

How consultation outcomes influenced the NP in 2023

Draft vision

The following was presented to the steering group on 11/9/23:

*“In 2040, Stapleford and Great Shelford will be thriving, rural villages distinct from Cambridge, where people want to live, work, shop and play. We value and want to protect our **greenbelt** landscape setting, improve its biodiversity and reduce our contribution to climate change. Reflecting this, ~~modest~~ **pockets of low density** new development, which is sensitively and sustainably designed, will focus on addressing identified **affordable** housing needs within our community. Where appropriate, it will also support the creation of new amenities and infrastructure to meet the needs of our **existing and future** population. Part of this infrastructure will be a safe ~~and sustainable~~ **active** travel network supporting everyday journeys and healthy recreation.”*

Feedback taken into consideration:

- 82% of respondents supported draft vision
- Should we be more explicit about protecting greenbelt?
- ‘Sustainable travel’ caused confusion – what this refers to could be clearer – people don’t want this to imply support for a greenbelt busway. Suggest we cut sustainable and replace with active since the NP only looks at active travel anyway
- Could phrase ‘modest development’ be open to interpretation?
- Do we need a more explicit commitment to affordable/social housing?

Proposed amended vision (as presented to steering group on 11/9/23):

*“In 2040, Stapleford and Great Shelford will be thriving, rural villages distinct from Cambridge, where people want to live, work, shop and play. We value and want to protect our greenbelt landscape setting, improve its biodiversity and reduce our contribution to climate change. Reflecting this, **pockets of low density** new development, which is sensitively and sustainably designed, will focus on addressing identified **affordable** housing needs within our community. Where appropriate, it will also support the creation of new amenities and infrastructure to meet the needs of our **existing and future** population. Part of this infrastructure will be a safe **active** travel network supporting everyday journeys and healthy recreation.”*

What I have done following steering group discussion:

- Dropped ‘greenbelt’ in sentence 2. As Rachel says, we can’t influence strategic issues such as what is or isn’t greenbelt in our NP
- Dropped ‘rural’ as a village description. Considered whether ‘satellite’ would be more appropriate. The other descriptor we could use which is already in local planning parlance relating to our villages is ‘necklace’. On balance, I think we should drop the additional descriptor completely and just say “...will be thriving villages distinct from Cambridge...” After all, the most important thing is that we are distinct from Cambridge

- Dropped 'Reflecting this' in response to a good point made by Anna. I don't think it adds meat to the vision, merely words, so am happy for it to go and leave us with a pithier vision statement
- Dropped 'affordable' in recognition that there is a range of housing needs in our area. I recognise there were diverging opinions about this amongst the group
- Returned to the original 'modest new development' (I have noted that 'modest' is somewhat subjective, but then so is 'thriving', 'protect', 'improve', 'sensitively' etc. The point of the vision is not to quantify matters but to qualify where we want to be)
- Returned to original 'sustainable travel network'. As Rosie pointed out, we will have a glossary of terms and there are also other ways we can help readers understand the difference between sustainable and active (NB: active travel is a subset of sustainable travel so it would not make sense to say 'sustainable and active travel network')

So, the revised vision is:

"In 2040, Stapleford and Great Shelford will be thriving villages distinct from Cambridge, where people want to live, work, shop and play. We value and want to protect our landscape setting, improve its biodiversity and reduce our contribution to climate change. Modest new development, which is sensitively and sustainably designed, will focus on addressing identified housing needs within our community. Where appropriate, it will also support the creation of new amenities and infrastructure to meet the needs of our existing and future population. Part of this infrastructure will be a safe sustainable travel network supporting everyday journeys and healthy recreation."

This is clearly not that different from the draft vision we consulted on. However, I am comfortable that we have fully considered consultation feedback and whether/how we should amend the vision in response to it. Again, bear in mind that 82% supported the draft vision in the first instance.

Draft objectives

Overall, respondents were far more positive than negative towards all of the draft objectives, suggesting there's a role for all of them in the NP.

