minimal impacts to the historic and natural environment, landscape and townscape through careful design, provided existing hedgerows, tree belts and plantations are maintained to create a soft green village edge. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution towards additional local school capacity. Site available immediately and capable of delivering houses in the short-term.</p> <p>Adjoins Site Option 31, presenting the opportunity for a comprehensive development.</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <p>Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan, with adjoining site 31.</p>

Settlement:	Melbourn		
Site Address:	Land to rear of Victoria Way, off New Road, Melbourn		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 130	Site Option Number:	31 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well screened site, limited landscape impact Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 7; Object: 2; Comment: 3</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses referenced this option specifically. 2 responses supported development in Melbourn, 2 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well screened from public highway. Suitable access can be achieved. Capable of delivery in the short term. Good transport links. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to Victoria way is already a problem. Infrastructure cannot accommodate additional development. Arrington Parish Council – A1198 would not be able to take further development from sites south of Cambridge. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of sites 30 and 31 would be disproportionate to size of village. Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. 		
Council's Response and Conclusion:	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Whilst located in a Minor Rural Centre, opportunities provided by the site warrant its allocation.</p>		

	<p>The front of this site lies between existing built development and the rear part is contained by the existing cemetery and well screened from the south by hedgerows, tree belts and plantations. Site capable of integrating development into the village with minimal impacts to the historic and natural environment, landscape and townscape through careful design, provided existing hedgerows, tree belts and plantations are maintained to create a soft green village edge. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution towards additional local school capacity. Site available immediately and capable of delivering houses in the short-term.</p> <p>Adjoins Site Option 30, presenting the opportunity for a comprehensive development.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan, with adjoining site 30.</p>
--	---

Settlement:	Melbourn		
Site Address:	Land to the east of New Road		
SHLAA Reference:	320	Site Option Number:	H7 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting if new soft green edge to south created. Good accessibility to a range of employment opportunities. Good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major impact on landscape setting if development extends too far to the south. Distance from local services and facilities. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 69; Object: 688; Comment: 71</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melbourn has good services and facilities and should welcome further limited development, particularly low cost affordable housing, shared ownership / key worker housing, housing for the next generation of local residents, 1-2 bed homes, and bungalows. Not enough affordable housing in Melbourn – huge waiting list. Need more houses available to rent. People need homes and no reason why Melbourn should not welcome them. BUT must consider impacts on services, facilities and infrastructure – resources should be made available to anticipate demands. Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Logical progression from existing housing on New Road, high ground so not affected by flooding, within walking distance of local amenities, and good access routes. Hope that new development would bring more services and facilities to the village. No objection to housing if it is guaranteed that infrastructure will be improved to cope with the expanded population. May provide job opportunities. Benefit to existing businesses and local shops – need a coffee shop, village hall – could these be incorporated?. Would provide more evidence of a case for better library provision. Will help pay for the village hub. People need houses and the local economy will benefit BUT houses need to be built with sensible layouts, sufficient access and services. Melbourn is one of the best villages for additional development – good access to sustainable transport (bus and train) for residents to get to jobs in Cambridge, Royston or London. Cycle route to Addenbrooke's. Endurance Estates (represented by Bidwells): no technical reason why this site cannot be successfully developed for new housing, can provide much needed homes in a sustainable village, and can help to deliver community benefits. Foxton Parish Council: Melbourn is a larger village and can sustain development which will be of benefit to its facilities. 		

- Locations chosen seem well placed in the village – within easy reach of the village centre. More houses will not be noticed – people need to live somewhere. Area has been subject to consideration for change of use for some time – once close to proposed route for by-pass.
- This development is our fair share of the required homes and not resulting in loss of open space that is benefitting the village – not in centre or a playing field.

OBJECTIONS:

- Proposed size of development is not sustainable in Melbourn – limited train and bus services, too few shops, amenities and employment opportunities, and will put strain on / overwhelm infrastructure, services (e.g. schools and doctors), and general utilities that are already at capacity.
- Primary school cannot accommodate existing needs – some children already attend Meldreth Primary School. Current inadequate mains drainage. Low water pressure due to recent nearby developments. No solution for Foxtan crossing so longer queues. Inadequate facilities and recreation areas for young people and children. County Council unable to solve drainage problems as do not have financial resources to relay the High Street system – will take legal action if development takes place.
- Building on green belt land is unforgivable – sacrosanct and must be preserved. Green Belt is there for a reason and not just to be moved as and when you please.
- Concerns about traffic and roads - will create extra traffic on already inadequate roads (in village centre and by school), congestion and more through traffic, noise pollution and emissions, will be detrimental to safety, will create parking problems, speeding is already a problem, village will become a rat run, need a new link road between A10 and New Road, distance from local services will increase in traffic into the village, junction of A505 / New Road is an accident hotspot, concerned about construction traffic having to use road by primary school, part of Bramley avenue is unadopted and ransom strip by East Farm, a new road through the development from Russet Way / Bramley Avenue to New Road would create a new rat run, and cycling links would need to be upgraded.
- Increase in village population by significant percentage changing entire nature and character of the village. In danger of losing village identity – Melbourn is a village not a city. Will become a dormitory.
- Already have drainage and flooding problems (particularly when heavy rain), putting open land under concrete is likely to increase these rather than alleviate this. On a downward slope and therefore at risk of flooding.
- Detrimently affect quality of life of existing residents and unacceptable impact to residents living on village boundary – noise, disturbance, overshadowing, loss of light, and loss of open aspect. Will affect house prices. Size and length of time to complete development would cause unacceptable levels of noise, dirt and traffic.
- Will not help community cohesion as will create a separate community. Risk of increased crime. Village already has antisocial issues.
- Large scale developments should be limited to larger well served

	<p>communities closer to Cambridge. Lots of new building already in Royston, Cambridge, Trumpington and Cambourne so why is this site needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More housing is needed in the country but not in this area – need more Government encouragement to move to areas further north where there is more space and need for job creation. • Adverse effect on village setting and major impact on the landscape. Imposing projection of development on sloping land. Views of the development would be extensive. Existing properties are hidden by crest of hill. • Other more suitable brownfield sites e.g. old Bassingbourn Barracks, Mettle Hill. • Do not need new houses. Number of proposed houses exceeds village needs. Increase in population will make the village overcrowded. Demographic projections show the population has decreased, but already dense infilling that is increasing housing stock. • Houses on the market are not selling so adding more houses will make it more difficult to sell. • Existing high density houses have no off road parking causing congestion on site side roads which would be used for access to H7 and H8. • Unacceptable loss of farmland (needed for food production given forecasted food shortages) and countryside outside the village framework. Area of natural beauty and wildlife area - habitats for flora and fauna. Almost all orchards in Melbourn have been built on - big effect on wildlife. Destruction of habitats used by bats is illegal. • Environmental and quality of life considerations are being disregarded in favour of developers greed – another example of uncontrolled urban sprawl that will lead to destruction of rural South Cambridgeshire. • Once building starts it won't stop – will end up building all the way to A505. What is the point of a village framework boundary? • Main problem is location – make the village longer not wider. The suggested housing is on the wrong side of the village – site between old and new A10 would be better. Sufficient other housing sites being developed in Melbourn e.g. Victoria Way extension, old police station. Development should be spread around the village and not concentrated in one estate. • Access to site is likely to prove difficult. • Loss of habitat for many birds. Several significant trees on site - orchard. • Notice should be given to the Village Plan (subject to comprehensive consultation) which showed huge resident opposition to new development outside of the village boundary and identifies current problems in Melbourn. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: object as greenfield site outside of the village framework. • Should build on brownfield sites first. Development replacing previous buildings is ok. • Setting of old orchard should be given significant weight. • Creation of urban mass. Too many houses in too small a space. No confidence that site will be well designed – very little flair has been designed into new developments, usually crammed.
--	--

- Scale of development is unsustainable and environmentally damaging.
- For proposal to go ahead will need community support, which this does not have. Will have profound impact on community. Residents rightly fear impact on schools, health providers, shops, traffic etc – none of which have been addressed in the consultation documents. Village Plan makes clear the wishes of the community and this should be used in decision making.
- Large water storage area below this site and exposed position means subject to strong winds.
- Why not make smaller villages like Shepreth and the Eversdens bigger to bring back their community?
- Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village.
- Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure.
- Surely the Local Plan should take account of the existing Village plan? Current proposals seem to ignore this. Development of the scale proposed would need the support of local existing community to be successful. Concerned at lack of funding to meet aspirations of draft Transport Plan and therefore unlikelihood of any improvements away from Cambridge southern fringe. End of rural bus subsidies will increase isolation for residents in these communities.

COMMENTS:

- No indication is given to type of housing that will be built. Melbourn needs more housing but mainly starter homes, retirement homes or social housing, not 4+ bedroom homes with small gardens. Social housing provided needs to go to local residents not outsiders.
- Better to build to 3-4 storeys than to build close together, must have adequate off road parking, open space and village style buildings (not ultra-modern) in variety of styles. Important new homes have rooms of a reasonable size and adequate floor space for family life.
- Will need considerable investment in infrastructure and adequate infrastructure must be provided before new homes are occupied. Hoped that all support services will be increased to meet the needs of the increased village size – assessment of capacity of all services and facilities needs to be undertaken.
- Anglian Water: sewage treatment works may require capacity enhancement. Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required.
- Off road parking and green space is essential to any new development.
- Will a new primary school be built?
- Elsewhere derelict houses have been renovated and sold or rented to young couples – could this be done in Melbourn? Need to use existing housing stock more effectively.
- Growth should be organic and at a sustainable pace. If it goes ahead it should be implemented incrementally over a number of years to allow time for the supporting infrastructure and services to be improved.
- Need houses but not a development of this size, would support a much

	<p>smaller scale development. Village cannot support all of H7 and H8, should be 100-120 homes max.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial cost of new infrastructure must be borne by the developer – there must be no increase in council tax for local residents to subsidise development costs. • Encourage bus company to provide route to include this development. • Decision should be made based on local opinion. • Melbourn Primary School: the school can accommodate 315 pupils and present numbers vary from 300-320 pupils. With other new developments already being built, school has very little spare capacity. Need to plan for school expansion (there is space on site) if any further developments. • Have service providers been consulted about this proposal? Doctors, school etc. • Natural England: site is a distance from any local services and facilities so will increase the dependence on use of cars. • Whaddon parish Council: additional housing in Melbourn is likely to lead to increased use of trains that are already busy at peak times. Assessment of transport options needed. • Melbourn Housing Development Awareness Campaign: over 500 responses from villagers – 8% comment, 8% support, 84% object. 9 responses from parish councillors – 1 support, 8 object.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site with limited development potential. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape setting of Melbourn through the development of an open arable field on gently rising land.</p> <p>There are other more sustainable sites available for allocation.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Melbourn		
Site Address:	Orchard and land at East Farm		
SHLAA Reference:	331 & 176	Site Option Number:	H8 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting if new soft green edge to south created. Good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. Good accessibility to a range of employment opportunities. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance from local services and facilities. Previously rejected site, only deliverable with Site Option H7 as otherwise would form a promontory of development into open countryside. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 68; Object: 670; Comment: 69</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melbourn has good services and facilities and should welcome further limited development, particularly low cost affordable housing, shared ownership / key worker housing, housing for the next generation of local residents, 1-2 bed homes, and bungalows. Not enough affordable housing in Melbourn – huge waiting list. Need more houses available to rent. People need homes and no reason why Melbourn should not welcome them. BUT must consider impacts on services, facilities and infrastructure – resources should be made available to anticipate demands. Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Logical progression from existing housing. Cycle route to Addenbrooke's. Hope that new development would bring more services and facilities to the village. No objection to housing if it is guaranteed that infrastructure will be improved to cope with the expanded population. May provide job opportunities. Benefit to existing businesses and local shops – need a coffee shop, village hall – could these be incorporated? Would provide more evidence of a case for better library provision. Will help pay for the village hub. People need houses and the local economy will benefit BUT houses need to be built with sensible layouts, sufficient access and services. Foxton Parish Council: Melbourn is a larger village and can sustain development which will be of benefit to its facilities. Locations chosen seem well placed in the village. More houses will not be noticed – people need to live somewhere. Area has been subject to consideration for change of use for some time – once close to proposed route for by-pass. This development is our fair share of the required homes and not resulting in loss of open space that is benefitting the village – not in centre or a playing field. 		

