

CHAPTER 5: Development Options	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS
<p>QUESTION 16: Which of the site options do you support or object to and why?</p>	
<p>Site Option 1: extension to Northstowe</p> <p>Support:57 Object: 13 Comment: 10</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses: Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located? 7 responses supported development at Northstowe.</p>	<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 Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council – 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. • 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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 2: New town at Waterbeach</p> <p>Support:61 Object: 38 Comment: 16</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>431 responses indicated support for a new settlement at Waterbeach (no preference given for site 2 or 3). 24 indicated objection.</p> <p>39 responses supported development at 'Waterbeach Barracks', and 1 objected.</p> <p>2 Responses indicated specific support for this option.</p>	<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 development to a less developed area of Cambridge locality; • 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

	<p>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"> • 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
--	---

	<p>justify the transport improvements that should come with it;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	--

	<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	--

	<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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
--	---

	<p>and opportunities to reflect significant features within the development should be considered;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 3: Small new town at Waterbeach</p> <p>Support:23 Object: 32 Comment: 18</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>431 responses indicated support for a new settlement at Waterbeach (no preference given for site 2 or 3). 24 indicated objection.</p> <p>39 responses supported development at 'Waterbeach Barracks', and 1 objected.</p> <p>4 Responses</p>	<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

<p>indicated specific support for this option.</p>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>* 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	--

	<p>monument nearby. Transport infrastructure inadequate; Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Not green belt, heritage buildings must not be compromised, use brownfield land first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	--

	<p>of sufficient transport infrastructure provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 interest of these sites; • 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>Site Option 4: Waterbeach Barracks built up area only</p> <p>Support:27 Object: 14 Comment: 20</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>3 Responses indicated specific support for this option.</p> <p>39 responses supported development at 'Waterbeach Barracks', and 1</p>	<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

<p>objected.</p>	<p>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"> • 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.
------------------	--

	<p>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;</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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 <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach Waste Management Park - The WWMP could include Energy from Waste and/or other new waste management technologies and has potential to
--	---

	<p>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</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 • 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 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. • 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
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 5: New Village – Bourn Airfield</p> <p>Support: 17 Object: 118 Comment: 13</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>422 responses indicated specific support for this</p>	<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. • Delivery in 2016 is a realistic objective. • 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

<p>option. 19 objected.</p>	<p>sustainability possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
-----------------------------	--

	<p>Caldecote and Cambourne;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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; • 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 - We see Bourne Airfield (site option 5) as an extension of Cambourne. It is only separated from Cambourne at present by the Broadway, a C class road. As an extension to Cambourne it could benefit from existing infrastructure (e.g. a new secondary school which is capable of being expanded) rendering it more viable and, therefore, more likely to be delivered. A 3000 house development on
--	---

	Bourne Airfield is unlikely to support a viable secondary school serving that development alone.
<p>Site Option 6: Land at former Marley Tiles site, Dales manor Business Park, Sawston</p> <p>Support:17 Object: 4 Comment: 10</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>3 responses indicated specific support for this option.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected.</p>	<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

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 7: Land at Grove Road / West Way, Dales Manor</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield land, outside Green Belt; • Little landscape impact;

<p>Business Park, Sawston</p> <p>Support:16 Object: 5 Comment: 8</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses indicated specific support for this option.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 cars; • Large site, 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>Site Option 8: Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 19 Comment: 10</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where</p>	<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

<p>should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>1 response indicated specific support for this option, 1 objected.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected.</p>	<p>families can stay locally;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <p>COMMENTS:</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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
--	--

	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 9: Land east of Sawston</p> <p>Support: 3 Object: 25 Comment: 9</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses objected to this option.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected.</p>	<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,

	<p>Plantation Road, Green Road not suitable. Babraham Road is a busy road, and would get busier;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 10: Mill Lane, Sawston</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 26 Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>1 response indicated specific support for this option.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected.</p>	<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

	<p>brownfield land first</p> <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; • 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 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. • Would need to respect setting of new community orchard; • Possibly, but not exceeding 30;
--	--

	<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>Site Option 11: Land rear of 41 Mill Lane Sawston</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 20 Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>1 response indicated specific support for this option.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected.</p>	<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; • 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>Site Option 12: Land between 66 & 68 Common Lane,</p>	<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

<p>Sawston</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 23 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Sawston, 5 objected.</p>	<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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;
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 really a viable development at the loss of some good green land • 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>Site Option 13: Land at Buxhall Farm, Glebe Way, Histon</p>	<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;

Support: 4
Object: 215
Comment: 4

In addition, petition with 405 signatories opposing the site.

Questionnaire Responses:

Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?

0 responses referenced this option specifically.

1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected.

- 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;

OBJECTIONS:

- 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, playgrounds, and other amenities village desperately needs.
- 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.

COMMENTS:

- Conditions should be in place to see hedgerows planted around the adjacent remaining open fields and other

	<p>farmland bird friendly measures as a minimum;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anглиan Water – There is Capacity to serve the site; • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine.
<p>Site Option 14: Land rear of 49-71 Impington Lane, Impington</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 25 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected.</p>	<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;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <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 • 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
--	--

	<p> 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>
<p>Site Option 15: Land north of Impington Lane, Impington</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 17 Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>1 response objected to this site.</p> <p>1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected.</p>	<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>Site Option 16: Land at SCA Packaging</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation links are good from this area with the

<p>Ltd, Villa Road, Impington</p> <p>Support: 11 Object: 3 Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>1 response supported development in Histon and Impington, 1 objected.</p>	<p>guided busway and regular buses, and closeness to employment centres;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 • 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
--	--

	<p>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> <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>Site Option 17: 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)</p> <p>Support: 22 Object: 115 Comment: 13</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses supported this site, 3 objected.</p> <p>16 responses supported development at</p>	<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

Cambourne, 11
objected.

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

	<p>opposed to Bourn and Cambourne options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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>Site Option 18: Land off Cambridge Road, Great Shelford</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 10 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>6 responses supported development in Great Shelford and Stapleford.</p>	<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 that the floodplain would be kept free from inappropriate development;

OBJECTIONS:

- 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;

COMMENTS:

- **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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 19: 29 - 35 and 32 London Road, Great Shelford</p> <p>Support: 13 Object: 6 Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses supported this option specifically.</p> <p>6 responses supported development in Great Shelford and Stapleford.</p>	<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>Site Option 20: Granta Terrace, Stapleford</p> <p>Support: 18 Object: 6 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p>	<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

<p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses supported this option specifically.</p> <p>6 responses supported development in Great Shelford and Stapleford.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 21: Land at the junction of Long Drove and Beach Road, Cottenham</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 9 Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses related to this site.</p>	<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; 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>Site Option 22: Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham</p> <p>Support: 11 Object: 6 Comment: 8</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing</p>	<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

<p>sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses related to this site.</p>	<p>from Oakington Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <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 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
---	---

	<p>available it should be used first</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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." <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 • 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 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 • 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.
--	--

	<p>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>
<p>Site Option 23: The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 6 Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>1 response supported this site.</p>	<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 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>Site Option 24: Land south of Ellis Close and East of Oakington Road, Cottenham</p>	<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

Support: 6
Object: 5
Comment: 7

Questionnaire Responses:

Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?

1 response supported this site.

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

OBJECTIONS:

- 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 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
- **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.