No.	Draft objective & proposed changes presented to steering group on 11/9/23	Redrafted objective as of 12/9/23	Next steps
1	<p>HOUSING NEEDS</p> <p>New residential development proposals will contribute to addressing existing and future housing needs in Stapleford and Great Shelford in terms of affordability, size, accessibility and tenure.</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support amongst respondents for affordable housing • Can the NP support inter-generational living? <p>Suggested changes:</p> <p>We have a draft policy about multi-generational living so does it make sense to amend draft objective to New residential development proposals will contribute to addressing existing and future housing needs in Stapleford and Great Shelford in terms of affordability, size, accessibility, and tenure and multi-generational living.</p>	<p>We discussed the importance of affordability, inter-generational living and whether we want to support further development for older people. RH made the valid point that a lot of the latter in our area is for incomers and isn't affordable to local older people, hence there is still unmet need here.</p> <p>I propose:</p> <p>New residential development proposals will contribute to addressing existing and future housing needs in Stapleford and Great Shelford in terms of its affordability and suitability for all stages of life.</p> <p>Or, we can be far less prescriptive in the objective itself and leave that to the policies to deal with:</p> <p>New residential development proposals will contribute to addressing existing and future housing needs in Stapleford and Great Shelford.</p>	<p>RH to consider these two options and decide which is most appropriate from a planning perspective.</p>
2	<p>THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>New development will be designed to a high standard and in its built form will reinforce the distinctive rural look, feel and quality of the two villages.</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How specific can the NP be about appropriate height, density and bulk of new development? <p>Suggested changes:</p> <p>None. The NP can specify parameters with reference to its Design Guidance but this doesn't need to be reflected in the draft objective.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>New development will be designed to a high standard and in its built form will reinforce the distinctive rural look, feel and quality of the two villages.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Appendix 8 to the Consultation Statement for the S&GS NP

3	CLIMATE CHANGE	<p>New development will be designed to be (a) compatible with, and belong in, a net zero emissions future, and (b) resilient to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water shortages – how can these be dealt with by the NP or are they already covered in existing planning policy? <p>Suggested changes: New development will be designed to be (a) compatible with, and belong in, a net zero emissions future, and (b) resilient to the effects of climate change. The water supply must be protected alongside the need for new homes.</p> <p><i>Question for Rachel – does including the final sentence require an additional policy?</i></p>	<p>We agreed to add another sentence re. water supply and I have ensured that this relates to the development of all buildings (e.g. life sciences R&D), not just residential.</p> <p>New development will be designed to be (a) compatible with, and belong in, a net zero emissions future, and (b) resilient to the effects of climate change. The water supply must be protected alongside the need for new homes and other buildings.</p>	<p>RH to ensure that water supply (quality and quantity) is addressed in our policies. This does not mean that we need a specific policy about water supply.</p> <p>My concern is that developers must demonstrate the impact of (a) development and (b) subsequent occupation on water availability (e.g. volume of demand vs supply) and quality (e.g. pollutants and particulates in run-off).</p>
4	BIODIVERSITY	<p>We will protect and enhance specific features and sites of ecological value identified in the Landscape Character Assessment for our Plan area. More broadly, we will deliver biodiversity enhancements at all development sites within the Plan area.</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the NP set some specific targets/goals around biodiversity issues? Link relevant objectives in the NP to the Cambridge Nature Network No explicit mention of greenbelt protection <p>Suggested changes: None. Agree with all of the feedback but the first two will be reflected in policy (and don't need to be explicit in the draft objective) and the third is addressed in draft objective 5 below.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>We will protect and enhance specific features and sites of ecological value identified in the Landscape Character Assessment for our Plan area. More broadly, we will deliver biodiversity enhancements at all development sites within the Plan area.</p>	n/a
5	OUR RURAL SETTING AND LANDSCAPE	<p>New development will actively minimise its impact on the landscape character of the Plan area, recognising the value of long views and vistas into and out of the rural setting of the villages, the open spaces within it</p>	<p>RH explained that the greenbelt protects the city from urban sprawl, not the surrounding countryside. The NP has no strategic role in greenbelt allocation.</p>	RH to confirm

		<p>and, critically, the separation of the villages from the urbanised Greater Cambridge area.</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No explicit mention of greenbelt protection <p>Suggested changes:</p> <p>New development will actively minimise its impact on the landscape character of the Plan area, recognising the value of long views and vistas into and out of the rural setting of the villages, the open spaces within it and, critically, the separation by greenbelt of the villages from the urbanised Greater Cambridge area.</p>	<p>One word added ('expanding'):</p> <p>New development will actively minimise its impact on the landscape character of the Plan area, recognising the value of long views and vistas into and out of the rural setting of the villages, the open spaces within it and, critically, the separation of the villages from the expanding urbanised Greater Cambridge area.</p>	
6	COMMUNITY AMENITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE	<p>We will ensure that development addresses its associated demands on, and existing shortfalls in, our community's amenity and infrastructure needs, specifically in healthcare, primary school education, transport, open spaces and play spaces.</p> <p>Negligible specific feedback on this objective, although it was well supported. I have grouped feedback on sustainable travel and infrastructure together because they are indirectly relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is support for sustainable travel but not for the GCP's busway • Better public transport is needed, including more regular train services • Improving existing highways (e.g. lighting, prioritisation, better paths and cycleways) in/around our villages could do a lot to improve traffic problems, without the need for more expensive interventions <p>Suggested change:</p> <p>None, but we should consider whether the 3rd of these bullets points is/can be incorporated into relevant policy.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>We will ensure that development addresses its associated demands on, and existing shortfalls in, our community's amenity and infrastructure needs, specifically in healthcare, primary school education, transport, open spaces and play spaces.</p>	<p>RH to consider whether/how to incorporate into a relevant policy how improvements to existing highway problems could do a lot to reduce traffic problems without the need for more expensive interventions.</p>
7	ACTIVE TRAVEL	<p>Residents travelling in and out of the Plan area, and people travelling through the Plan area, will find it increasingly easier to choose sustainable means to</p>	<p>We debated this a lot but didn't resolve it in the meeting. We agreed that we need to address improving existing active infrastructure not just</p>	<p>JF and LD to review ASAP and make recommendation to RH,</p>