- Could be absorbed by the village.

OBJECTIONS:

- Proposed size of development is not sustainable in Melbourn – limited train and bus services, too few shops, amenities and employment opportunities, and will put strain on / overwhelm infrastructure, services (e.g. schools and doctors), and general utilities that are already at capacity.
- Primary school cannot accommodate existing needs – some children already attend Meldreth Primary School. Current inadequate mains drainage. No solution for Foxtan crossing so longer queues. Inadequate facilities and recreation areas for young people and children. County Council unable to solve drainage problems as do not have financial resources to relay the High Street system – will take legal action if development takes place.
- Building on green belt land is unforgivable – sacrosanct and must be preserved. Green Belt is there for a reason and not just to be moved as and when you please.
- Concerns about traffic and roads - will create extra traffic on already inadequate roads (in village centre and by school), congestion and more through traffic, noise pollution and emissions, will be detrimental to safety, will create parking problems, speeding is already a problem, village will become a rat run, need a new link road between A10 and New Road, distance from local services will increase in traffic into the village, junction of A505 / New Road is an accident hotspot, concerned about construction traffic having to use road by primary school, part of Bramley avenue is unadopted and ransom strip by East Farm, and a new road through the development from Russet Way / Bramley Avenue to New Road would create a new rat run.
- Increase in village population by significant percentage changing entire nature and character of the village. In danger of losing village identity – Melbourn is a village not a city. Will become a dormitory.
- Already have drainage and flooding problems (particularly when heavy rain), putting open land under concrete is likely to increase these rather than alleviate this. On a downward slope and therefore at risk of flooding.
- Detrimentially affect quality of life of existing residents and unacceptable impact to residents living on village boundary – noise, disturbance, overshadowing, loss of light, and loss of open aspect. Will affect house prices. Size and length of time to complete development would cause unacceptable levels of noise, dirt and traffic.
- Will not help community cohesion as will create a separate community. Risk of increased crime. Village already has antisocial issues.
- Large scale developments should be limited to larger well served communities closer to Cambridge. Lots of new building already in Royston, Cambridge, Trumpington and Cambourne so why is this site needed?
- More housing is needed in the country but not in this area – need more Government encouragement to move to areas further north where there is more space and need for job creation.
- Adverse effect on village setting and major impact on the landscape. Imposing projection of development on sloping land. Views of the

development would be extensive.

- Other more suitable brownfield sites e.g. old Bassingbourn Barracks, Mettle Hill.
- Number of proposed houses exceeds village needs. Increase in population will make the village overcrowded. Demographic projections show the population has decreased, but already dense infilling that is increasing housing stock.
- Houses on the market are not selling so adding more houses will make it more difficult to sell.
- Existing high density houses have no off road parking causing congestion on site side roads which would be used for access to H7 and H8.
- Unacceptable loss of farmland (needed for food production given forecasted food shortages) and countryside outside the village framework. Area of natural beauty and wildlife area - habitats for flora and fauna.
- No development as orchards provide a vital environment for invertebrates and pollinators. Bat colony at East Farm - destruction of habitats used by bats is illegal.
- Environmental and quality of life considerations are being disregarded in favour of developers greed – another example of uncontrolled urban sprawl that will lead to destruction of rural South Cambridgeshire.
- Once building starts it won't stop – will end up building all the way to A505. What is the point of a village framework boundary?
- Main problem is location – make the village longer not wider. The suggested housing is on the wrong side of the village – site between old and new A10 would be better. Sufficient other housing sites being developed in Melbourn e.g. Victoria Way extension, old police station. Development should be spread around the village and not concentrated in one estate.
- Access to site is likely to prove difficult.
- Loss of habitat for many birds. Several significant trees on site - orchard.
- Notice should be given to the Village Plan (subject to comprehensive consultation) which showed huge resident opposition to new development outside of the village boundary and identifies current problems in Melbourn.
- Campaign to Protect Rural England: object as greenfield site outside of the village framework.
- Should build on brownfield sites first. Development replacing previous buildings is ok.
- Setting of old orchard should be given significant weight.
- Creation of urban mass. Too many houses in too small a space. No confidence that site will be well designed – very little flair has been designed into new developments, usually crammed.
- Scale of development is unsustainable and environmentally damaging.
- For proposal to go ahead will need community support, which this does not have. Will have profound impact on community. Residents rightly fear impact on schools, health providers, shops, traffic etc – none of which have been addressed in the consultation documents. Village Plan makes clear the wishes of the community and this should be used in decision making.

- Large water storage area below this site and exposed position means subject to strong winds.
- Why not make smaller villages like Shepreth and the Eversdens bigger to bring back their community?
- Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure.
- Surely the Local Plan should take account of the existing Village plan? Current proposals seem to ignore this. Development of the scale proposed would need the support of local existing community to be successful. Concerned at lack of funding to meet aspirations of draft Transport Plan and therefore unlikelihood of any improvements away from Cambridge southern fringe. End of rural bus subsidies will increase isolation for residents in these communities.
- Already rejected H8 for sound and logical reasons, inclusion of H7 does not resolve issues.
- Wildlife Trust: objects as unacceptable negative impacts on wildlife through loss of an area of orchard. Should be retained and managed as a traditional orchard.

COMMENTS:

- No indication is given to type of housing that will be built. Melbourn needs more housing but mainly starter homes and social housing, not 4+ bedroom homes with small gardens. Social housing provided needs to go to local residents not outsiders.
- Better to build to 3-4 storeys than to build close together, must have adequate off road parking, open space and village style buildings (not ultra-modern) in variety of styles. Important new homes have rooms of a reasonable size and adequate floor space for family life.
- Will need considerable investment in infrastructure and adequate infrastructure must be provided before new homes are occupied. Hoped that all support services will be increased to meet the needs of the increased village size – assessment of capacity of all services and facilities needs to be undertaken.
- Anglian Water: capacity available to serve proposed growth.
- Off road parking and green space is essential to any new development.
- Will a new primary school be built?
- Elsewhere derelict houses have been renovated and sold or rented to young couples – could this be done in Melbourn? Need to use existing housing stock more effectively.
- If it goes ahead it should be implemented incrementally over a number of years to allow time for the supporting infrastructure and services to be improved.
- Need houses but not a development of this size, would support a much smaller scale development. Village cannot support all of H7 and H8, should be 100-120 homes max.
- Financial cost of new infrastructure must be borne by the developer – there must be no increase in council tax for local residents to subsidise development costs.
- Decision should be made based on local opinion.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melbourn Primary School: the school can accommodate 315 pupils and present numbers vary from 300-320 pupils. With other new developments already being built, school has very little spare capacity. Need to plan for school expansion (there is space on site) if any further developments. • Have service providers been consulted about this proposal? Doctors, school etc. • Natural England: site is a distance from any local services and facilities so will increase the dependence on use of cars. • Whaddon parish Council: additional housing in Melbourn is likely to lead to increased use of trains that are already busy at peak times. Assessment of transport options needed. • Melbourn Housing Development Awareness Campaign: over 500 responses from villagers – 8% comment, 8% support, 84% object. 9 responses from parish councillors – 1 support, 8 object. • English Heritage: would not directly impact on the historic built environment but is not well related to the built-up area if developed on its own, and would result in loss of one of the few remaining orchards in the area.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site with limited development potential. On its own, site previously rejected as a promontory of development into open countryside. Considered together with Site Option H7 there would be no promontory of development. However, development at sites H7 and H8 would have adverse impacts on wildlife through loss of an area of orchard and an adverse effect on the landscape setting of Melbourn through the development of an open arable field on gently rising land.</p> <p>There are other more sustainable sites available for allocation.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Gamlingay

Settlement:	Gamlingay		
Site Address:	Land off Grays Road, Gamlingay		
SHLAA Reference:	171 (part)	Site Option Number:	32 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope to improve existing village edge. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 3; Object: 11; Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 4 responses supported development in Gamlingay, 2 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of the land off Grays Road identified Site Option 32 is supported by the landowner and this will provide a logical expansion of the village with potential benefits. • Additional housing for existing village residents. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Agricultural land. • Relationship with Gamlingay Wood SSSI, and negative impact on users of the woods. The ecological effects of bringing habitations close to SSSIs is well understood, and is ecologically damaging in most cases. • Impact on views of the woods. • Two new footpaths running along the west and north boundaries are in the process of being handed to the parish council by the land owner. Building will lose these footpaths to the community. • Traffic volumes – village already struggling to cope, will impact on quality of life. • This site would threaten the rural landscape setting of a historic village. • Business of the Local Plan is not "to improve" any edge of any village. • There are substantial existing access issues with site which no assessment appears to have been done. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further developments should be considered in Gamlingay until impacts of the major developments at Station Road and Green End are known. • The successful sheltered housing scheme is currently on this edge of the village. To surround it with housing would change its character completely. • Existing services and infrastructure struggling to cope. • Arrington Parish Council – Support the site options to the north and east of Cambridge. The A1198, already a very busy road, would not be able to take further traffic from developments south of Cambridge. • Gamlingay Parish Council – Strongly object to the inclusion of this site. Only after the delivery of the two large developments within the existing framework are delivered and the impact of these has been fully assessed should consideration of this site be made in consultation with local people. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Object. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Croydon Parish Council – Do not use greenfield land - it can never be replaced. • The Wildlife Trust – Any development in the village at this location must consider its impacts on the nearby Gamlingay Wood SSSI and nature reserve, as this forms the nearest accessible green space, but is a site that is susceptible to inappropriate recreational uses and has a finite capacity to support visitors without damage to its important wildlife
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site with limited development potential. Development of this site would have a material effect upon the landscape setting of Gamlingay by introducing development to the rear of the historic linear development along Church End. On balance, continuing the harsh exposed village edge in this location when viewed from the north would not be appropriate, particularly when other development options are available.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Gamlingay		
Site Address:	Green End Industrial Estate, Green End, Gamlingay		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 117	Site Option Number:	33 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope to improve local environment. • Could provide additional space for primary school • Close to local services and facilities <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment land 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 5; Object: 2; Comment: 9</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 responses supported this option specifically. • 4 responses supported development in Gamlingay, 2 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owner reports building difficult to let when they become vacant. • Opportunity for mix of employment and housing. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of potential development in Gamlingay seems greatly disproportionate. • Traffic volumes have increased substantially. • Community infrastructure in the village reducing rather than increasing. • Arrington Parish Council – A1198 would not be able to take further development form sites south of Cambridge. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should employment be lost to housing? Steps should be taken to avoid net loss of jobs to the village. • Road obstruction due to parking from Green End to Gamlingay Church. Could school parking be addressed? • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. • Gamlingay Parish Council - There is a general historical expectation that this site will come forward for mixed use- industry/housing development in the near future. 		