COMMENTS:

- **Anglian Water** - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or

	<p>diversion of assets may be required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 25: Land off Histon Road, Cottenham</p> <p>Support: 5 Object: 4 Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses related to this site.</p>	<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.
<p>Site Option 26: Land to the rear of 34 - 46 Histon Road, Cottenham</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 4 Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses related to this site.</p>	<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 unworthy of consideration as 'sustainable' sites <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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Site Option 27: Cottenham Sawmills, Cottenham</p> <p>Support: 3 Object: 5 Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses related to this site.</p>	<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>Site Option 28: Land off Station Road, Fulbourn</p>	<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;

Support: 3
 Object: 81
 Comment: 6

Questionnaire Responses:

Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?

1 response supported this option specifically.

4 responses supported development in Fulbourn, 4 objected.

- 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

	<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. Insufficient evidence that there would be sufficient water supply to service additional development and wildlife sites long term • 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
--	--

	<p>economy and farming-related businesses and so pose a threat to much needed employment opportunities, already scarce outside of the nearby city;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 to inappropriate recreational uses and has a finite capacity to support visitors without damage to its important wildlife
<p>Site Option 29: Land east of Station Road,</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously developed site;

<p>Linton</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 2 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>3 responses supported this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Linton.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required; • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine;
<p>Site Option 30: 36 New Road, Melbourn</p> <p>Support: 8 Object: 1 Comment: 3</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>2 responses supported</p>	<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

<p>development in Melbourn, 2 objected.</p>	<p>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"> • 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 be found; • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine.
<p>Site Option 31: Land to rear of Victoria Way, off New Road, Melbourn</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 2 Comment: 3</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>2 responses supported development in Melbourn, 2 objected.</p>	<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 form 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;
<p>Site Option 32: Land off Grays Road,</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p>

<p>Gamlingay</p> <p>Support: 3 Object: 11 Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Gamlingay, 2 objected.</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. • 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>Site Option 33: Green End Industrial Estate, Green End, Gamlingay</p> <p>Support: 5 Object: 2 Comment: 9</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>3 responses supported this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported development in Gamlingay, 2 objected.</p>	<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>Site Option 34: Land at Mill Road, Gamlingay</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency - Some sites identified as having development potential (or limited development potential)

Support: 3
Object: 10
Comment: 2

Questionnaire Responses:

Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?

0 responses referenced this option specifically.

4 responses supported development in Gamlingay, 2 objected.

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

OBJECTIONS:

- 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.
- 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

	<p>equally impossible. This scheme is currently a cul de sac which makes it attractive to the very many young families who are housed there;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 35: The Former EDF Depot & Training Centre, Ely Road, Milton</p> <p>Support: 3 Object: 4 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>3 responses supported</p>	<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

<p>development in Gamlingay, 1 objected.</p>	<p>brownfield land first;</p> <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>Site Option 36: Land south of Whitton Close & west of Boxworth End, Swavesey</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 9 Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>1 response supported development in Swavesey, 2 objected.</p>	<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 commuter/ghost village; Not the jobs available; Natural habitat - impact needs fully investigating and mitigating.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	---

	<p>Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 • 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
--	---

	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wildlife Trust - Aerial photos suggests that much of the land is wooded and or rough grassland that could have value as a wildfie rich local green space. This potential value must be fully assessed before any decision is taken on allocation of the site for development
<p>Site Option 37: Next to Walnut Tree Close, North End, Bassingbourn</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 96 Comment: 5</p> <p>In addition, petition with 173 signatories opposing the site.</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses objected this option specifically.</p> <p>7 responses supported development in Bassingbourn, 6 objected.</p>	<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; • High Street cannot cope with additional traffic (the third most notorious blackspot within South Cambs); • Through traffic would be increased to Shingay, along a

	<p>single track road;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 38: Land north of Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 78 Comment: 7</p> <p>In addition, petition with 173 signatories opposing the site.</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses objected this option specifically.</p> <p>7 responses supported</p>	<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

<p>development in Bassingbourn, 6 objected.</p>	<p>buildings in the conservation area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
---	---

	<p>enable easy access for cars and also to Royston station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. • 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
--	--

	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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>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
--	--

	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 39: Land between South End & Spring Lane, Bassingbourn</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 119 Comment: 9</p> <p>In addition, petition with 173 signatories opposing the site.</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses objected this option specifically.</p> <p>7 responses supported</p>	<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 recognises 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

<p>development in Bassingbourn, 6 objected.</p>	<p>development due to lack of employment opportunities in village and the local area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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
---	--

	<p>too little too late.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents should determine;
<p>Site Option 40: Land at Cockerton Road, Girton</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 10 Comment: 4</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>3 responses supported development in Girton, 1 objected.</p>	<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

	<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <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 • 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>Site Option 41: Land off Long Road (south of Branch Road), Comberton</p> <p>Support:15 Object: 69 Comment: 14</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>7 responses objected this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported development at Comberton, 307 objected.</p>	<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 additional development; • 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
---	--

	<p>use. Road connecting villages are unsafe to cycle.</p> <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 a field, 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>Site Option 42: Land adjacent (north) to 69 Long Road, Comberton</p> <p>Support: 14 Object: 59 Comment: 15</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>6 responses objected this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported</p>	<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

<p>development at Comberton, 307 objected.</p>	<p>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> <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 of business locations, like the science park etc. • 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
--	--

	<p>school in Cambourne. New pupils can be sought from surrounding villages, they don't have to live in Comberton itself</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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
--	--

	<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. • 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>Site Option 43: Land to the east of Bush Close, Comberton</p> <p>Support: 14 Object: 70 Comment: 14</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses objected this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported development at Comberton, 307 objected.</p>	<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;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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
--	---

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Site Option 44: Land to the west of Birdlines, Manor Farm, Comberton</p> <p>Support: 10 Object: 80 Comment: 15</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses objected this option specifically.</p> <p>4 responses supported development at Comberton, 307 objected.</p>	<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

	<p>on recreation facilities at Hines Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	--

	<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This land has a wide and diverse wildlife environment, including reed buntings, hares, rooks, owls, rookeries, wood peckers, bats and starlings. Loss of wildlife and 'soft' rural edge to village. • 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
--	--

	<p>problems on flood plains of southern border of village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
--	--

	<p>large scale development in Comberton would spoil this lovely rural town and Green Belt should be protected for future generations</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. • 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 development of low-rise housing at this site • 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
--	---

	<p>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>
<p>Site Option 45: Papworth Hospital, Papworth Everard</p> <p>Support: 23 Object: 7 Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>2 responses supported development at Papworth Everard.</p>	<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>Site Option 46: Land east of 35-69 Rockmill End, Willingham</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 6 Comment: 2</p>	<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;

<p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>1 responses supported development at Willingham, 5 objected.</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 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 than this site option • 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>Site Option 47: Land to the rear of Green Street, Willingham</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 6 Comment: 2</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>1 responses supported development at Willingham, 5 objected.</p>	<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;
<p>Site Option 48: Cody Road, Waterbeach</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 13 Comment: 6</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected.</p>	<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;

OBJECTIONS:

- 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

	<p>provide 900 homes and access to A10 without driving through village, or detrimental impact on rural character of village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside 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 • 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)
<p>Site Option 49: Land at Bannold Road and Bannold Drove, Waterbeach</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 7 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected.</p>	<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;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Wicken Fen Vision; • Comberton Parish Council – Local residents to determine;
<p>Site Option 50: North side of Bannold Road, Waterbeach</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 7 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected.</p>	<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 Cambridge; pockets of agricultural land should not be sacrificed; hedgerows in this area should be