	<p>reach their destinations, whether for work or leisure purposes. The safety of non-motorised users will be prioritised over the needs of motorised users throughout the Plan area.</p> <p>I have grouped feedback on sustainable and active travel together:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is support for sustainable travel but not for the GCP's busway • Better public transport is needed, including more regular train services • Confusion exists between active and sustainable travel • Non-motorised users need more routes, not just improved safety • The NP should not pit motorists and non-motorists against each other – a lot of people are reliant on car travel • Ensure that prioritising/improving active travel does not cause new problems to emerge, e.g. make driving around our village even more difficult than it already is • Minor discrepancy in wording between the active travel draft objective on p10 and p15 of consultation paper (NB: the one on p15 is the correct version) <p>Suggested change: Residents travelling in and out of the Plan area, and people travelling through the Plan area, will find it increasingly easier easy to choose sustainable active travel modes to reach their destinations, whether for work or leisure purposes. The safety of non-motorised users active travellers will be prioritised over the needs of motorised users both a priority of new development and upgraded throughout the Plan area.</p>	<p>creating new (although this might be in the policies rather than objective).</p> <p>We need to bear in mind that this objective is specifically about <i>active</i> travel, not sustainable travel.</p> <p>JF concerned not to overlook the driving needs of an ageing population; LD concerned that we need to reduce car numbers, particularly those passing through the plan area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JF queries whether reducing car use by, for example, providing new bus routes and stops can be dealt with via policies addressing the 'Managing the Impacts of Traffic Movement' objective??? <p>These are great resources for inspiration: https://www.sustrans.org.uk/media/4469/4469.pdf https://n-somerset.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2022-07/NSC%20Active%20Travel%20Strategy%20-%20FINAL%20accessible%20%28Apr22%29.pdf</p> <p>JF's proposed amendment: To reduce the amount of travel by private car within, into and out of the Plan area, pedestrians, cyclists and users of other transport modes involving physical activity will be prioritised in an upgraded or expanded travel network.</p>	<p>who will then advise on suitability.</p> <p>JF note to RH – there is overlap here with OBJ8 because one of the ways in which the impacts of traffic movements can be mitigated is by supporting more active travel. This suggests to me that they belong in the same policy chapter.</p>
--	--	---	--

Appendix 8 to the Consultation Statement for the S&GS NP

8	MANAGING THE IMPACTS OF TRAFFIC MOVEMENT	<p>The adverse effects of increased road traffic movements from new development on our community's quality of life (and apparent in, for example, air pollution, noise, vibration, road safety, accessibility and street scene environment) will be identified and appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>No relevant feedback received.</p> <p>Suggested changes: None.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>The adverse effects of increased road traffic movements from new development on our community's quality of life (and apparent in, for example, air pollution, noise, vibration, road safety, accessibility and street scene environment) will be identified and appropriately mitigated.</p>	n/a
9	COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS	<p>Existing routes for non-motorised users into the much-valued countryside in our Plan area will be protected and maintained. New routes for non-motorised users from our villages into our countryside will be opened up.</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping existing paths clear of vegetation and clean is one way to immediately improve countryside access <p>Suggested changes: None. Feedback is explicit within existing draft objective.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Existing routes for non-motorised users into the much-valued countryside in our Plan area will be protected and maintained. New routes for non-motorised users from our villages into our countryside will be opened up.</p>	n/a
10	COUNTRYSIDE ENHANCEMENT	<p>The Countryside Enhancement Strategy set out in the Landscape Character Assessment for the Plan area will be implemented. These landscape, biodiversity and public access improvements will complement the existing landscape character of the area and protect and enhance the setting of Cambridge.</p> <p>No specific feedback.</p> <p>Suggested changes: None.</p>	<p>While we recognised that this objective was not well understood by consultees, we agreed that no changes to it were required.</p> <p>The Countryside Enhancement Strategy set out in the Landscape Character Assessment for the Plan area will be implemented. These landscape, biodiversity and public access improvements will complement the existing landscape character of the area and protect and enhance the setting of Cambridge.</p>	All – retain this objective and await more detail in the NP report before deciding whether to retain or reject.