<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Although located at a Minor Rural Centre, the site offers particular opportunities which warrant its allocation.</p> <p>The site is primarily occupied by a wide variety of commercial buildings of no townscape merit, and is run down and in need of improvement. Redevelopment has the potential to improve the townscape in this part of the village and improve vehicular and pedestrian permeability. Whilst it will result in the loss of some employment, part of the site could provide employment uses that are compatible with residential uses which could result in a significant positive benefit to the existing noise environment. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution to additional local school capacity. The site is capable of delivering houses in the short-term.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Settlement:	Gamlingay		
Site Address:	Land at Mill Road, Gamlingay		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 093	Site Option Number:	34 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Limited impacts on landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to mitigate impacts on Listed Building settings. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 3; Object: 10; Comment: 2</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 4 responses supported development in Gamlingay, 2 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. • Sympathetically build. • Opportunity to provide a residential scheme to serve local need and contribute to the vitality and viability of the village centre as well as benefiting Cambridge more widely. • Benefits from natural screening along both the southern and eastern boundaries which would mitigate potential visual impact on the nearby conservation area and views of the site from the south. • Village centre within easy walking and cycling distance. • There would not be an increased risk of flooding on the site or surrounding it. • This site presents a viable residential development opportunity and there are no identified reasons as to why it should not be taken forward for allocation. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of this site would have an adverse impact at the entrance to the village and the conservation area. • The village is about to receive a large number of new houses at Station Road and Green End. These developments will increase the size of this overdeveloped and under-resourced village very substantially. No further developments should be considered until the full impacts of these sites are known. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on village services and facilities. • Greenfield site, should not be considered until all existing brownfield options have been exhausted. • Loss of green space and an impact on wildlife. • Adjacent to a conservation area, visual impact that is inappropriate for this setting. • Impact on wildlife, green spaces essential to village life. • Increase in noise and traffic movements in Mill Street, West Road, and Heath Road. • Access will need to be developed requiring either substantial modifications of West Lane and its junctions, or a new access road that will completely destroy the character and visual impact of the entrance to the village. • Access from Mill Street would be prevented by the closeness to the old railway bridge which completely cuts off the view of the road to those entering the village. Access through the social housing scheme would be equally impossible. This scheme is currently a cul de sac which makes it attractive to the very many young families who are housed there. • Increased noise and pollution. • The site is at the edge of the village, and it would invite further contiguous development in future. • It would extend the village framework in one of the most historic parts of the village. New houses will look out of character. • Gamlingay has already seen new development alongside huge developments in nearby places. Scale of potential development in Gamlingay greatly disproportionate. Dozens of properties on market for months, and permission for new homes has been given for Station Road and Green End. • Gamlingay Parish Council - This site will put undue pressure on local infrastructure and services. The Parish Council strongly object to the inclusion of this site and it should NOT be considered in this Local Plan review. Only after the delivery of the two large developments, within the existing framework, are delivered and the impact of these has been fully assessed should consideration of this site be made in consultation with local people. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Object. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Croydon Parish Council - Do not use greenfield land - it can never be replaced.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site with limited development potential. The open field to the south of the site provides the most visible element of the immediate setting for Gamlingay when approaching from the south. Important frontage and prominent in approach to the Conservation Area and village. Adverse effects on settings of Listed Buildings along Mill Street and Honey Hill. There are other more sustainable sites available for allocation.</p>

	Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.
--	--

Milton

Settlement:	Milton		
Site Address:	The Former EDF Depot & Training Centre, Ely Road, Milton		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 132	Site Option Number:	35 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Planning permission for housing already granted for part of site <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt • Loss of employment land 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 3; Object: 4; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 3 responses supported development in Gamlingay, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good transport links. • Close to employment. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Loss of open space. • Impact on Conservation Area. • In a Group Village. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing conditions regarding access and leisure/countryside facilities which were part of the Helical retirement village agreement must remain. • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine. • Croydon Parish Council - loss of Green Belt and employment land. • Milton Parish Council - development has planning permission for 89 not 130 and rest cannot be built on owing to development constraints as 		

	parkland is Humphry Repton landscape.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response: Planning permission (S/0983/11) was granted in May 2012 for 89 dwellings with vehicular access, public open space, car parking, associated landscaping, and infrastructure.</p> <p>With the exception of the proposed sports pavilion and football pitches, the proposals are by definition 'inappropriate development'. In determining the application, the Council concluded that the very special circumstances identified are sufficient to clearly outweigh the harm by way of inappropriateness and the other identified harm in regard to openness of the Green Belt. The Council also concluded that the proposed redevelopment of the site would achieve improvements to the historic and landscape environments, the provision of housing including affordable housing, and the provision of community facilities and publicly accessible open space. It is clear that the site's unique circumstances can accommodate the development in a positive and sustainable way.</p> <p>Conclusion: Existing commitment. Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Swavesey

Settlement:	Swavesey		
Site Address:	Land south of Whitton Close & west of Boxworth End, Swavesey		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 083 (part)	Site Option Number:	36 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential. Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot • Scope to mitigate adverse impacts by development of part of the site only <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on landscape and townscape • On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 4; Object: 9; Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 1 response supported development in Swavesey, 2 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional housing for existing village families. • The site is deliverable and can help address the housing needs of Swavesey and the wider area in a manner that is respectful to its immediate environs and setting. • Site surveys have found no technical reason why the site cannot deliver new homes in an environmentally sensitive way and bring social and economic benefits to the village. The final layout, number of dwellings and mix of dwellings can be concluded through stakeholder engagement. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error in the criteria sees this land suitable for development while the other sites in the village classed as unsuitable. House will be knocked down to provide access. Land never had a building on it and used to graze cows. • Significant negative impact on townscape and landscape. The rural, linear part of the village would be further compromised as would the wild life corridors. Swavesey getting too big and losing village community/lifestyle. More modern building would turn it into a 		

	<p>commuter/ghost village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not the jobs available. • Natural habitat - impact needs fully investigating and mitigating. • Development of this nature will step away from current linear structure and set a precedent. Raised land means development visible over the existing properties and change feel and characteristics of village. • Increase volume of traffic - already congested. • Guided bus over 1 mile away - without parking facilities will be more problems in village centre. Ordinary bus service reduced. 30 mins+ walk to the guided busway. Travel by car to P&R at Longstanton would increase traffic along narrow Ramper Road. • Surrounding Properties: Water run-off and localised flooding at present - site is higher, adding to problems. • Loss of light and shadowing. • Schools and Doctor's Surgery oversubscribed. Primary school almost full and village college already overcrowded. Have the full implications of proposed development along with affects of Northstowe been fully explored? • Already been enough housing development. • Woodland - Historic woodland. • Road - volumes of peak traffic. Concern Whitton Close become a rat run depending on site entrance locations. • Flooding & Drainage - Water run-off and localised flooding an issue for surrounding properties. Site rises up a meter, and will make worse. Heavy Jurassic clay will require installation of intensive and expensive site drainage system to control surface water runoff from the site. • Natural Habitat - Many species provide a wealth of biodiversity. The farmland supports a wide range of wildlife including great crested newts, barn owls, buzzards, rabbits and foxes and their habitat would be destroyed. • Site assessment classifying area as partially developed when not case - only one property. History of refused permission based on character of the approach to the village centre and other factors, none have changed. • At the bottom of the garden to 9 Whitton Close is a hedge and orchard. The hedge is at least 12ft - 15ft high, with abundant wildlife. The hedge should not be cut down. It is beautiful, has health and wildlife benefits, and cuts noise of the A14. • Object because: the back of our house is less than 12m from the proposed development boundary; light to our property would be markedly reduced; surface water from the adjacent field floods our back garden and might become worse if the site is developed; the impact of noise on our house and garden would be increased significantly; the outlook from our house would be completely destroyed. • Doctor's surgery - no spare capacity and difficulties parking for those with mobility problems. • Increased traffic would add to the burden of parking in areas which are already a bottleneck such as Market Street. • Difficult to expand sewage treatment facilities, particularly in view of Northstowe. • The scale of the development suggested is out of proportion with the location at the end of the village, with no local services. Site directly
--	--

	<p>touches the existing ends of properties along Whitton Close and also the main road Boxworth End/Middlewatch. Developing directly adjacent to existing properties will be a significant detriment to them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal differences between site and other rejected sites. • Will Northstowe not be able to accommodate demand? • Swavesey Parish Council - Main objections include: loss of woodland habitat, development on greenfield site, against linear village structure (which has been deciding factor in many planning decisions), village services currently running at capacity (eg primary school) increased development will put pressure on existing services, flooding and drainage concerns (increase flood risk locally and around village), increased pressure on sewage treatment and treated water outflow (currently at capacity and having to take Cambourne and Northstowe developments), guided busway not close to many residents and access is not easy. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Middle Level Commissioners - Site outside Environment Agency's floodplain but within Board's catchment boundary. Surface water in area discharges to Board's system via Award Drains under jurisdiction of your authority. Board's operations are dictated by water levels in Environment Agency's Swavesey Drain system outside the Board's control. Drain approaches capacity during relatively low rainfall events and can be 'tide locked' by Great River Ouse for several days. Restricts operation of Board's pumping facility and/or results in flooding due to overtopping of adjacent flood defence embankments. New developments within its catchment will require regulation to current rates of run-off and large enough to be feasible both technically and financially. Developers should be required to fund provision and maintenance of all necessary flood defences and warning measures required. • Swavesey Primary School - Delighted that the Council are putting a plan in place for Swavesey and local area as it allows for future planning of numbers of children that need to be accommodated. We want the Council to be aware of the lack of space in this primary school at the moment. This issue has been getting worse over the last few years. The school was built for 266 pupils but we have 302. Over subscribed and there are children living in our catchment who are on our waiting list. Future planning and development should put in place strategies to deal with school places before the children arrive. • The Wildlife Trust - Aerial photos suggests that much of the land is wooded and or rough grassland that could have value as a wildlfie rich local green space. This potential value must be fully assessed before any decision is taken on allocation of the site for development.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site was identifies as having limited development potential. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Swavesey. Development on this site would be very large scale and harmful to the character of this compact, linear village and the setting of several Grade II Listed Buildings. It would constitute substantial back land</p>

	<p>development, poorly related to the existing built-up part of the village, significantly extending the village to the west. Development on this site has previously been adjudged to be harmful to the countryside and character to this rural, linear part of the village by independent planning inspectors.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Bassingbourn

Settlement:	Bassingbourn		
Site Address:	Next to Walnut Tree Close, North End, Bassingbourn		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 085	Site Option Number:	37 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential. Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited landscape and townscape impact <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk to small part of site 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 4; Object: 96; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 responses objected this option specifically. 7 responses supported development in Bassingbourn, 6 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet local needs, and contribute to the vitality and viability of services. Landscaping could mitigate any significant impacts. Accessible to services and transport in the village centre. Flood risk Assessment, landscape and traffic impact statements submitted by site proposer. Environment Agency - We are in support of the proposed sites for allocation. The direction of development is generally in line with the principles of the sequential test of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The site allocations indicated are directing of development to areas of lower risk of flooding. Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bassingbourn not a sustainable location for development due to lack of employment opportunities in village and the local area. Poor public transport (could be further reductions). Increased risk of flooding, parts of site at flood risk. Drainage problems on North End. Loss of open space, creating ribbon of development north of the village. Impact on wildlife habitats. High grade agricultural land. Impact on rural character of the area. Outside the existing development framework. Becoming a dormitory town rather than a village. Impact on historic character, and archaeology. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Street cannot cope with additional traffic (the third most notorious blackspot within South Cambs). • Through traffic would be increased to Shingay, along a single track road. • Developments in the Causeway remain unsold. • Oil pipeline runs under the site. • Infrastructure inadequate or close to capacity. • Insufficient capacity in schools and doctors surgery. • No account has been taken of future military use of Bassingbourn Barrack, which could include housing a multi-role brigade. • Village has already grown significantly in recent years. • Focus of development should be on more sustainable locations in the district. • Arrington Parish Council – A1198 would not be able to take further development form sites south of Cambridge. • Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Parish Council – Not suitable due to lack of local employment, lack of infrastructure, traffic congestion and flood risk. No account taken of future of Bassingbourn Barracks. • Croydon Parish Council – No site with flood risk should be considered. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. • Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Parish council – Localism requires the District Council to engage with Parish councils proactively. Too often communication is too little too late. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. Approximately a quarter of the site along the western and eastern boundaries is within Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b. NPPF Sequential Test applied – other sites in Flood Zone 1 are available. Development of this site would have some adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area as it would result in the encroachment of built development into the views across the open fields, which are considered as key attribute, and would also change the well defined village edge provided by the gardens of Walnut Tree Close.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Bassingbourn		
Site Address:	Land north of Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 219 (part)	Site Option Number:	38 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Scope to mitigate adverse impacts by development of part of the site only <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk to small part of site. • Landscape and townscape impacts 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 1; Object: 78; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 responses objected this option specifically. • 7 responses supported development in Bassingbourn, 6 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrington Parish Council - Support the site options to the north and east of Cambridge. The A1198, already a very busy road, would not be able to take further traffic from developments south of Cambridge. • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council - Not sustainable due to lack of local employment, the need for travel and traffic congestion. Infrastructure is close to capacity and no account has been taken of future military use of Bassingbourn Barracks. Surrounding roads do not provide satisfactory access to the site. Development would alter landscape character and result in the loss of rural outlook to listed buildings and buildings in the conservation area. • Flat economy, more job cuts in the public sector and employment centre around Cambridge and in high skill high tech businesses. No jobs in Bassingbourn, Royston not within 1.6km, and Litlington does not have 2000+ jobs as claimed. Royston housing development proceeding at fast pace. Danger of double counting by SCDC / North Herts the jobs in Royston. • Outside village framework, contrary to saved policies. • High grade agricultural land. • Site previously rejected on application. 		