	<p>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>Site Option 51: Land off Lode Avenue, Waterbeach</p> <p>Support: 2</p>	<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

<p>Object: 4 Comment: 7</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>0 responses referenced this option specifically.</p> <p>5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected.</p>	<p>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"> • Waterbeach Parish Council - No objection to this site, nut 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.
<p>Site Option 52: Land off Cambridge Road, Waterbeach</p> <p>Support: 5 Object: 15 Comment: 5</p> <p>Questionnaire Responses:</p> <p>Question 6 - Where should new housing sites be located?</p> <p>1 response supported this option specifically.</p> <p>5 responses supported development at Waterbeach, 1 objected.</p>	<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;

OBJECTIONS:

- 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. 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;
- 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

	<p>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> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglia 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 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. 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>QUESTION 16b: Are there other sites which we should consider?</p>	
<p>Support: 295 Object: 92 Comment: 98</p> <p>Total of 690 Comments on Question 6 of the questionnaire (Where should new housing sites be located?)</p>	<p>Objection to rejection of SHLAA sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 2)- Longstanton Green End Farm: within boundary of bypass, good access to employment, deliverable. • (SHLAA Site 10)- Caldecote - land rear of 104 West Drive: Can mitigate landscape impacts, access can be achieved. • (SHLAA Site 11)- Caldecote - land rear of 10 West Drive: Landscaping can be achieved, access can be achieved, highly accessible. • (SHLAA Site 12)- Barrington - Land between 12 & 22 Shepreth Road: Neglected derelict land. Group village status permits additional development. Existing developments set precedence and compromise visual amenity.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 18)- Girton - Duck End: Located immediately adjacent the existing settlement framework and would provide a logical extension to the village. • (SHLAA Site 20)- Orwell - Land adjacent to Petersfield Primary School, Orwell: Object that only larger Group Villages have been identified. Site performs better than some site options. • (SHLAA Site 27)- Great Abington - Land East: Residential led sustainable extension to village. Short walking distance to services and facilities, bus stop with direct public transport link to Cambridge, Haverhill. Deliverable, available and suitable. • (SHLAA Site 28)- Little Abington - Bancroft Farm: Capable of providing house types that Parish Councils support - enable older residents to 'downsize'. No flood risk. Small scale residential development. Potential to enhance townscape of Conservation Area. • (SHLAA Site 32) - Linton - Land to the south of Horseheath Road: Supported by a number of technical studies. Logical urban extension to Linton, in a sustainable location, accessible in terms of public transport and key facilities. • (SHLAA Site 47) - Willingham - Land south of Over Road: Noise - Aspinall's yard ceased as builders merchants years ago. Access - suitable access retained when frontage parcels sold off for development. Redundant horticulture and storage - tidy up area which may become nuisance to adjoining residents. Flood Risk - principally zone 3 but moderate zone 2, but surrounding land same level and Environment Agency's maps may be inaccurate. Low flood risk which should not rule site out. • (SHLAA Site 52) - 72 and 64A West Drive, Highfields Caldecote: The village is suburban in character, and has grown through 'backland' development. Site would be entirely in keeping with this character. The nearby factory has closed, ending potential noise problems. The biodiversity and environmental factors are less than described in the SHLAA report. • (SHLAA Site 59) - Bassingbourn - North End and Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn: Constraints such as Conservation Area, minor flooding and archaeology but part of site could be developed. Retaining trees and hedges will screen Listed Buildings. Infrastructure capable of accommodating development. • (SHLAA Site 64) - Land behind Ridgeleys Farm House, Fen Drayton: Outside of the floodplain. A small-scale development could enhance the town and landscape, and could mitigate noise and pollution on-site. It could enable working from home, as well as reuse of existing buildings in the countryside on brownfield land. Development here could improve biodiversity. A low-carbon scheme could mirror the SPD for the LSA land. • (SHLAA Site 65) - Swavesey - Land abutting Fen
--	---

	<p>Drayton Road Swavesey: Given the identified sustainability of Swavesey (highly accessible to the CGB) that it is a settlement capable of taking at least one additional residential allocation. Site lies outside the flood zone, and Green Belt, and does not impact on heritage assets. Visual impact on the countryside can be mitigated through sensitive design, layout and landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 76) - Sawston - Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston: All published criteria/remarks for these three sites are similar excepting 076 is in Green Belt (as are sites 258 and 178). Site 076 seems to be rejected because of proximity to the industrial estate but mainly offices. • (SHLAA Site 77) - Fowlmere - Appleacre Park, London Road: Located at the edge of Fowlmere, Appleacre Park is already a well-established residential park. We contend that the proposed site (No 77), which is within the perimeter of the Park, is well capable of residential development. • (SHLAA Site 79) - Comberton - 40 to 48 West Street: Excellent central site that would help combine the village rather than extend it is a fragmented way. Near to bus route. • (SHLAA Site 94) - Milton – Fen Road: The site is in single ownership with immediate access to the site being possible to deliver Gypsy and Traveller pitches. Land between the site and the river will be set aside for open space and landscaping purposes, providing scope for appropriate flood defence measures comparable with those approved for the adjoining permanent Gypsy and Traveller site. • (SHLAA Site 97) - Over - Land at and to the rear of 16 The Lanes: The existing PVAA designation should be removed and a sensitive development of around 20 dwellings allowed to be delivered in this highly sustainable location providing much needed housing and securing considerable improvements to the adjacent public footpath realm. No substantive reasons why it should not be allocated; • (SHLAA Site 99) - Teversham - Land south of Pembroke Way: Extensive natural screening along its western and southern boundaries limits its impact on the wider landscape. Within its boundary is a large area which could be used for public open space or play space and enhanced to benefit both existing and future residents. Careful design and layout will mitigate any impacts of a potential scheme on the surrounding landscape and ensure that the southern edge of the village remains rural in character and retains its permeability. • (SHLAA Site 100) – Land north of Gables Close, Meldreth: The conclusion that site "has no development potential" is flawed, and does not seem to be based on any logical conclusions but on the council's strategic
--	---

	<p>preference for large, edge of Cambridge sites. Re Heritage Considerations, the proposed site is set well back from the High Street and, with due consideration for the existing trees, would make no visual impact on the backdrop of the High Street. No incidents of flooding over last 50 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 107) – Fowlmere - land to west of High Street: Contrary to the SHLAA, a sensitive development would have no negative impact upon the setting of the village or the open countryside. The site already reads more as an element of the built area presenting an opportunity for a mixed use development in a sustainable location. • (SHLAA Site 108&109) – Fulbourn - Land south of Fulbourn Old Drift & Hinton Road: Development can appear less intense and more low-key than the SHLAA assessment suggests with the design being focussed on landscape, village edge and village entrance enhancements. The site benefits from long sections of road frontage to attain access. There are no evident reasons why a residential-led development of the site could not be deliverable. • (SHLAA Site 111&284) – Fulbourn: The most sustainable release of Green Belt land for necessary mixed use development being the most sustainable location and having the greatest physical capacity to help meet the unmet need for dwellings and job growth. • (SHLAA Site 121 & 256) – Over - Land at Station Road and New Road : Located just outside the village framework, adjacent to existing dwellings. Development of these areas of land for housing would allow for small extensions to the village, without damaging the existing character of Over. • (SHLAA Site 121) – Over - Land fronting New Road and Station Road: Has a very real development potential for residential housing given its location, the character of the surrounding area, ease of access to and from the guided busway, Swavesey village college and the Longstanton bypass, and the fact that it does have access to both New Road and Station Road, and all service utilities are available to the site directly from the public highway. It is immediately deliverable for such development, and is sufficiently extensive to result in a number of affordable housing units being included. • (SHLAA Site 128) – Cottenham - Rampton Road: Opportunity for a residential led mixed use development. Could provide a new vehicular and pedestrian access to primary school, to future new school if required, and the parish council's recreation ground. • (SHLAA Site 135) – New Settlement - Six Mile Bottom: We believe that the key issues raised, can all be addressed and do not detract from the merits of the site in principle as a location for growth: Landscape impact, Highway considerations, and Utilities capacity.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 136) – Fulbourn - Land at Balsham Road: Although Green Belt, would not impact on Green Belt Objectives. Assessment appears based on assumption 'whole site' would be developed - limited development up to 35 dwellings on front of site, with back land landscaped. Potential to provide a range of benefits for local population and wildlife. • (SHLAA Site 139) – Stapleford - Land east of Bar Lane and South of Gog Magog Way: The land does not provide a Green Belt function, the land to the east of Haverhill Road does. The site can be developed at a lower density in a manner to be respectful to its setting. The proposal also includes the formation of a recreation area to the north part of the site, adjacent to the existing recreation ground. • (SHLAA Site 142) – Waterbeach - Land north of Poorsfield Road: Suitable for 5-7 houses, underused derelict orchard, adjoins other sites creating development opportunity. • (SHLAA Site 144) – Girton - Land at Dodford Lane: The site lies within the Green Belt and is some 3 hectares in extent. Whilst it is acknowledged that the frontage of the site is identified as an important countryside frontage, the design and layout of any residential scheme on site is capable of mitigating the impacts of the street scene and protecting the character of this part of the village. • (SHLAA Site 145) – Great Shelford - Granham's Farmyard: The site lies within the Green Belt and borders existing residential development at Macauley Avenue. Whilst there may be historic assets in and around the site it is considered that the built up nature of much of the land, its proximity to the built up area and the sustainable nature of the land at Great Shelford is such that the land should be considered for residential development requiring a review of the Green Belt. • (SHLAA Site 146) – Great Shelford - Land at Hinton Way: The site is thus well related to the settlement of Great Shelford and Stapleford which in our view has been appropriately identified for new growth. This site can bring forward much needed affordable housing and given the planning history of land immediately to the east which had planning permission for a new hotel development. • (SHLAA Site 147) – Coton - Land on Whitwell Way opposite Sadler's Close: Two thirds of the site lies within the designated Green Belt with the remainder fronting Whitwell Way located outside the Green Belt and outside the village framework. It is not known what the historic reasoning for the exclusion of this part of the site from the Green Belt but it is quite clear this is an anomaly which we consider can be appropriately addressed by allocating the site for development and allowing the continuation of the built up frontage along this road, will not impact on neighbouring properties nor the wider
--	--

	<p>countryside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 148) – Coton - Land opposite Silverdale Avenue, Whitwell Way: The opportunity exists to create a new residential environment in one of the necklace villages around Cambridge and in a location which has good cycling and walking connections via the Coton footpath into the town. We consider that a review of the Green Belt in this location provides the opportunity to secure much needed new housing within the District and in a location which minimises impact upon neighbouring existing development and the wider landscape • (SHLAA Site 149) – Great Shelford - Land at Marfleet Close: The land is paddock land located close to a major commercial enterprise at Scotsdales garden centre. The site is well defined on all sides and it is considered that the design and layout of the site is capable of addressing any concerns about impact on neighbouring properties and the wider landscape. Great Shelford as a Rural Centre should continue to be a focus for new growth and we consider that this land would assist the Council in fulfilling such a role. • (SHLAA Site 157) – Willingham - Land to the rear of High Street / George Street: The site is adjacent to the existing settlement framework and would provide a logical extension to the village. Access could be gained easily from the existing Bourney's Manor Close and could be developed either on its own or in tandem with site reference 157. • (SHLAA Site 159 & 160) – Fen Ditton - East and west of Ditton Lane: Development providing approximately 400-500 new homes. Strong links to green infrastructure and sustainable modes of transport into Cambridge City centre. Maintain Green Belt buffer between development and A14. • (SHLAA Site 162) – Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane Fulbourn: Not in Green Belt. Single ownership, deliverable. Has been technically assessed, unconstrained site. • (SHLAA Site 165) – Over - Land off Meadow Lane: All of the concerns raised by the Council regarding this housing land proposal can be satisfactorily addressed. The sustainability of the site has increased significantly since the opening of the Guided Busway system at the neighbouring villages of Swavesey and Longstanton. • (SHLAA Site 166) – Duxford – Rear of 8 Greenacres: Duxford compares favourably with other better served Group villages. Greater weight should be given to proximity to employment and rail services. Would generate funds for local infrastructure. • (SHLAA Site 169) – Swavesey: This land is essential to the viability of the ongoing farming enterprise at Fenwillow Farm and its loss would render holding unviable. Any proposals to bring the land forward for recreation use must therefore also address the future of
--	---

	<p>the land to the north (SHLAA site 169), enabling the farm to be restructured.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 174) – Gamlingay - land off Heath Road/Green End: That the land off Heath Road/Green End identified on the attached plan is allocated for residential development that will provide a well related and logical expansion of the village with potential benefits. • (SHLAA Site 177) – Girton - Land off Oakington Road, Girton: Land outside floodplain can be developed. Landscape impact can be addressed. Pylons not in the way of housing. Utilities upgrades would need addressing the same as any other development. • (SHLAA Site 180) – Hardwick - Land off St.Neots Road: Propose between 175 and 200 dwellings, with additional open space, and new doctors surgery. Vehicular access from St.Neots Road, with emergency links at Hall Drive, providing footpath / Cycleway links. Will link the existing village with the Meridian Close development. Site comprises underused paddock or garden land, surrounded by existing residential development. • (SHLAA Site 180) – Hardwick - Land off St Neots Road / Part New Site: This part of Hardwick comprises an opportunity for a comprehensive approach to development to provide a positive scheme of development. • (SHLAA Site 181) – Comberton - Land to west of Green End: Site should be carried forward for further consideration, together with road access to West Street. • (SHLAA Site 182) – Over - Land north of New Road: Site within the structure of the village ideally sited for housing, close to community centre, school, shops and footpath links. Two potential options for housing: Whole site for approximately 50-60 dwellings with access from New Road, or 2. Approximately half of the site for 20-30 dwellings, with access from New Road. Other half of site for extension to playing field. • (SHLAA Site 185) – Oakington - Land at Kettles Close: The land is brownfield. Our Drainage consultants have confirmed extensive drainage works at Northstowe will significantly reduce run-off at Oakington Brook, and remove flood risk (Flood Risk Assessment attached). The logical boundary is along the firm line of the Oakington Brook. Given site is surrounded on three sides by residential development it would help round off development in this part of Oakington. • (SHLAA Site 188) – Great Shelford - Land off Cabbage Moor: Not part of the wider landscape but is related to the urban area. Accessible to the services and facilities provided in Great Shelford, but it is possibly better related to those that exist to the north in Trumpington. Too few options in Great Shelford. • (SHLAA Site 191) – Meldreth - Land adjacent to Whitecroft Road: Suitable location, subject to detailed
--	---