- Heritage and archaeological interests will object.
- Development will increase use of private vehicles and add to severe congestion in village and beyond.
- Village is 30th most employment deprived area in 2004 study.
- Secondary School has deficit PAN.
- Development would open way to further more extensive housing within general site area. Access roads could become rat run.
- Severe traffic congestion at peak times in the High Street Bassingbourn. Bassingbourn, in recent years has been identified as the third most notorious blackspot within South Cambs. Adoption of any sites 37, 38 or 39 will adversely impact the situation.
- Parked vehicles reduce High Street to one lane. Also, extra traffic along the short distance from the school to the end of Spring Lane.
- The people that live in the High Street have the right to park their cars outside of their own homes. That could never be denied. This bottleneck in our village is an unsolvable problem and any increase in population can only make the matter worse.
- The lack of public transport to centres of employment, particularly in Cambridge and to the rail link in Royston will increase the use of private vehicles. With implications of congestion and the environment generally
- New housing developments would affect the character of the village particularly on the land between Spring Lane and South End.
- Bassingbourn's amenities could not support an addition to the population without putting extra pressure on services, schools and roads in the village.
- Petition with 173 signatories. Bassingbourn could not cope with one site option being developed leave alone three sites - given the transport and education infrastructure issues. Alternative sites must be found.
- Local affordable housing need for young people should be met by small developments of 8-10 houses on suitable sites.
- The alternative for new houses is to build on the A1198 on the relatively low yield farm land between Kneesworth and the A505 roundabout. This would enable easy access for cars and also to Royston station.
- 155 extra houses in Bassingbourn would turn Bassingbourn from a beautiful community driven village into a TOWN on the outskirts of Royston.
- New homes needed but Bassingbourn is not the right location - could further developments, similar to Cambourne not be created, rather than ruining existing villages. Lack of capacity and infrastructure to support additional families - doctors surgery, village school. Spoil the natural beauty of area. Intrusion into open countryside. Drainage problems leading to flooding. Empty houses on Causeway - can the building of new houses be justified?
- Potential for destruction of historic character of Bassingbourn. Three sites contain important elements of village history. Site warrants archaeological investigation.
- We like field and trees also the village life in general and concreting over arable land for food production is not answer. There are brown sites like the disused travellers site in Melbourn and many others
- Access poses major issues and dangers.
- Site has no direct access. Only access proposed by the promoter is from

	<p>Elbourn Way, which would require agreement with owners of Site 059, but is not likely unless housing is permitted on that site. To obtain access would require crossing two ransom strips, both subject to existing legal contracts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be a major intrusion into the open countryside, have an adverse impact on the landscape and detrimental effect on the character of the village. Site does not warrant further assessment. By excluding this site smaller housing could be considered in far more appropriate and easily accessed sites. • Huge developments would seriously harm character of village and detrimental to South End and Spring Lane especially. The Rouses is much used and valued by residents. • Would inevitably worsen problems with surface water, and entail a major upgrade of drainage system to prevent further flooding. • An unwelcome precedent would be created, that could affect other areas around Bassingbourn. The green separation between houses in Bassingbourn and the cluster of houses in North End will be further removed. • Access is poor and development would require demolition of at least one property. • The proposal gives no clear indication where road access to the site would be. There appears to be two possible locations, one through Park View and the other through Elbourn Way. The Park View route and adjoining roads are already narrow with extensive on-street parking. Loading these roads with more traffic will make it increasingly unpleasant for the people living there and dangerous for pedestrians and children. Access through Elbourn Way poses similar issues as the residential roads are narrow with an increasing amount of on-street parking and five bends with restricted view including two around a children's play area. • Demand for new housing is unproven - empty houses on Butterfield Way. • Consideration should be given to previously developed sites - dilapidated property in South End, redundant Pear Tree public house, waste ground adjacent to the Kneesworth hospital site, Barracks • There is wildlife in the copse at the end of Elbourn Way i.e. deer, birds (barn owl, woodpeckers). • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Object • These will be homes sold for profit and out of the price range achievable for most local people. There are not enough jobs locally to support the new residents and Bassingbourn risks becoming a dormitory for London. • Harm should not be done to the quality of life enjoyed by present local residents, and the environment should be protected and enhanced for future generations. • Before massive new development is allowed in Bassingbourn, has SCDC taken into account the vast new housing developments in Royston? • People follow jobs and it would be mutually beneficial for jobs to be re-deployed/created in the north of England. • This field is on a flood plain and flooding has occurred at least twice this year to houses (numbers 88 down) causing numerous problems to the house holders. • Support Site Option 38, however we object to the fact that the remainder of the land promoted was excluded. The entire site represents a suitable
--	--

	<p>location for residential development, subject to design and landscape mitigation measures. We request that the entire site is allocated for residential development, with associated amendments to the development framework boundary. The northern parcel of land has no immediate access to the highway network; but suitable access can be provided if the land to the south is included, which would also deliver a more convenient and accessible link to the village centre for pedestrians. It appears that the only reason the land to the south was excluded was because of alleged landscape and townscape impacts on the conservation area and listed buildings within the village. These are matters that can be overcome by careful design.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site. • Localism and relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans relies on SCDC engaging with Parish Councils to explore ways of meeting local aspirations through the new plan. We support this approach. In turn this requires parish councils to be proactive and ensure the community can contribute within timescales if they wish. We believe it necessary for the district council to encourage parish councils to do this and for them to adopt modern and effective communication systems. • Bassingbourn has poor public transport for which there are no improvement plans. Recent proposals were to reduce or remove services. Whilst there should be some windfall development within the village the focus of development should be more local to Cambridge, including Northstowe, Bourn Airfield, and areas with good public transport services. Development in many south Cambs villages would not be employment led. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. • Croydon Parish Council - Do not use the part of the site where there is flood risk. • Possibly the best site in Bassingbourn as access does not need to use the overcrowded High Street. • The site is high grade agricultural land (Grade 2) and its development would be contrary to the objective of not using such land unless lower grade land or brown field sites do not exist. (The former traveller site at the junction of Meldreth Road and Whitehill Road should be considered as should the future availability Bassingbourn Barracks).
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. The site includes very small areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3a along the western boundary of the site. NPPF Sequential Test applied – other sites in Flood Zone 1 are available. Achieving suitable access would be problematic.</p> <p>Development of the whole of this site is likely to have a major adverse effect on the setting of the Conservation Area and the setting of several Listed Buildings, including the Grade I Listed church, due to the loss of significant open space, the green rural backdrop and the functional link with countryside beyond. The site has significant archaeological potential. Development of</p>

this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area as it would result in the encroachment of built development into the enclosed fields that form a soft edge to the village and form part of the rural setting for the listed buildings and conservation area. The proposed development would be contrary to the pattern of single depth development in the historic core of the village.

Conclusion:

Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.

Settlement:	Bassingbourn		
Site Address:	Land between South End & Spring Lane, Bassingbourn		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 078	Site Option Number:	39 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Limited landscape and townscape impact <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on setting of Listed Buildings • Site access suitability 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 2; Object: 119; Comment: 9</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 responses objected this option specifically. • 7 responses supported development in Bassingbourn, 6 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed Buildings nearby but not significant part of their setting and will not cause harm. • Services within walking distance of site. • Village Classification Report recognise services available in the village. • Suitable access can be achieved. • Environment Agency - We are in support of the proposed sites for allocation. The direction of development is generally in line with the principles of the sequential test of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The site allocations indicated are directing of development to areas of lower risk of flooding. Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. • Cambridgeshire County Council - Development within this location could provide sustainable growth requirements, assessment confirm site is suitable for housing. Part of the site currently leased to Parish Council, County Council will transfer freehold to Parish Council for use as public open space. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn not a sustainable location for development due to lack of employment opportunities in village and the local area. • Increased traffic on Spring Lane, increased danger to pedestrians. • Site at flood risk, and would increase flooding elsewhere. Site contains a spring, with high water table. • High Street cannot cope with additional traffic (the third most notorious blackspot within South Cambs). • Access is poor and development would require demolition of at least one property. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important green space and amenity area, it provides an area for dog-walkers who cannot use the recreation ground. Highly valued by local community. • Impact on biodiversity, wildlife regularly seen. • Provides a green corridor from the broad farmland into the openness of the recreation ground. Development would be detrimental to village character. • Close to Ford Wood which is a protected wood used by walkers and villagers. • It is joined to the recreation ground which is in need of an extension for junior football pitches. • Would impact on historic character of Bassingbourn, including Conservation Area, evidence of historic features on site. • Outside the existing development framework. • Site has been considered before, and rejected. • Becoming a dormitory town rather than a village. • Infrastructure inadequate or close to capacity. • Insufficient capacity in schools and doctors surgery. • No account has been taken of future military use of Bassingbourn Barrack, which could include housing a multi-role brigade. • Poor public transport (could be further reductions). • Focus of development should be on more sustainable locations in the district. • Village has already grown significantly in recent years. • Development already taking place in Royston. • Developments in the Causeway remain unsold. • Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Parish Council – Not suitable due to lack of local employment, lack of infrastructure, traffic congestion and flood risk. No account taken of future of Bassingbourn Barracks. Would alter landscape character. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is ideally located to deliver additional open space in the village; • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. • Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Parish council – Localism requires the District Council to engage with Parish councils proactively. Too often communication is too little too late. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. The site includes a small area within Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b within the eastern section of the site. NPPF Sequential Test applied – other sites in Flood Zone 1 are available. Development of this site would have some adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area as it would result in the encroachment of built development into the enclosed fields that form a soft edge to the village, and would also change the rural character of this area of the village. It would also impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings.</p>

	<p>Consultations have indicated that the site has value as an open space in the village, and following Parish Council representation has been proposed as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Girton

Settlement:	Girton		
Site Address:	Land at Cockerton Road, Girton		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 143	Site Option Number:	40 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential..</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on landscape and townscape and Listed Church 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 2; Object: 10; Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 3 responses supported development in Girton, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site presents an important opportunity to secure new housing development in the village and which would require a revision of the Green Belt boundary • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be rigorously defended; • The site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of north Girton and in particular Cockerton Road; • 15 dwellings would be too dense for the site and would require the new half of Cockerton Road to be completely different in character from the existing half. It would damage the quality of life for existing residents; • Any new development should harmonise with the existing development and not spoil its pleasant character. High urban densities and dwellings above two storeys should not be accepted; • Girton is being surrounded by major developments. Imperative that planning provides green space rather than infilling with unsuitable development. Avoid development adversely affecting village character - loss of green space; • Primary school is oversubscribed, therefore children driven to schools in other villages; 		

- Pressure on the road through Girton to A14 or Huntingdon Road;
- Consider the implications of increased run off towards Beck's Brook and the increase in potential flooding;
- Good connecting fields for birds and other wildlife that would be adversely affected by development. Preserve character of villages - not let them become one amorphous mass with the rest of the large developments nearby;
- Site previously been considered by an Inspector for development, and found not suitable. The location of site and any development is out of character with immediate area and does not relate well to Girton. Our client's site on land off Duck End, Girton, should instead be considered for allocation to include for both affordable and market housing. Site is located adjacent to framework and would provide a logical extension to village. Existing residential curtilage land and more appropriate site for residential dwellings with regards to the existing character of the settlement;
- Serious precedent for similar undesirable developments in the locality which accumulatively would place an undue strain on educational and other community services;
- Would decrease the value of current properties on Cockerton Road. The local infrastructure, especially sewerage and drainage, is over 40 years old and is struggling to cope - the flooding on Dodford Lane is an example of this;
- Petition signed by 19 residents. Green Belt and green "envelope" surrounding the village. Girton Village Plan - defend the Green Belt and retain village identity being eroded from University and NIAB2. Also traffic implications (rat run). Pressure on school places. Adverse impact on character this end of village, spoiling landscape value, and setting of church, listed buildings, and burial ground. Need to preserve separation. Existing services and infrastructure cannot cope. Cramped development out of keeping will spoil character. Edge of site to rear of garden to south not enclosed by dense hedgerow as reported in SHLAA. Doctors no capacity to grow;
- The site cannot be seen as rounding off the existing built up area as it would project out into the green belt and create a new distinct anomaly;
- Non-residents park on Cockerton Road and new houses will mean additional traffic;
- **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council** – Object