	<p>findings of noise assessment. Previously developed site, within village framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 202) – Waterbeach - Land off Cambridge Road: It is deliverable; suitable access to the local highway network; logical extension to the village; it has the potential to complement development at the barracks site through housing delivery early in the plan period; it represents an environmentally sound approach; would it not lead to the coalescence of settlements. • (SHLAA Site 203) – Land at Duck End, Girton: The site merits reconsideration on a reduced scale, which would provide the opportunity to round off the village and provide for a suitable transition between the edge of the village and the A14. • (SHLAA Site 207 & 212) – Great Shelford & Stapleford - Land off Mingle Lane & Hinton Way: Represents a suitable location for residential development, and associated open space, outdoor recreation, and strategic landscaping. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted to explain how the proposed development relates to the surrounding landscape. • (SHLAA Site 209) – Steeple Morden - Land north of Bogs Gap Lane: Does have adequate access to the adopted highway and is already connected to the existing drainage system. The Tier 2 issues can be mitigated by reducing the number of proposed new dwellings. • (SHLAA Site 210) – Whittlesford - Land at rear of Swanns Corner, Mill Lane: There are some inaccuracies in the assessment of the site contained in the SHLAA. A stable has been erected on the site, and while this represents appropriate development in the Green Belt, it would still have an impact on the openness of the area. There are no Elm trees within the site. There is a sewage pipe within the site, but not a sewage pumping station. The site does have an existing access to the highway network. • (SHLAA Site 214) – Fulbourn - Land off Home End: The site is now surrounded by buildings and a car park. We request that a review of the Green Belt boundary is required, and land off Home Farm should be released from the Green Belt for development. • (SHLAA Site 218) – Fowlmere - Land at Triange Farm: Villages such as Fowlmere have an irregular settlement pattern such that small areas of land could be released for residential development without causing harm, either to the character or wider setting of the village. Flexibility should be built into the overall strategy relating to the settlement hierarchy. • (SHLAA Site 222 & 223) – Barton - North of Comberton Road: Should be reconsidered for inclusion as the sustainability appraisal is considered to present an inaccurate assessment of the potential impacts of
--	---

	<p>development. Sustainability Appraisal makes no allowance for benefits that may accrue from new housing. Without new development in village future viability of local shops, pub, school and other local services will come under increasing threat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 226 and 289) – Harston - East of 98-102 High Street: Contrary to the SHLAA, a sensitive development would have no negative impact upon the setting of the village and listed buildings or the openness of the wider Green Belt but would deliver much needed housing in a sustainable location. • (SHLAA Site 227) – Histon – Villa Road: Unclear why our client's site has not been included as a site of limited development potential, as it has similar, and better, characteristics to provide for a range of housing needs. • (SHLAA Site 233) – Foxton - Land west of Station Road: Foxton has a sustainable base to accommodate some new development. The site is well related to the settlement pattern of Foxton and would have very little visual encroachment into the countryside. • (SHLAA Site 244) – Longstanton: Has been discounted even though it is part of Longstanton which with Northstowe will be the largest settlement in the District. • (SHLAA Site 246) – Longstanton: It is superior to many of the sites suggested within the Issues and Options document and also consider that Longstanton/Oakington/Northstowe should be upgraded in terms of the flawed settlement hierarchy. • (SHLAA Site 248) – New Settlement - Hanley Grange, east of A1301 and west of A11: It is difficult to reconcile the Government's SA which found no 'showstoppers' for Hanley Grange, but concerns relating to Waterbeach, with the SA now undertaken by SCDC. There is nothing in the evidence which would lead to Hanley Grange being rejected at this stage. • (SHLAA Site 250) – Swavesey – Driftwood: Site's current lawful use and nature has significant potential to cause harm, particularly following the construction of residential estate bordering to south. Brownfield site located adjacent to village boundary and outside area at risk from flooding. Allocation for housing would remove a potential nuisance and help to enhance character and appearance of locality and setting of nearby heritage asset. • (SHLAA Site 257) – Longstanton - South east of Mill Lane and north of Clive Hall Drive: There is justification for rationalising and rounding off village framework by including land for residential development Would follow a defined property boundary. • (SHLAA Site 260) – Cottenham - Part Site Option 22 / SHLAA Site 260 - Land at Oakington Road: Propose smaller site suitable for development. In ownership of two landowners (remainder of site owned by 4 landowners). Plot of 4.5 acres,
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 261) – Barrington Quarry Site: Council should have considered smaller development parcel of cement works, consistent with approach at Waterbeach. • (SHLAA Site 264) – Meldreth 80a High Street, Meldreth: Site does not flood, no smell from sewage works, near to services. Site is fully screened from the public footpath. • (SHLAA Site 265) – Cambourne - Land to the north of the A428: The site is not subject to any landscape designations, and provides opportunities for landscape and habitat creation. Connections across the A428 can be achieved though highway, cycleway, footpath and public transport to achieve a fully-integrated settlement. This location sits logically within the wider village grouping in the countryside, and would not therefore read merely as an extension of the existing three villages. • (SHLAA Site 270) – Waterbeach - Land off Gibson Close: A well-designed development could retain the character of the surrounding area and prevent any impact on the conservation area and listed buildings, and appropriate landscaping could mitigate any impact on the natural environment and the character of the area. In terms of highway access, we consider that if three sites were combined (SHLAA Ref 270, 142 and part of 043) that vehicular access could be provided from Mill Road and Poorsfield Road, with limited vehicular access from Gibson Close. • (SHLAA Site 274) – New Settlement - Land generally to north and north east of Northstowe adjoining Cambridgeshire Guided Busway: Land to north of CGB should be allocated for a mixed use development, to provide employment and housing within easy reach of Cambridge, and overcome an identified deficit in employment in current proposals for Northstowe. New employment, including high value manufacturing, will complement the needs of the Cambridge high technology cluster. Reduce pressure on Green Belt. • (SHLAA Site 275) – New Settlements and Northstowe - Old East Goods Yard, Station Road, Oakington: Comment: Factual corrections to assessment: Site Dimensions - Plot width is 26m at entrance, narrowing to 16m and then 11m for the final 40m of its length. Figures in the Sustainability Appraisal Report: Air Quality and Env. Public Transport Access - Nearest guided busway stop is Oakington around 80m from the site and not Longstanton at 872m. (Sustainability Appraisal Report: Transport). Objections on landscape inconsistent, would make best use of previously developed site. Flood risk addressed. • (SHLAA Site 276) – Linton - Land adjacent to Paynes Meadow: The assessment of the site contains some inaccuracies. The site is not part of a large arable field. It is enclosed by mature hedge boundaries on three sides, which makes it separate from the neighbouring open
--	--

	<p>land. The site is well-related to existing housing to the south. The site sits in a valley/dip, which means that the site would be screened from the village by the existing housing and the hedge/tree boundaries. The highways concerns about the impact on the A1307 would apply to all the sites around Linton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 278) – Whittlesford Bridge - Highway Agency depot: Good public transport access. Whittlesford plus Whittlesford Bridge justify status as minor rural centre. Would not harm setting of listed buildings. • (SHLAA Site 290) – Over - Land east of Mill Road: Was only dropped due to status of village. Should be upgraded due to Guided Bus. Also high level of need for affordable housing in village. • (SHLAA Site 293) – Great Abington – 104 High Street – Infill development, with no trees on site, good access, would not impact on listed building. Would provide affordable housing for village. <p>New site suggestions at ‘Better Served Group Villages’ or higher in the settlement hierarchy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site SC298) – Cambridge – NIAB 3, land between A14, Huntingdon Road and Histon Road: Propose residential and commercial uses in a key location. • (SHLAA Site 302) – Cambridge - Land north and south of Barton Road: Residential accompanied by substantial amount of community infrastructure, and scope for an element of high tech employment. Location likely to support non-motorised modes of transport. • (SHLAA Site 303) – Cambourne - south of business park: Despite marketing, lack of demand for large plots - propose smaller-scale employment along the road frontage with new homes behind. • (SHLAA Site 304) – Cambourne – north of Cambourne: Scale would allow for original green and spacious design of Cambourne to be maintained and enhanced. Original ethos has been eroded by increase in density of Upper Cambourne in particular. Excellent access to A428, potential to reduce traffic movements as community becomes self-reliant. Good linkages to Cambourne that do not interfere with A428. • (SHLAA Site 305) – Great Shelford - Land east of The Hectare: With the extension of Scotsdales Garden Centre up to Hobson's Brook the boundary of the Green Belt is no longer straight. Suggest Green Belt boundary is amended to follow Hobson's Brook and release site. • (SHLAA Site 306) – Histon – Land West of 113 Cottenham Road: Consider this land for residential development purposes. • (SHLAA Site 307) – Histon - Land r/o 49-83 Impington Lane: Support is given to Site Options 14 & 15 for
--	--

	<p>housing but with boundary amendments. The revised site is enclosed visually. The revised site is 3.193ha and the dwelling capacity is 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 308) – Impington - Land at Former Bishops Hardware Store, Cambridge Road: Site within village framework, suitable for redevelopment. • (SHLAA Site 309) – Impington - south-east of Ambrose Way: Should be developed as a continuation of the present Ambrose Way residential development. Whilst Anglian Water advises that the land lies within the flood plain, it has not flooded within the last 100 years, and is set on higher ground than the adjoining brook to the south-west, and part of the south-east of the land. • (SHLAA Site 310) – Sawston - Dales Manor Business Park: Land adjoining Site Option 6, within the Dales Manor Business Park which is similarly available for residential use and equally suitable for such use. Either in isolation or as part of a wider scheme incorporating Site Option 6 and Site Option 7. • (SHLAA Site 311) – Sawston - land north of White Field Way: Sawston benefits from excellent transport links to the centre of Cambridge and contains a large range of services and amenities. The site is viable in terms of access, flood risk and landscape setting. The site would support the vitality and viability of the local economy and provide an opportunity to bring more services and facilities to the village. The site benefits from existing natural screening which would be improved to ensure any perceived impact on the wider landscape was mitigated. • (SHLAA Site 312) – Sawston - Land at former Marley Tiles Site: Seeks to consolidate existing employment uses within site into a smaller area along the south eastern boundary. Remainder of site would be developed for housing. • (SHLAA Site 313) – Sawston – Land north of Babraham Road • (SHLAA Site 314) – Cottenham - Land between 130 and 144 Histon Road: The site measures approximately 1.39 hectares and the north-east boundary is only 87 metres to the south-west of the Cottenham development framework (and the site's road frontage is only 119 metres away). If the site had been assessed within the SHLAA it would have confirmed that it is one of the more sustainable options and accordingly, we consider the site should have been identified as a development option in the Local Plan Issues & Options Report • (SHLAA Site 316) – Cottenham – Land to Rear of High Street: Site provides an opportunity for Cottenham to
--	---

	<p>grow in a unique way with a development form that reflects traditional growth and is well related to settlements core, rather than sterile formulaic expansion associated with other options. Access through demolition of 33 High Street, Cottenham which is a 1970's house in an otherwise traditional street scene.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 317) – Gamlingay – Cinques Road: Would consolidate end of Cinques Road into satellite area of Gamlingay. • (SHLAA Site 318) – Linton - Land to the east of Linton: The proposal includes the significant improvement of the Bartlow Road/A1307 junction and the Horseheath Road/A1307 junction. There are no facilities or services that cannot accommodate further development at Linton or for extra provision be provided by the development. • (SHLAA Site 319) – Melbourn – CEMEX site: Sustainable location, near existing infrastructure and services, with access to public transport. • (SHLAA Site 320) – Melbourn - Land to the east of New Road: The site is 26 ha, but it is not proposed that the whole site is intensively developed. The remainder of the site will be used to create a buffer and boundary to the edge of the settlement or to potentially provide open space and play space facilities. The site would provide a logical rounding off to the south of Melbourn and the filling in between New Road and East Farm. • (SHLAA Site 321) – Papworth Everard - land at The Ridgeway: Smaller site than SHLAA proposal, would not materially impact on character of adjoining area. Could be screened by tree buffer. • (SHLAA Site 322) – Waterbeach - Site Option 50 (Part) / New Site - 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. • (SHLAA Site 323) – Willingham - north side of Rook Grove: The site is adjacent to the existing settlement framework and would provide a logical extension to the village. Access could be gained easily from the existing Bourney's Manor Close and could be developed either on its own or in tandem with site reference 157 contained within the SHLAA. • (SHLAA Site 324) – Bassingbourn - North End & Elbourn Way: Part waste ground / part arable. Both relate well to village and built form - easy walking distance. Access could be achieved by demolishing Spar and barn/garage to 37 High Street. • (SHLAA Site 325) – Bassingbourn - Pear Tree Public house site: Perfect infill site. • (SHLAA Site 326) – Comberton - Bennell Farm (in parish of Toft): The site has extensive mature landscaping
--	--

	<p>around all its boundaries which would act as a visual enclosure and screen to surrounding properties and therefore reduce impact on the Green Belt. Opportunity to provide additional local public amenity and community benefits. Consider whether affordable housing could benefit both toft and Comberton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 327) – Milton - Land west of A10: 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 seen to be a logical urban extension to Milton being in a sustainable location which is accessible in terms of public transport and key facilities within the settlement. • (SHLAA Site 328) – Milton – Golf Course: On edge of village, Not flood risk, assist securing long term future of existing facilities; Sufficient size to allow mix of private and affordable housing; No known protected species; Allow for new and long term village envelope to be established to north and new tree and other planting to increase biodiversity; No heritage assets in vicinity; Although Green Belt, previously been considered potentially suitable. • (SHLAA Site 329) – Swavesey - Over Road: This site has the potential to make a significant contribution to meeting the identified demand for residential and employment land. Although the site is currently outside the village framework it is conveniently located close to the guided bus stop and only about half a mile from the village High Street. • (SHLAA Site 330) – Great Chesterford -adjacent to Whiteways, Ickleton Road: The site is a sustainable location, situated within walking distance from existing community services and facilities, close to good transport links and close to existing employment opportunities. The development will also ensure the current facilities are retained and enhanced. The site is unlikely to have any adverse impact on the landscape or ecology. • (SHLAA Site 332 333) – Cottenham – Land East of Cottenham: Cottenham Parish Council • Additional sites, subject to a Cottenham Master Plan, as part of a total infill proposal of the arable land twixt Church Lane and Long Drove. Furthermore land to the north and to the rear of houses opposite Smithy Fen on the Twenty Pence Rd (as bordered by Alboro Close Drove and Long Drove/Beach Rd) should be considered in order that sufficient land is available to facilitate housing, infrastructure, and industrial development and provide the bye-pass that the High Street so desperately needs. <p>New Sites Proposed at Other Villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balsham - Balsham Buildings, High Street - Deliverable site with highway access, close to village services, potential to enhance conservation area, direct public
--	--