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth
- **Comberton Parish Council** – Local residents to determine
- Please consider the noise impact on our village. Already almost intolerable when wind in wrong direction. Noise barriers need to be erected alongside village
- To reduce traffic impact from development access to the A14 East and M11 ought be made possible without travelling into the city. This could be achieved by unrestricting the Madingley Road / M11 junction or a connecting road between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road. The Huntingdon - Histon Road connection would prevent traffic from the North West Cambridge site having to travel into Cambridge. The Girton

	interchange should also be upgraded to improve safety as this area of the city is developed
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site was identified as having limited development potential. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions and an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton. There is currently a clear edge to the village at the end of Cockerton Road. The site has a rural character and provides an important part of the setting of the historic core of the village. The church tower (Grade II* Listed) and two other Listed Buildings are visible to the south. There are other more sustainable sites available for allocation.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Comberton

Settlement:	Comberton		
Site Address:	Land off Long Road (south of Branch Road), Comberton		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 158	Site Option Number:	41 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well screened site, limited landscape impact <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 15; Object: 69; Comment: 14</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 responses objected this option specifically. 4 responses supported development at Comberton, 307 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will have little impact relative to the village size; Less traffic impact on village. Benefits to community include affordable and market housing (and other facilities), and improvements to footpath. Environment Agency - - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt site. Adverse impact on setting scale, and character of Comberton. Elevated land would be visible form wide area; heritage impact – would be visible from Grade 1 Listed Church. Links with wildlife corridors, supporting BAP species; loss of high grade agricultural land; increased flood risk to village. Will reduce community feel; facilities and infrastructure already at capacity (doctors, village centre parking); sewers already overloaded in heavy rain, process of upgrading would be costly and disruptive. Increased traffic (noise, pollution, safety issues); roads and paths incapable of accommodating increased traffic (already village is rat-run to M11); site is not well served by public transport. Impact on Highfield Farm Tourist Campsite; insufficient water supply for 		

	<p>additional development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too far from services in the centre of the village to access on foot; would harm public rights of way. • No mains gas, unsustainable heating. • University of Cambridge - land is elevated and in full view of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory. Housing development would produce interference at radio frequencies which would interfere with the faint signals the Observatory measures. • Comberton Parish Council – strongly object, for reasons including impact on Green Belt and rural character, and on the Lords Bridge Radio Telescope. • Hardwick Parish Council - will overwhelm medical and secondary education facilities which Hardwick residents use. Road connecting villages are unsafe to cycle. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton Parish Council - Any substantial development in Comberton would cause an increase in road traffic through Barton. Would require reduction in speed limits, and additional safety measures; in particular a roundabout would be needed at the junction of B1046 and A603. Development would put pressure on village services in Comberton used by Barton residents. However, increased travel might give an opportunity to resume a more regular 18 bus service throughout the day. • If more houses have to be built in Comberton - the best Site Option 41; • Site 41 is too far from the centre. • Villages need growth over time to avoid stagnation. • If no development there will be a smaller intake of Primary School children from the village, encouraging the school to take children from further afield, more traffic for the village, and consequently for the College. • Any developments, although not ideal or necessary to the village, should be confined to the north of Jane's Estate. • Falling numbers in local schools is not reason for building more houses. • Development should improve the quality of life by ensuring they include off-road parking, open space, play areas, and leisure opportunities including improvements to footpaths and cycling paths. • Should be made available to self-builders. • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Identified as a site with limited development potential. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes regarding the setting, scale and character of Comberton. It would extend further the linear estate housing of Long Road further to the north into open countryside with a strong rural character away from the village centre. Development would have an adverse effect on the landscape setting of Comberton. Concern from Mullard Radio Telescope that it could interfere with observatory.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Comberton		
Site Address:	Land adjacent (north) to 69 Long Road, Comberton		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 004	Site Option Number:	42 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well screened site, limited landscape impact <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 14; Object: 59; Comment: 15</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 responses objected this option specifically. 4 responses supported development at Comberton, 307 objected <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The visual impact on the countryside and Green Belt would be limited given the close association that the development would have to the existing settlement form. The Green Belt boundary to the north of 69 Long Road is not to a defined boundary, but runs through private gardens. The Green Belt boundary should move north to run along a defined field boundary. Development is viable, including allowance for planning obligations. Could provide affordable housing. Drainage and sewerage issues need to be addressed. Convenient location to cycle into Cambridge - people do not have to use cars therefore less impact on road infrastructure. Close to village facilities. Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support. Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased flood risk. Increasing size and status of village will reduce community feel. Removed from village, on busy road and ribbon development. Traffic - so much more traffic since Cambourne, and speeds dangerously through village. Dangerous, noisy and degrade quality of life. Increased traffic would have an unmanageable negative effect to villages along B1046 corridor. Already, queues can back into Barton. Expansion of housing should be located on A roads which are near or easily in reach 		

	<p>of business locations, like the science park etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient water supply and increased financial risk. • Too far from the services in the centre of the village for access on foot (and lacks foot or bicycle path access). • Comberton small village serviced by B road and minor road. Infrequent bus services. Sites are mainly high grade agricultural land and Green Belt - will create urban sprawl. Land primarily clay and does not drain well. Strain on amenities. Further expansion would take away village character. • Sewage system at capacity and unable to cope. Properties flooded with foul water. New pumping station insufficient. Unacceptable and dangerous to health. Site options 41 & 42 at the highest point in village, will have a major effect on Barton Road, Swaynes Lane and Thornbury with respect flooding. No mains gas and rely on oil, unsustainable. Electricity supply subject to power cuts. Increase traffic. Barton road becoming increasingly dangerous. • The vast majority (over 95%) of Comberton residents oppose the SCDC plans for development in Comberton (at site references 004, 110, 158 and 255) and oppose the proposal to change Comberton from group village status. • Loss of agricultural land. • Comberton Parish Council - OBJECT if not treated as an EXCEPTION site, AGREED if taken as an EXCEPTION SITE (for affordable housing available to local residents). Development would have a minor impact on upon Green Belt purposes regarding the setting and character of Comberton by increasing the footprint of the built village envelope out into the open rural countryside. The long distance from village facilities and public transport may be an issue. • Pupil numbers in Comberton is predicted to fall with new school in Cambourne. New pupils can be sought from surrounding villages, they don't have to live in Comberton itself. • Present health centre just about cope with demand, often parking problems in Green End. Surgery would face significant problems and traffic problems would become impossible. • Hardwick Parish Council - Expansion of Comberton will overwhelm medical and secondary education facilities which Hardwick residents use. Roads connecting villages are unsafe for children to cycle to Comberton Village College and will become more dangerous with more traffic. Lack of safe cycle lanes, which would improve the health of children, reduce carbon emissions and save transport costs • Wish to preserve the rural heritage of our village. • As there is hardly any infrastructure in Comberton or in the villages further west the vast majority of working people must commute into Cambridge contributing to the daily congestion. Knowingly adding to that congestion by encouraging the provision of more housing, without employment prospects locally would be unwise. • Houses on St Thomas Close lower than allotments on Long Road and water floods straight off land through the estate. A regular occurrence. • Public transport is limited during daytime and non-existent during evening. No direct way by public transport to get to proposed new jobs on north of Cambridge.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children walk or cycle to school (CVC) in village; crossing Barton Road near Horizon Park where there is no speed limit; some days they have to wait several minutes for a break in the traffic; what's it going to be like if more traffic? • Any new housing required for the foreseeable future in the South Cambs area will be easily met by the current developments around Trumpington, Northstowe and Cambourne. In due course Bourn airfield and new town at Waterbeach military base will be developed with all the amenities required. • Better sites than Comberton, in places which are already bigger and could absorb larger developments more easily or where new and suitable infrastructures can be built as part of the development. Better transport links would result in less impact on environment as less reliant on cars. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth • Suggest any developments necessary to the village are confined to the north of Jane's Estate, thereby reducing the congestion to the centre and that retail/pharmacy facilities are included on this 'out of village' site. • Barton Parish Council - Any substantial development in Comberton would cause an increase in road traffic through Barton. Would require reduction in speed limits, and additional safety measures; in particular a roundabout would be needed at the junction of B1046 and A603. Development would put pressure on village services in Comberton used by Barton residents. However, increased travel might give an opportunity to resume a more regular 18 bus service throughout the day. • Caldecote Parish Council - Comberton. Site option 41-44 29% support. • Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the Univ. of Cambridge - Site Option 42 is located within the Lord's Bridge Restricted Area (Policy SF/8). Housing on Site Option 42 would not affect the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory provided the height of development does not exceed the roofline of adjoining houses to the south • Site 42. This site benefits from easy access to Long Road and Barton Road, keeping the heavy lorries etc. out of the village • Site 42 is small and can readily be fitted in. • Support some development in Comberton, especially affordable housing. • Without development in the village there will be a smaller intake of Primary School children from village, encouraging school to take children from further afield, more traffic for village, and consequently for College.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Small site at the furthest northern extent of the village. Development would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes regarding the setting, scale and character of Comberton. Development of this site would extend the linear estate housing of Long Road further to the north into open countryside with a strong rural character away from the village centre. There are other more sustainable sites available for allocation.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Comberton		
Site Address:	Land to the east of Bush Close, Comberton		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 255	Site Option Number:	43 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well screened site, limited landscape impact <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertainty regarding site access arrangements 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 14; Object: 70; Comment: 14</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 responses objected this option specifically. 4 responses supported development at Comberton, 307 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development is achievable; Would contribute to meeting local affordable housing needs; Access would have to be via the Drift; Environment Agency - - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt Loss of agricultural land; Heritage impact, close of Conservation area and Grade 1 listed church, part of historic setting of the village; Impact on rural character, scale, and setting of village; Increased flood risk, surface water drainage problems; Will reduce community feel; Facilities and infrastructure already at capacity (doctors, village centre parking, open space); Sewers already overloaded in heavy rain, process of upgrading would be costly and disruptive. Pressurised system, no connection could be made; Increased traffic (noise, pollution, safety issues); Roads and paths incapable of accommodating increased traffic (already village is rat-run to M11), and unsafe for cycling; Lack of suitable access. Access difficulties on Bush close, including due to parked cars. Mini roundabout would not be able to cope; 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is not well served by public transport; • Insufficient water supply for additional development; • Too far from services in the centre of the village to access on foot; • Would harm public rights of way (the Drift); • Swaynes Lane area often used by dog walkers, and for recreation (under stewardship scheme); • Impact on wildlife and biodiversity, supports a wide variety of species; • No mains gas, unsustainable heating; • Significant cost factors would impact on deliverability; • Significantly larger than village hierarchy suggests; • Comberton Parish Council – strongly object, for reasons including impact on Green Belt and rural character, and a range of other issues which means the site has no development potential. • Hardwick Parish Council - will overwhelm medical and secondary education facilities which Hardwick residents use. Road connecting villages are unsafe to cycle. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages need growth over time to avoid stagnation; • Any developments, although not ideal or necessary to the village, should be confined to the north of Jane's Estate; • Falling numbers in local schools is not reason for building more houses; • If no development there will be a smaller intake of Primary School children from the village, encouraging the school to take children from further afield, more traffic for the village, and consequently for the College. • Development should improve the quality of life by ensuring they include off-road parking, open space, play areas, and leisure opportunities including improvements to footpaths and cycling paths. • Should be made available to self builders; • Reasonably close to central cross roads; • Barton Parish Council - Any substantial development in Comberton would cause an increase in road traffic through Barton. Would require reduction in speed limits, and additional safety measures; in particular a roundabout would be needed at the junction of B1046 and A603. Development would put pressure on village services in Comberton used by Barton residents. However, increased travel might give an opportunity to resume a more regular 18 bus service throughout the day. • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site; • University of Cambridge – within the restricted area, but would not affect observatory if height did not exceed surrounding development;
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Evidence indicates that it is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site and it is not linked to the adopted public highway. The SHLAA assessment and Sustainability Appraisal have been revised in light of comments received from an objector, such that the site is no longer considered to have development potential.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Comberton		
Site Address:	Land to the west of Birdlines, Manor Farm, Comberton		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 110	Site Option Number:	44 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse impact on Green Belt purposes, landscape setting and setting of Listed Buildings. Capable of mitigation by limiting development to a part of the site 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 10; Object: 80; Comment:15</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 responses objected this option specifically. • 4 responses supported development at Comberton, 307 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development • Development should be organic, led by market forces, not driven by the state. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites earmarked for new housing are not suitable. • Increased flood risk. • Increasing size and status of village will greatly reduce community feel. More people is more likely to fragment. Villages like Comberton are already losing their uniqueness due to expansion. • Traffic - so much more traffic since Cambourne, and speeds dangerously through village. Dangerous, noisy and degrade quality of life. • Insufficient water supply and increased financial risk. East of England's water supply is over-subscribed - water shortages and financial risk to developers and utility companies is very high. Needs to be addressed at national and regional as well as local levels to develop a more sustainable long-term water strategy. • Access difficulties - traffic arising would need to travel through the village to exit and come into conflict with children going to school. There would be no access for construction traffic. • Conflicts with Policy SF/8 Lords Bridge Restricted Area. 		

- Adverse effect on quality of life of existing residents.
- Adverse impact on overstretched facilities i.e. roads, doctors, sewers; and effect on amenities such as existing footpaths. Doctors surgery nearly full. Pressure on recreation facilities at Hines Lane.
- Small village serviced by B-road and minor road. Infrequent bus services. A narrow winding road feeding village centre from A603. Then exit onto B road through village is not easy in peak times and accident spot. Birdlines only narrow access into South Street - problematical. No direct public highway access to the site - any access would increase traffic either on a bendy rural road or through an existing residential estate.
- Increase traffic. Barton road becoming increasingly dangerous - large numbers speeding through village. Single car width due to parking.
- Children walk or cycle to school (CVC) in village; crossing Barton Road near Horizon Park where there is no speed limit; some days they have to wait several minutes for a break in the traffic.
- Access via South Street is wholly inappropriate as this is a very narrow lane and floods frequently. Additional traffic will make the crossroads a busier junction and more dangerous to the ducks.
- Access via Birdlines Manor Farm track on South Street but will increase traffic on Royston Lane - narrow, used by large farm vehicles, bends and speeding traffic.
- The flow of traffic through from Comberton to the A603 in the mornings is already at full capacity -extra traffic should not be added to this route
- Bush Close - Difficult to pass a car in various parts of the Lane. The turning in front of the pub is a difficult area. Traffic comes round quite fast at times and there is little chance to see it.
- High grade agricultural land and Green Belt.
- Will create urban sprawl. Further expansion would take away village character.
- Low lying, adjacent to drainage brook. Land primarily clay and does not drain well.
- Wildlife in the field and adjacent countryside.
- Sewage system at capacity and unable to cope. Properties flooded with foul water. New pumping station insufficient. Unacceptable and dangerous to health. The plot is listed by insurance companies as land that floods.
- No mains gas and rely on oil, unsustainable. Electricity supply subject to power cuts.
- Development would have an adverse effect on the rural character and landscape setting of Comberton - the site makes a separation between the historic settlement and the modern development, and the Lot Way overlooks the site; the site is close to heritage sites - St Marys Conservation Area and the settings of the church group and the listed buildings at Birdlines Manor.
- Building will spoil character of existing village and rural landscape, especially when viewed from the open countryside (green belt) looking toward the village from Lot Way.
- Development of the site would be likely to make the flooding of Tit Brook even more serious; there is a geologically unstable drift boundary through the site that has caused shear stress damage to nearby houses.
- This land has a wide and diverse wildlife environment, including reed

	<p>buntings, hares, rooks, owls, rookeries, wood peckers, bats and starlings. Loss of wildlife and 'soft' rural edge to village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to compensate homeowners who will be affected by the proposed developments being built in their back garden? Reduction in property value due to proposals. • Suggest if any development in Comberton should be north of Jane's Estate. • The council are ruining village life rather than developing community spirit and diversity. Many have said they would leave Comberton if a plan of such magnitude are fulfilled. • Comberton Parish Council - Site is in full view of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Site and falls within the restricted area for the Lordsbridge Radio Telescope. Mitigation would appear to be impossible. Development would also have an adverse impact on upon Green Belt purposes regarding the setting, scale and character of Comberton by increasing the footprint of the village out into the open rural countryside, by the loss of the views down into the village from the south, and by causing a loss of rural character." Development would be negative from environmental and heritage considerations. • Concerned about location of access on South Street. Corner subject to flooding. Several tight bends and hill on a narrow road, awkward for traffic, and no provision for cycling. Extra traffic would not be sensible. Central crossroads narrow road means pedestrians restricted to one side on the road - heavily used route to school. Long and thin site and existing housing backs onto it along entire length - detrimental effect on large number of residents. • Negative impact on existing households, over 30 houses would be negatively affected in terms of rural view, house price, tranquillity and loss of rural lifestyle. • Building even partially on site 44 would be a disaster - access and environmental impacts preclude these areas totally. • Croydon Parish Council - If Green Belt purposes are to be maintained, this site must not be developed. • Roads - Popular Toft footpath feeds onto Royston Lane, also used by horse riders links to bridle path at Foxes Bridge Farm. Tit Brook, currently floods Royston Lane. • Sites have geological issues, namely impervious gault clay that exacerbates flooding on the low lying flat sites of flood plains. Site 44 also has unstable river terrace/ gault clay drift boundary at the east end of the site, that has caused serious damage to houses which straddle boundary. Landform is river basin catchment composed of gault clay and till, responsible for constant flooding problems on flood plains of southern border of village. • Land should be considered an area of natural beauty with uninterrupted views to the treetops at the edge of Barrington village, an area used frequently by walkers and villagers for exercise and leisure • Hardwick Parish Council - Expansion of Comberton will overwhelm medical and secondary education facilities which Hardwick residents use. Roads connecting villages are unsafe for children to cycle to Comberton Village College and will become more dangerous with more traffic. Lack of safe cycle lanes, which would improve the health of children, reduce
--	---

carbon emissions and save transport costs.

- We wish to preserve the rural heritage of our village.
- As there is hardly any infrastructure in Comberton or in the villages further west the vast majority of working people must commute into Cambridge contributing to the daily congestion. Knowingly adding to that congestion by encouraging the provision of more housing, without employment prospects locally would be unwise.
- Comberton chosen because it has a school - not a good reason.
- Better sites than Comberton exist that could be planned and developed sustainably, such as MOD Bassingbourn.
- Limit the development of Comberton, we want to live in a small community. Should remain as a village.
- More imaginative solutions. Address problem of unoccupied houses. Building two (houses) on plots within villages rather than one massive one.
- Full use of brownfield sites should be made rather than eroding the green belt.
- Should a person desire to live in a more built up 'rural' area they can choose to live in a new development such as Cambourne, Bar Hill or Northstowe. Leave old established villages as just that - villages. This leaves everyone with a choice.
- Any new housing required for the foreseeable future in the South Cambs area will be easily met by the current developments around Trumpington, Northstowe and Cambourne. In due course Bourn airfield and new town at Waterbeach military base will be developed with all the amenities required.
- **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council** – object.

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site.
- I have no problem with affordable housing - needed for young people to start on property ladder but larger developments would alter ambiance of village, and infrastructure could not cope. Traffic coming through Comberton is considerable, not helped by parking on either side of Barton Road. People who work or going to work in Cambridge in future will wish to live nearby but large scale development in Comberton would spoil this lovely rural town and Green Belt should be protected for future generations.
- **Barton Parish Council** - Any substantial development in Comberton would cause an increase in road traffic through Barton. Would require reduction in speed limits, and additional safety measures; in particular a roundabout would be needed at the junction of B1046 and A603. Development would put pressure on village services in Comberton used by Barton residents. However, increased travel might give an opportunity to resume a more regular 18 bus service throughout the day.
- **Caldecote Parish Council** - Comberton. Site option 41-44 29% support.
- **Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the Univ. of Cambridge** - Site Option 44 is located within the Lord's Bridge Restricted Area (Policy SF/8). Site Option 44 is largely well-screened from the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory and there are no objections in principle to the

	<p>development of low-rise housing at this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not opposed to some further development in Comberton, but: falling numbers in local schools is not reason for building more houses. School rolls decline for other reasons. Building more houses would not rectify such issues. • Development should improve the quality of life by ensuring they include off-road parking, open space, play areas, and leisure opportunities including improvements to footpaths and cycling paths; infrastructure and plot layout should be established, and building plots made available for purchase by self-builders or local, independent builders. This will achieve variety of housing materials and design (including "affordable" houses). • Expansion of the village is inevitable, but must be controlled. All new houses should be limited to 2-storey as a maximum. Site 44 acceptable as reasonably close to the central crossroads. This means that the expansion can be in controlled stages, and the designs can all vary as they are on the edge. • Would like to see some development in Comberton, especially affordable housing. • If we stay as we are there will be a smaller intake of Primary School children from village, encouraging school to take children from further afield, more traffic for village, and consequently for College. • There is overwhelming (local) support for building on viable new settlements (including Waterbeach/Bourn Airfield). • Use of green land for development will have detrimental impact on environment and will reduce the rural feel of the village. Effects on land drainage, wildlife and CO2/thermal emissions would be disastrous. Infrequent buses, limited routes and cuts in timetables mean residents rely on cars, having negative environmental pollution impact. Infrastructure, including roads, schools, doctor's surgery and community facilities would struggle to cope. Better sites than Comberton, in places which are already bigger and could absorb larger developments more easily or where new and suitable infrastructures can be built as part of the development. Better transport links would result in less impact on environment as less reliant on cars.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site assessments acknowledged that site had limited potential and only a part of the site could potentially be developed in order to mitigate landscape and historic impacts.</p> <p>Evidence now indicates that it is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site and it is not linked to the adopted public highway. The SHLAA assessment and Sustainability Appraisal have been revised in light of comments received from an objector, such that the site is no longer considered to have development potential.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Comberton		
Site Address:	Land at Bennell Farm, West Street		
SHLAA Reference:	326	Site Option Number:	H10 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting if existing soft green edge retained. Submission proposes development at a low density to match local character. Good accessibility to a range of employment opportunities. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 15; Object: 102; Comment: 19</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To meet 5 year land supply targets. Can be well integrated with village, if well designed and not too large. Proposal for overflow car park for Village College at busy times which will alleviate existing parking problems in residential streets at this end of village; Site can be developed without adverse landscape impact and demonstrates that a low density solution to the redevelopment of this site can be achieved. Well-served by supporting facilities and local bus services. Near to village college. Available, suitable, achievable and deliverable. Site scores exceptionally well in the Council's Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2013). On-site surface water drainage systems are achievable. Drainage and sewer problems should not be made worse. Would need to address landscape impacts; It would appear to be a better option than the other sites identified in Comberton. Would bring further employment to the village. Meet needs for affordable housing. Toft Parish Council – Supports some development, but currently too large. Need to demonstrate infrastructure able to cope. Conditional support as could help meet affordable housing needs of Toft residents. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erosion of Green Belt. Outside the existing Village Framework. Grade 2/3 agricultural land. Sewage infrastructure inadequate. Unable to cope with any more development Since provision of mains drainage in Comberton and Toft there have been countless problems with flooding from foul water manholes - into gardens in Barton Road and Swaynes Lane. In many areas of Comberton the sewage is "managed" by being taken away by 		

- large trucks because the piped infrastructure cannot cope.
- Site frequently waterlogged due to the low lying nature of the site and the geology of the heavy soil type.
 - Increased risk of water flooding from Tit Brook into South Street.
 - Rainwater runoff, from the land to the North of H10, drains through Kentings and to the field to the south, which is prone to flooding. If development is successful the concreting over of this large area will increase the rainwater runoff.
 - Flooding often occurs along Barton Road, east of mini roundabout.
 - Excess waste water from Cambourne causes flooding downstream in Comberton and other places.
 - Poor public transport to/from areas of work and recreational activities at evenings/weekends.
 - There are no cycle paths to NW Cambridge.
 - Increased traffic, noise, and pollution.
 - The minor road (B1046) is already very busy at peak times and is also subject to a lot of rat running by heavy lorries, commercial vehicles and other traffic.
 - Traffic pressures on West Street, especially at morning / afternoon school times. Road too narrow and too many bikes / school children to be safe for increase in traffic.
 - Barton Road/West St. - narrow road. No off-street parking and small car park of local shop often overflowing - traffic jams.
 - The entry and exit roads to the village are already in a poor state and badly maintained
 - Increased traffic in Barton.
 - Comberton is Group Village.
 - No jobs in Comberton. Increased commuting.
 - Lack of shopping facilities / services.
 - No mains gas.
 - All objections to other option sites in Comberton, related to sustainability, ability of the village to absorb further significant developments and the lowland landscape are relevant here.
 - Comberton village is not suitable for housing development of this scale; this size of settlement should be restricted to brownfield sites with appropriate amenities and infrastructure.
 - Medical centre at capacity.
 - Unfair and unreasonable that Toft could receive the benefits and Comberton carry the cost.
 - The Comberton/Toft parish boundary should be changed so that Comberton Village College and possibly Bennell Farm are inside Comberton.
 - Currently attractive pastoral land and adds greatly to the rural character of Comberton.
 - An impossible situation for Comberton financially- for infrastructure etc.
 - The proposed development is too large; it would damage the rural character and village atmosphere of Comberton.
 - Important to keep the village compact by preventing its gradual creep along the B1046 and the eventual merger with Toft.
 - Comberton is an historic village that has a linear plan-form, but this has been eroded through developments in depth.