	<p>transport link to Linton Village College.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington - land to rear of West Green- Requesting land be put forward for consideration for development in Local Plan review. • Bourn - Land to rear of Riddy Lane - The property has substantial potential for development. The plot is approximately 1.6hec, set meters outside of the current village boundary. • Duxford - Land at end of Manger's Lane - Lies within Duxford Framework. PVAA designation, mitigate development within it by providing higher level of affordable housing. • Eltisley – Land off St.Neots road - Adjacent to a relatively recent affordable housing scheme. The site had two existing accesses off St Neots Road. The site is contained within defined boundaries and is considered that development would not have a detrimental impact on the existing character of Eltisley. • Fen Drayton – Manor Farm- Well related with the existing settlement and would represent a natural rounding off of the southern boundary. The site would also represent a natural continuation of the existing pattern of development by way of an extension of residential development at Vermuyden Way to the north. • Fowlmere - Former Farmyard, Cambridge Road - Has the potential to enhance the townscape of the north-east corner of the village and it represents an unobtrusive location for a small-scale residential development. • Fowlmere – land to rear of Pipers Close - Would contribute to meeting affordable housing needs of Fowlmere. • Guilden Morden - Land south west of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road -The site is between existing housing on Dubbs Knoll Road. There is good accessibility and no flood risk. The site is close to village amenities • Guilden Morden – Church Lane - Land is left over from previous times, and has no use. Open to the idea of affordable housing, private housing or best use of land that might be considered by the Council. • Hardwick - St.Neots Road - Group landowners who would like to see back scrubland developed to complete Hardwick village. • Hauxton - Waste Water Treatment Works, Cambridge Road - Currently facilitates remediation of land opposite. Once complete, not required. Can be brought into beneficial use without adverse impact on openness of Green Belt and redevelopment accords with requirements of NPPF. Within outer rural Green Belt area - not impact upon setting of Cambridge. Natural extension to Bayer CropScience. • Highfields Caldecote - rear of 18-28 Highfields Road - Within village framework, capable of accommodating 97 dwellings. Formerly allocated in plan. No constraints. Proposed strategy to define limits on the scale of
--	---

	<p>development within group villages, and indeed other settlements, is inappropriate because it takes no account of whether suitable larger sites within the settlement boundaries exist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highfields Caldecote – Land at Highfields Caldecote - Site used by 29 mobile homes. Already has access, and is close to the village. Full range of services. Outside the Green Belt. The existing site's residential use by professionals and retired people proves the need for accommodation; permanent accommodation is preferable to the current mobile homes. • Little Abington - Cambridgeshire County Scout Camp site - Include site in village envelope to facilitate future development as camp site or housing. We are aware that full development of the site would not be possible, as part of it is flood plain, and in any case, we would not wish to see overcapacity on the site. • Orwell - Leaden Hill - The site is contained within defined boundaries and it is considered that development would not have a detrimental impact on the existing character of Orwell. • Over – New Road and Station Road - Ideal spot for a tasteful residential development. Not only is it convenient for the Guided Bus, there are also two other routes out of the village via the Longstanton by-pass and through Swavesey to the A14. • Steeple Morden - Station Road - Close to village centre and various amenities; Enhance viability of local primary school, pub/shop/ post office and garage; Development without any adverse impact upon landscape and townscape character or heritage assets. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croydon - land south of High Street - Site is at the centre of the village, and existing facilities, and able to be integrated with the community through the public bridleway on the west boundary. The site is screened to east and west and has an established frontage hedgerow. Suitable for sensitive development of market and affordable housing. • Great Eversden - Land north of High Street and west of Chapel Road - Should be allocated for a small-scale residential development Close to three village services, and direct public transport to Comberton VC. • Landbeach – Land of Chapmans Close - Near to services and facilities of Landbeach, major employment areas, public transport between Ely, Waterbeach and Cambridge. Would not undermine primary Green Belt objectives. • Lolworth - South of Redlands Road - Available for development and would be deliverable within the plan period. Site is in single ownership and could come forward for residential use to 2031. • Lolworth - Land at High Street - Available and could
--	---

	<p>accommodated residential development within the plan period. The land is in single ownership and is therefore deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lolworth - North of Redlands Road - Available for development and would be deliverable within the plan period. Site is in single ownership and could come forward for residential use to 2031. • Land at Old North Road, Kneesworth - Brownfield land within Kneesworth could provide a mix of market and affordable housing to support the local community, and that the Local Plan could allow a greater amount of market housing on such a site to support the provision of much needed affordable housing and help in meeting local housing needs. • Pampisford - land east of the High Street - Undeveloped parcel of land which is overgrown with vegetation but which has an access from the High Street and is closely related to built form to the west and the south. It is presently outside the development framework of Pampisford but immediately adjacent to it. • Shepreth – Meldreth Road- Recent affordable housing developments have been absorbed into village, this site could be too. Hourly train service. Logical infill site • Toft – Powell Close - The site lies outside the settlement framework for Toft. The site is approximately 0.288 hectares and could provide low density residential development (2-4 dwellings). The new dwellings could be sited to leave a managed woodland area which would provide both retained ecological habitat areas as well as acting as mature screening of the development from the countryside to the west. <p>Support for Rejection of SHLAA Sites</p> <p>In total 254 representations supported the continued rejection of one or more Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on infrastructure and services, • congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing). • Green Belt / open space is valuable. • Surrounding fields attractive part of village. • Protect the allotments. • Impact on rural character of settlements. • Impact on historic character and landscape. • Loss of Agricultural land. • Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt. <p>Each site was referenced in the following number of representations: (SHLAA Site 33) Stapleford – Land East of Bar Lane: 199 (SHLAA Site 41) Stapleford – Land Between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane: 226</p>
--	---

	<p>(SHLAA Site 139) Land East of Bar Lane and South of Gog Magog Way: 204</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 140) Stapleford – Land east of Bar Lane and Gog Magog Way: 204</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 141) Stapleford – Land east of Bar Lane and Gog Magog Way: 205</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 145) Great Shelford Land at Granhams Farm: 198</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 146) Great Shelford - Land at Hinton Way: 198</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 149) Great Shelford – Land at Marfleet Close: 190</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 188) Great Shelford – Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road: 190</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 205) Great Shelford – Land north west of 11 Cambridge Road: 190</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 207) Great Shelford – Land east of Hinton Way, North of Mingle Lane: 230</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 208) Stapleford – Land north of Gog Magog Way: 194</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 212) Great Shelford – Land east of Hinton Way: 226</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 253) Stapleford – Land at Gog Magog Way / Haverhill Road: 194</p> <p>(SHLAA Site 262) Stapleford – Land at Hinton Way: 193</p> <p>Other Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 44) Sawston – South of Mill Lane (2) - Site has history of flooding. Would impact on infrastructure. • (SHLAA Site 22) Land to the rear of 28 The Green, Eltisley (2) - Noise, pollution, access, impact on historic environment. Lack of amenities. Sewer problems. • (SHLAA Site 35) Eltisley - Land south of St. Neots Road (1) - Would be detrimental to listed buildings and conservation area. Lack of amenities. • (SHLAA site 65 and 287) Land abutting Fen Drayton Road, Swavesey, Land adjacent to Fen Drayton Road – Support rejection. • (SHLAA Site 47) Land at Over Road, Willingham (1) - access onto Over Road would be too dangerous and disruptive to traffic flows and pedestrian safety. • (SHLAA Site 164) Harston -158 High Street – High water table, High Street already busy. • (SHLAA Site 150) Haslingfield - land at River Lane (6) - Access inadequate, flood risk, infrastructure at capacity. Impact on rural character. Detrimental impact on grade 2 listed buildings. • (SHLAA Site 162) Fulbourn - Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane (3) - Unsuitable access to local roads and the fact that the water table is very close to the surface in this area making construction of dwellings costly and difficult. Loss of a local open space amenity. • (SHLAA Site 264) Meldreth (2) - Would destroy small orchard, important habitat in river Mel corridor. Impact on
--	---