- Impact on biodiversity.
- Applications for development on this site have been rejected and there must be compelling reasons before this policy is changed.
- The area outside and around the Village College is already congested with traffic at peak times and often dangerous with problematic exit from the College itself.
- Already have additional housing near The Valley.
- Restricting development due to arbitrary appraisal of settlement's 'sustainability' tick box assessment of services criticised in report Living Working Countryside: Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing.
- Sites in Toft preferable to no loss of Green Belt, being forced into consideration due to strategy approach of rejecting infill villages.
- **CPRE** - Object to loss of Green Belt.
- **Comberton Parish Council** – Significant majority of residents object to development in and adjacent to Comberton. Erosion of the Green Belt. Impact on already overloaded sewage system in Comberton. Poor public transport to/from areas of work and recreational activities at evenings/weekends. Lack of village (retail) facilities. Increased risk of water flooding from Tit Brook into South Street. Additional traffic through the village, mitigation through perhaps an enlarged Parish Boundary to permit both funding and local representation at Parish / District level.
- **Haslingfield Parish Council, Harlton Parish Council** – Object to loss of Green Belt.

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth.
- **English Heritage** – village has historic linear character. Some limited housing fronting onto west street might be possible without harming local character.
- **Natural England** – notes site in Green Belt.
- Probably a good location as long as this is the only development.
- **Barton Parish Council** – Need to ensure calming and reduction of traffic through Barton. Provision of cycleway in Comberton.
- No objection on proviso that infrastructure is sorted out.
- Site was suggested for affordable houses and car park for Village College - very beneficial to village and would be least painful of five sites proposed in Comberton.
- Recent flooding in east of village e.g. Swaynes Lane is unacceptable.
- Need to ensure calming and reduction of commuter traffic through Barton and provision of cycleway in Comberton.
- The problem of it being in Toft parish should be resolved by moving the parish boundary westward to the edge of the Comberton built-up area.
- Traffic calming measures near the Village College the position of the exit onto West Street would need careful consideration.
- This site is preferable to the alternatives because;
 - well screened from West Street and on approach from Toft and adjacent the existing village college area, adjacent to the bus route in West Street and would not generate access traffic through existing housing.
- May be acceptable if it provided for local Affordable Housing needs for

	<p>the foreseeable future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be decided by local opinion.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Although located at a Minor Rural Centre, the site offers specific opportunities.</p> <p>Part of the site to be used to provide public benefits which could include parking for Comberton Village College and for recreation use, and the affordable housing provision to be of equal benefit to the villages of Toft and Comberton.</p> <p>The site is surrounded by mature boundary landscaping comprising hedgerows and trees which effectively hide it from view. Development of the site to a lower density to merge into this part of the village would have little impact on the landscape and townscape setting of the village and would not impinge upon the linear nature of development in the most historic parts of the village. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation. Sustainable Drainage Systems to be used to ensure water run-off from the site is no worse than the existing situation. Site available immediately and capable of delivering houses in the short-term.</p> <p>Conclusion: Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Papworth Everard

Settlement:	Papworth Everard		
Site Address:	Papworth Hospital, Papworth Everard		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 151	Site Option Number:	45 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential. Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuses previously developed land • Scope to improve local environment • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of employment land • Risk to settings of listed buildings 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 23; Object: 7; Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 responses supported development at Papworth Everard <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should remain an employment site. • Too much development already in the area at Cambourne. • Arrington Parish Council - The A1198, already a very busy road, would not be able to take further traffic from developments south of Cambridge. • Papworth Everard Parish Council - The existing site-specific policy for Papworth Hospital should be included in the new Local Plan. Must be used predominantly for provision of new employment. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. • Wildlife Trust – Consider impacts on Papworth Wood SSSI. Nearest open space, but susceptible to inappropriate recreation uses. Residential would create greater pressures than employment. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine, note that it is a brownfield site. 		

<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site is currently allocated for reuse or redevelopment for employment uses in the Site Specific Policies DPD (Policy SP/10) - requires a sequential approach to finding suitable replacement uses, starting with healthcare then employment uses within the B1 use class. The draft Local Plan will continue to include a policy for the redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses to avoid furthering the imbalance between jobs and housing in the village.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

Willingham

Settlement:	Willingham		
Site Address:	Land east of 39-65 Rockmill End, Willingham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 045 (part)	Site Option Number:	46 ((I&O1))
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited impact on landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 4; Object: 6; Comment: 2</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 responses referenced this option specifically. 1 response supported development at Willingham, 5 objected . <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is available, suitable, achievable and can be brought forward at an early stage in the period of the emerging Local Plan. The site is a logical urban extension to Willingham being in a sustainable location which is accessible in terms of public transport and key facilities within the settlement; Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support; Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional traffic volumes and congestion resulting from development as far out as Cottenham and Willingham - especially on the B1049, and particularly at the junction of the B1049 with the A14. Loss of valuable agricultural land. Inadequate local facilities to cope with increase in housing. Northstowe should be developed with further new housing development in New Towns; Development needs to be focussed in Longstanton to ensure that it retains its identity. Small-scale development within that village will provide a boost to the population in an established community while providing an economic boost to local services. SHLAA Site 002 can provide development early in the plan period close to existing amenities in the village centre and is better located in relation to existing facilities 		

	<p>than this site option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development has too high a housing density figure, would place additional pressure on local services and would significantly impact on the character of this part of Willingham. • Highly valued outdoor space for local people walking to escape the busier parts of the village centre. There is also a large allotment site which would have to be relocated. • Significant problems with traffic, poor bus service despite completion of Guided Busway • The site is not suitable for development as it is located some way from existing services and facilities and its development does not reflect the immediate character of this part of Willingham. • Previously rejected site. • The development of this site would be visually intrusive and does not relate well to existing residential dwellings and the built up framework of the village. • Rampton Parish Council - Increase in the size of Willingham will increase the traffic load through Rampton. • Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Willingham. And it is outside the village envelope. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth • Comberton Parish Council - Local residents to determine
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Whilst located at a Minor Rural Centre, the site offers particular opportunities to warrant its allocation.</p> <p>Site capable of integrating development into the village with minimal impacts to the historic and natural environment, landscape and townscape through careful design, including the creation of a significant landscape buffer to provide a soft green village edge. Although there will be additional pressure on infrastructure and utilities, these will be capable of mitigation, including a contribution to additional local school capacity. Site available immediately and capable of delivering houses in the short-term.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Willingham		
Site Address:	Land to the rear of Green Street, Willingham		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 204	Site Option Number:	47 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to local services and facilities • Scope to mitigate adverse impacts by development of part of the site only <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on townscape and character of Conservation Area • Impact on setting of Listed Buildings 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 2; Object:6; Comment: 2</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 1 responses supported development at Willingham, 5 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional traffic and congestion on B1049. • Impact on listed building and Conservation Area. • Adverse impact on landscape and townscape. • Site is not deliverable, site would be difficult to assemble. • Rampton Parish Council – Increase traffic load through Rampton; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine, note the impact on heritage. 		
Council's Response and Conclusion:	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site with limited development potential. Adverse impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and a adverse impact on the setting of several Listed Buildings. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Willingham. Site in multiple land ownership would make deliverability more difficult. There are other more sustainable sites available for allocation.</p>		

	Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.
--	--

Waterbeach

Settlement:	Waterbeach		
Site Address:	Cody Road, Waterbeach		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 089 and 189	Site Option Number:	48 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot • Limited impacts on landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would reduce separation from Barracks 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 6; Object: 13; Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represents a suitable location for residential development. We request that the site is allocated for residential development, with associated amendments to the development framework boundary. • Acceptable disbenefit. • Good alternative to a new village/town on MoD land. • Already has good infrastructure and easy access to public transport. • Small development, seems reasonable. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach is a traditional agricultural village and not a suburb of Cambridge; pockets of agricultural land should not be sacrificed; the site provides an amenity for the village and also a wildlife habitat, and agricultural land for food production; the hedge between the Levitt Lane development and the option 48 field should be preserved; the sparrow population has decreased noticeably since a previous hedge at 34 Bannold Road was removed. Specimen trees in gardens are not a substitute for established hedges for providing habitat. • Waterbeach Parish Council – Object on the basis that there is a need for green space in this part of Waterbeach and that its development 		

- would increase pressure on Bannold Road and Way Lane.
- Would remove the current buffer between the village and the barracks site. All three Waterbeach sites "with development potential" are adjacent to a possible new town. Given the uncertainty regarding a new town, further consideration should be given to proposals so close to such a large development.
 - Bannold Road has just had a development of 100 houses (Levitts Lane), most of it on brownfield land.
 - Development on the site would reduce separation from the Barracks. Street scene change from rural to urban - disappearance of habitat and worsening of life quality for residents. Continued disruption from development. Eroding of footpath and additional traffic will affect road safety - dangerous to cycle or walk.
 - Green Belt and grade A agricultural land.
 - Traffic congestion worsened by parking outside doctors.
 - Precedent for losing green buffer between village and barracks. Village boundary should remain as is.
 - If Site Option 4 is adopted, village boundary at Bannold Road should not change and retain green separation.
 - Site is Greenfield (green lung) between the village and barracks (or new settlement), separation between them should be maintained. When Morris Homes development built off Bannold Road, a buffer strip was included between it and this field, to build up to it would not make sense. Site is a Greenfield on northern edge of Waterbeach and this boundary should be maintained.
 - Site 48 is low lying and subject to flooding, particularly behind 41, 43 and 45 Bannold Road.
 - Bannold Road will change from rural to urban, disappearance of habitats and worsening of life quality.
 - Only 2 buses per day will increase traffic.
 - Noise from waste treatment unit increased with every house built. Over capacity - large numbers of Tanker movements.
 - Flood plain - increase potential for flooding.
 - Abundance of vacant properties on barracks - further infill unnecessary. Barracks brownfield site - could provide 900 homes and access to A10 without driving through village, or detrimental impact on rural character of village.
 - Outside village envelope.

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth.
- **Comberton Parish Council** - Local residents to determine.
- This site should be considered in conjunction with the assessment of Waterbeach as the site of a major new settlement.
- **The National Trust** - When considering development at Waterbeach the Council should recognise there is a potential opportunity to create a more direct access to the Wicken Vision to serve the informal open space needs of the growing population. Currently the River Cam provides a barrier. A new bridge and upgrading of the footpath network would help serve the local community and would assist in delivering the strategic Green Infrastructure objectives for the Vision area(as identified in the

	Recreation & Open Space study and the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Study).
Council's Response and Conclusion:	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>The new local plan proposes a new town north of Waterbeach. Sites in this area should remain open to assist in maintaining the village character of Waterbeach. The plan proposes to extend the Green Belt in this area to achieve this goal.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Waterbeach		
Site Address:	Land at Bannold Road and Bannold Drove, Waterbeach		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 206	Site Option Number:	49 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot • Limited impacts on landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for noise and odour from farm 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 6; Object: 7; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 responses referenced this option specifically. • 5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The farm (and odour) is in the nature of a village community; • Site is available and deliverable in early stages of the plan period; • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first; • Waterbeach Parish Council - No objection to this site. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt. • Impact on rural character. • Loss of buffer between village and barracks. • Loss of agricultural land. • Impact on wildlife and biodiversity. • Hedgerows in the area should be preserved. • Odour issues due to farm to the east. • Noise level from waste treatment unit and over capacity. • Additional traffic, poor public transport. • Already vacant properties available following departure of the army. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be considered in conjunction with new settlement site. • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site. • National Trust – Should recognise opportunities to improve access to 		

	<p>Wicken Fen Vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>The new local plan proposes a new town north of Waterbeach. Sites in this area should remain open to assist in maintaining the village character of Waterbeach. The plan proposes to extend the Green Belt in this area to achieve this goal.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Waterbeach		
Site Address:	North side of Bannold Road, Waterbeach		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 155	Site Option Number:	50 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot • Limited impacts on landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would reduce separation from Barracks 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 6; Object: 7; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 response referenced this option specifically. • 5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Barracks separation from which was desired by planning officers are no more. Smaller development on this land together with only building on the built area of the barracks (smallest development size) would be preferred to building large or medium scale new town on the north edge of barracks. • Acceptable disbenefit. • Part of Site Option 50, is within our clients control and together with their additional land to the north is well-positioned site that will allow growth within Waterbeach on a manageable scale. Site is adjacent to dwellings and sits adjacent to built up area. Would allow comprehensively planned development which provides greater link between village and Barracks, encouraging two areas to feel like one community, without coalescence. Sustainable site offers opportunity to add housing without having detrimental impact on setting. Smaller scale as opposed large developments suggested within other Options, including 'new settlement' to north of Waterbeach, likely to result in housing being delivered within next 5 years as the impact and required infrastructure is less. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Support • Waterbeach Parish Council – No objection. • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach is a traditional agricultural village and not a suburb of 		

	<p>Cambridge; pockets of agricultural land should not be sacrificed; hedgerows in this area should be preserved: the sparrow population has decreased noticeably since a previous hedge at 34 Bannold Road was removed, and there is wildlife in the drainage pond adjacent to the Levitt Lane development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the site would reduce separation from the Barracks • Bannold Road will change from rural to urban, disappearance of habitats and worsening of life quality. • Only 2 buses per day will increase traffic. Noise from waste treatment unit increased with every house built. Over capacity - large numbers of Tanker movements. Flood plain - increase potential for flooding. • Abundance of vacant properties on barracks - further infill unnecessary. Barracks brownfield site - could provide 900 homes and access to A10 without driving through village, or detrimental impact on rural character of village. Outside village envelope. • It does seem silly to consider the building of new houses on undeveloped land when there are many perfectly good houses standing empty as a result of the closure of the army barracks. It would make sense to utilise these houses, or to wait until the future of the army land is decided, before building on farm land. • Lovely entrance to countryside and popular with walkers and cyclists. Site 50 has many trees and hedgerows which would be lost. Loss of soft Fen edge. Need to retain village character with Barracks development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Comberton Parish Council - Local residents to determine. • This site should be considered in conjunction with the assessment of Waterbeach as the site of a major new settlement. • The National Trust - When considering development at Waterbeach the Council should recognise there is a potential opportunity to create a more direct access to the Wicken Vision to serve the informal open space needs of the growing population. Currently the River Cam provides a barrier. A new bridge and upgrading of the footpath network would help serve the local community and would assist in delivering the strategic Green Infrastructure objectives for the Vision area(as identified in the Recreation & Open Space study and the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Study). • This site should be considered in conjunction with the assessment of Waterbeach as the site of a major new settlement.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>The new local plan proposes a new town north of Waterbeach. Sites in this area should remain open to assist in maintaining the village character of Waterbeach. The plan proposes to extend the Green Belt in this area to achieve this goal.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Waterbeach		
Site Address:	Land off Lode Avenue, Waterbeach		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 001	Site Option Number:	51 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot • Limited impacts on landscape setting <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited flood risk to half of site • Railway noise 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 2; Object: 4; Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 response referenced this option specifically. • 5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; • Waterbeach Parish Council - No objection to this site, not object to site 48 (Cody Road); <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk on part of the site; • Difficult access; • Noise from railway; • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be considered in conjunction with new settlement site; • Anglian Water – There is capacity to serve the site; • National Trust – Should recognise opportunities to improve access to Wicken Fen Vision; • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine. 		
Council's Response and Conclusion:	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Does not avoid land at risk of flooding – Flood Zone 2. NPPF Sequential Test applied – other sites in Flood Zone 1 are available.</p>		

	<p>Site with limited development potential identified for consultation. There are other more sustainable sites available for allocation.</p> <p>Conclusion: Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>
--	---

Settlement:	Waterbeach		
Site Address:	Land off Cambridge Road, Waterbeach		
SHLAA Reference:	Site 202 (part)	Site Option Number:	52 (I&O1)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt • Impact on landscape setting unless development limited to Cambridge Road frontage 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 5; Object: 15; Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses to Question 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 response supported this option specifically. • 5 responses supported development in Waterbeach, 1 objected. <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land between Car Dyke Rd and A10 by its nature of being skimmed by a link road does not appear as rural land. The only "aspect impact" would be from back window of a couple of rows of the houses on Cambridge Rd. The way the Car Dyke Road was laid out, to a passer-by this land does appear as set aside for development. Limiting a density of buildings should prevent loss of vistas allowing for a more "tapered" ending of the village, bringing the village boundary to more natural site; • The evidence base illustrates it is the most sustainable option for accommodating residential development on the edge of the village. The site is also deliverable and accessible to the highway network; • Waterbeach Parish Council – No objection; • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential) are potentially at risk of flooding (on the edge of Flood Zone 2). Developers will need to investigate flood risk on a site specific basis and apply appropriate mitigation measures as may be required. Any new development within the site boundary should be directed away from flood risk sensitive areas. This may result in the reduction of developable yield of the site (i.e. number of properties the site can facilitate). No objection on basis that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the Green Belt; • Impact on the landscape setting where the Fenland landscape is beginning; • An unnecessary encroachment on green belt land given the better development potential of brown field land north of Waterbeach; • Needlessly extends the already strongly defined south-west boundary of the village by creating a ribbon-like development along Cambridge Road which would be vulnerable to further extensions in the future. 		

	<p>Development along the south frontage of Cambridge Road would significantly degrade the rural vistas enjoyed by walkers and cyclists, and adversely affect the movement of local wildlife including young deer;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sacrifice of Green Belt (Landbeach and Milton/ A10) and Grade 2 Agricultural land for ribbon development of 8-10 houses makes no sense in the context of the scale of other proposals for the village on the airfield and elsewhere; • Adverse impact on village boundary of Waterbeach whether approached from Car Dyke Road, or along Cambridge Road which forms a pleasant cycle and walking route from Landbeach; • Major concerns on road design and safe access to any proposed properties close to junction with Car Dyke Road; • Croydon Parish Council – No loss of Green Belt • For over 40 years SCDC have vigorously protected the Green Belt around Waterbeach. No reason to change now. Ribbon development was prevalent in the austere times of early and mid 20th Century but abandoned when it was realised how visually destructive it became. Many Fenland villages were blighted by this cheap infrastructure development. An unsuccessful appeal on Cambridge Road concluded that housing would be a 'prominent and incongruous feature...as seen in wider rural context'. NPPF guidelines suggest that Green Belt boundaries could be reviewed in exceptional circumstances. Here there are none. I disagree that the proposal could 'complement any development at Waterbeach Barracks' • Physical barrier to wildlife. Wildlife from undeveloped land to north uses cover of large gardens to migrate and forage along Carr Dyke to south and to open land beyond. Land south of Cambridge Road is active wild life corridor; • No decision should be taken whilst future development of Waterbeach Barracks is undecided (brownfield land); • This land floods in winter; • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Object • The current sporadic housing in this area, interspersed with paddocks surrounded by more mature hedges and trees makes an aesthetically pleasing transition from the village to the country. The land to the south of Cambridge Road is open and offers walkers long views across the fens and views of its wildlife; many people enjoy walking along Cambridge Road because of this. Intensification of housing along the road frontage would result in a loss of this feature, so it is important the village framework is not increased here and that the Green Belt remains as currently defined; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site • Comberton Parish Council - Local residents to determine • This site should be considered in conjunction with the assessment of Waterbeach as the site of a major new settlement • The National Trust - When considering development at Waterbeach the Council should recognise there is a potential opportunity to create a more direct access to the Wicken Vision to serve the informal open space
--	---

	<p>needs of the growing population. Currently the River Cam provides a barrier. A new bridge and upgrading of the footpath network would help serve the local community and would assist in delivering the strategic Green Infrastructure objectives for the Vision area(as identified in the Recreation & Open Space study and the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Study)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should be considered in conjunction with the assessment of Waterbeach as the site of a major new settlement. If Waterbeach is to be kernel for a new settlement it should not encroach on to the Cambridge Green Belt • Occasionally in winter this land has standing water on it so homes built there are likely to flood.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <p>Site with limited development potential identified for consultation. Whilst potentially capable of development, it would impact on the rural character of the area, and would be some distance from services and facilities in the centre of the village. There are other more sustainable site available for allocation.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

Settlement:	Waterbeach		
Site Address:	Land north of Bannold Road		
SHLAA Reference:	322 (overlaps part of 155)	Site Option Number:	H9 (I&O2)
Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Consultation:	<p>Site with limited development potential.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact on landscape setting. Good accessibility to a range of employment opportunities. Good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major impact on townscape through loss of green separation from Barracks unless only part of site developed. 		
Summary of Representations:	<p>Support: 14; Object: 44; Comment: 11</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support this option else you won't meet your 5 year targets. Persimmon Homes support this option with additional land to west up to Cody Rd – 2.2ha. Site available and deliverable. Support this small development because impact of loss of barracks on low businesses. Object to large scale of proposed development of barracks. Small scale of development will not have great impact on village. Low impact and close to main employment areas (Science Parks etc). Ideal site for housing. Waterbeach has services and with barracks gone there is need for housing to support local businesses. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will lose rural aspect that is part of historic character of village. Would remove green buffer between village and barracks. Waterbeach Parish Council has extremely serious reservations about this option. Real risk of drainage and flooding. Proposed access is opposite doctors surgery which is already busy Impact on wildlife. Loss of agricultural land. Influx of new people will undermine village identity. Already accepted new development recently within village. Waterbeach should not have to take so much new housing to meet targets. Do not want this option AND redevelopment of barracks site. Too much low cost affordable housing. Prefer gradual infill in village of housing with mixed style and sizes. Increased traffic from development detrimental to road safety - Bannold Road and Way Lane (doctors surgery and primary school). Traffic problems at junction of Cody Road, Bannold Road and Way Lane. Bannold Rd serves as access for farmland with very large lorries transporting crops and tankers to Anglian Water treatment works. Increased traffic congestion especially commuting into Cambridge at peak times. Object unless A10 improved. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach Railway station heavily overused. • Land is within Internal Drainage District and falls below 5m contour. • Poor drainage. Land has flooded in past. If new housing where will flood water drain to? • Treatments work in Bannold Drive at capacity. • 300 empty houses within barracks so new houses not needed. • Villages services near capacity e.g. schools. • Cottenham Village College would have to be expanded and then would be too big. • Follow guidance of 1993 Inspector who indicated these sites should not be included and land should keep its open rural character. • Outside village framework. • Better to develop barracks and leave this site as green lung. • Ashdale Land and Property Company object to this option because SHLAA site 142 better option. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage thinks site should not be allocated at this stage until proposals for Waterbeach barracks are more clearly established - may be desirable to retain this open space between existing village and any new community established on the barracks site. • If barracks are developed this site should be left as open space. • Anglian Water - Sewage Treatment Works may require capacity enhancement. Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Maximum of 90 to preserve 'village'. • National Trust - Housing at Waterbeach could contribute to improved access across River Cam into Wicken Vision area. A new bridge and footpath improvements would help ensure River does not form a barrier between the town and this area of strategic Green Infrastructure.
<p>Council's Response and Conclusion:</p>	<p>Council's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located at Minor Rural Centre • Does not make best use of brownfield land. • Strong Parish Council and local objection. <p>The new local plan proposes a new town north of Waterbeach. Sites in this area should remain open to assist in maintaining the village character of Waterbeach. The plan proposes to extend the Green Belt in this area to achieve this goal.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>