	<p>riverside footpath. The development could result in the destruction of a number of trees, included some covered by a TPO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 131) Land west and north of Duxford(2) - Ickleton Parish Council - A development of this size would be utterly inappropriate and would not integrate with the existing settlement of Duxford. Proximity to the M11 junction would encourage medium and long distance car based commuting. Ickleton Society - adverse impact on Ickleton which already suffers from a large amount of rat running traffic. • (SHLAA Site 248) 'Hanley Grange' site, south of Pampisford and east of Hinxton (6) - Support rejection of Hanley Grange. It would do nothing to address the needs of Cambridgeshire / South Cambridgeshire residents but would draw in a large number of people who would simply commute south. Pampisford Parish Council - land should NOT be reconsidered. • (SHLAA Site 16 62 63) Thriplow (1) - Support for rejection of Thriplow sites. – Landscape and transport impacts. <p>Other Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - Welcome consideration of constraints including designated sites, landscape, biodiversity and flooding. No specific comment regarding options, other than to request that options should have least impact on the natural environment, landscape and access to this. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Paramount that possible development locations be evaluated in the light of sufficient transport infrastructure provision. This points to favouring locations on transport corridors. A significant development at Waterbeach should be seriously considered. • CPRE - No comment on sites, as arbitrary planning policies should not be imposed on local communities. • Comberton Parish Council - Would object to any other sites next to village framework not proposed as an exception site. • Fulbourn Parish Council - Objects to all the options considered by SHLAA. • Caldecote Parish Council - Support rejection of sites identified in the SHLAA. • Great Abington Parish Council - There is a need for a small development site in the Abingtons of about 30 units. • Harlton Parish Council - Support rejection of SHLAA sites 150 (land at river Lane), 163 (Land at Barton road), and 261 (Land at Barrington quarry) • Haslingfield Parish Council - Regarding the other site options, the pros and cons listed in the local plan are considered appropriate. Support rejection of SHLAA
--	---

	<p>sites 150 (land at river Lane), 163 (Land at Barton road), and 261 (Land at Barrington quarry)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Abington Parish Council - Support the rejection of SHLAA site 248 Hanley Grange, east of A1301 and west of A11 - Hinxton & Pampisford • Little Abington Parish Council - Object to the rejection of SHLAA site 028 - Bancroft Farm, Church Lane - Little Abington; SHLAA site 027 - Land east of Great Abington (land east of 17 Pampisford Road, Great Abington) The Abingtons housing survey 2011 indicated a current need for at least 10 affordable houses and 10 "retirement" bungalows for local residents and their families. • Litlington Parish Council - Supports the current policy for most development in major centres. without detailed knowledge those proposed look viable. • Ickleton Parish Council - Supports the District Council's rejection of site options, in particular the utterly unsustainable Hanley Grange proposal. Underlying problem with SHLAA process is that it has been developer led. • Cottenham Village Design Group - No comment on individual sites. Near to Cottenham we would be in favour of a combination of development within and around our own village, with the developments being coordinated and integral to the existing village and with the benefit that well thought out and designed additions could bring to the village in terms of investment in the schools and retail core and then the development of larger settlements such as at Northstowe and Waterbeach. • Weston Colville Parish Council - No other areas warrant consideration • Sawston Parish Council - Sawston parish council would support sites 076 and 116 going forward for the next stage of the assessment process based on the information we have at present. However the Parish Council do have concerns about the infrastructure and traffic. • Middle Level Commissioners - Development affecting Uttons Drove WWTW and Swavesey Drain. Flood risk/water level management systems in area are complicated and under stress during certain situations. 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. Concerns about increased volume of treated effluent discharging from Uttons Drove waste water treatment works into Swavesey Drain system which will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding flood risk/water level management systems and will contribute to increased flooding in Board's area unless a more appropriate point of discharge is found.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellcome Trust - Support identification of locations in south of district for new housing development. Greater choice of housing locations close to Genome Campus. • Advisory Council for the Education of Gypsy and other Travellers - Consider needs of travellers, sites should be spread over a wide number of villages; • Cam Valley Forum - Some larger villages should be developed especially where work places are also established. • Support for development at Hardwick, to facilitate more facilities e.g. Doctors surgery. • Expansion of the Comberton is inevitable, but must be controlled. If the size becomes enormous then it will not be a village, but becomes an extension of Cambridge. • Hope that the Council will resist suggestions from developers and others to add more sites as with such a long list of sites already identified, adding further ones seems unnecessary. • The potential sites for development do not include any provision in smaller villages, relying on larger settlements. Whilst acceptable to conclude these sites are most sustainable, this does not mean sites within smaller settlements cannot be suitable for smaller scale development. As a consequence, many sites that are viable in isolation are being discarded prematurely. Opportunities in smaller villages should be taken into account, to allow organic growth of villages and to keep communities alive. • Object to sites allocated on edge of Group villages in Green Belt. Should be more flexibility around group and infill villages. • We object to Bourne Airfield and the expansion of Cambourne and question whether these locations will deliver the types of market and affordable housing required in the South Cambridgeshire area. • All rejected sites should remain rejected. • Support for rejection of all sites in Gamlingay. • Support for rejection of SHLAA sites at Fulbourn. the character of Fulbourn as a village depends on the preservation of the Green Belt status of fields south of the Ida Darwin site, especially the three closest. • Object to all the site options. • Sawston – sites on the flood risk zone should be rejected. • Sites in villages where there are existing services the security of which could be preserved by some development: for example villages where there is a school but where there might be a falling school roll. • Meldreth options should not have been rejected, due to access to the railway station. • Those sites already rejected should remain so. It seems extremely unfair that a developer or owner can submit as many planning applications for the same site as they wish and only have to win the once, whereas the Parish
--	--

	<p>Council has to win every time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although Bassingbourn Barracks site not currently under consideration. History has been explored of the site in recent research. • Develops at Harston can be done without heritage impact. <p>General Comments from Questionnaires</p> <p>General comments responding to Question 6 on the questionnaire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for development or brownfield sites rather than Greenfield sites (45 responses). • Support for development in villages (20 responses), and objection to village development (29 responses). • Develop close to transport links, where services can be provided • Build on villages in the guided bus corridor; • Develop close to major employment areas; • Create new settlements rather than swamp existing villages / No more new villages, concreting over south Cambridgeshire; • Locate development away from Cambridge. • Development should reflect Parish Plans. • There should be no new development, it is not needed. Plan to meet local needs. • Support for development in other locations: Over (2), Barrington Quarry (2), Bassingbourn Airfield (8), Guided bus corridor (2), Hardwick (2), Bourn (1), Hinxton (1), Orwell (2), Little Wilbraham (1), Great Eversden (2), Oakington Airfield (2).
--	--