Consultation Statement

Appendix 7: Response to Representations - Site Allocations

Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Published as part of the Proposed Submission Local Plan - Regulation 19 consultation (August 2026 - September 2026)

GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

Summaries of Representations: Site Allocations

Cambridge Urban Area

Cambridge Urban Area Introduction

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There were comments offering broad support for allocation of sites in the Cambridge Urban Area, abut also concern about the impact of growth, such as on traffic. Historic England made extensive comments on the plan, highlighting areas that they supported, but also areas for improvement. A number of comments provided support for Cambridge Science Park North, a development proposal submitted through the local plan process for an expansion of the Science Park north of the A14. Other comments highlighted wards and streets where there was potential for improvement or policy. This includes areas around Chesterton, and around the Elizabeth Way roundabout. There was reference to facilities and the need for improvements such as for arts, sports, youth, leisure. Health facilities were also highlighted. Proposals to deliver an eastern entrance at Cambridge Central Station were welcomed, and the opportunity to densify development in that area were highlighted. Anglian Water sough recognition of their assets in the areas proposed for development.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Comments are noted. Through plan preparation the plan has sought to identify sites which are suitable for development, but also migration measures required in order to ensure that developments will be sustainable. Heritage issues have been addressed though policy, and a series of evidence studies considering heritage impact appraisal, and consideration of tall buildings for example. Relevant policies have been reviewed in light of comments received. The Science Park North proposal has been considered, there is not considered to be exceptional circumstances to release the land from the green belt, including taking account of the economic land supply available. A range of services facilities and needs were highlighted in comments. The Proposed Submission local plan will be supported by an updated Infrastructure Delivery plan and informed by specific studies looking at Cultural and community infrastructure needs. The area policies proposed around the eastern entrance of the station have been considered in light of proposals.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
I strongly believe that this plan should conform with the 2024 legislation regarding Grey Belt. I believe the Council should NOW either designate Grey Belt sites or invite proposals for sites which may be regarded as such. I am told that the plan is too far in its creation to take this on board. But if neither of the above is done then planning of this kind will be confused, resisted or stymied until 2045/47.	201025 (J Green)

St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge (HELAA Reference 59405) Would be a disaster for this community. Site 115524 was given an Overall Score of 'Red'. The exclusion of Site 115524 must be permanently enforced. It would destroy the only public park in North Petersfield and protected open-space, as demonstrated by five recent planning refusals	201269 (J Sanderson), 201427 (J Bradley) 205180 (C Dunbar) 205704 (J Neal) 201863 (J Brightman)
Cambridge Science Park North We support the creation of approximately 3,500 skilled jobs and at least 460 training and apprenticeship opportunities at Cambridge Science Park North, which will strengthen the city's innovation ecosystem and provide high-value careers for local people. We welcome the development's well-balanced environment that integrates work, learning, leisure and wellbeing, demonstrating a commitment to inclusive growth that benefits residents, employees and future generations. The construction and delivery of the development present opportunity to employ local people, support apprenticeships, and strengthen links between education providers, employers, and the local supply chain. This aligns closely with our aim at Constructed Pathways in supporting individuals into skilled employment and ensuring that major developments deliver lasting benefits for local communities and people.	201594, 201595, 201596 (Constructed Pathways)
Cambridge Science Park North We strongly support the Cambridge Science Park North development because it will create a wide range of employment, training, and education opportunities in the growing mid-tech and advanced manufacturing sectors. Cambridge Science Park North represents an ambitious and forward-thinking project that will strengthen education and skills development through meaningful	201597, 201598 (Cambridge Regional College)

partnerships with local schools and colleges. The inclusion of a dedicated STEM educational hub within the plans is especially exciting. This facility will provide learning and event space to inspire the next generation of innovators, offering practical experience and engagement with emerging technologies. Such opportunities are vital to ensuring that young people across the city and region are equipped for the jobs of the future.	
Cambridge Science Park North As an organisation that works closely with employers, education providers, and local partners, we see first-hand the importance of creating the right conditions for businesses to grow and for people to access meaningful, skilled employment. The proposals for Cambridge Science Park North respond directly by supporting mid-tech and advanced manufacturing activity, strengthening supply chains, and helping to retain talent, investment, and economic value within Greater Cambridge. Overall, we believe that the proposals for Cambridge Science Park North strike the right balance between innovation, sustainability, and inclusivity.	210710 (Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce)
Cambridge Science Park North Cambridge Science Park North represents an ambitious and forward-thinking project that will strengthen education and skills development through meaningful partnerships with local schools and colleges. The inclusion of a dedicated STEM educational hub within the plans is especially exciting. This facility will provide learning and event space to inspire the next generation of innovators, offering practical experience and engagement with emerging technologies. Such opportunities are vital to ensuring that young people across the city and region are equipped for the jobs of the future.	201598 (Cambridge Regional College)

Cambridge Science Park North Support for Cambridge Science Park North allocation.	201880, 205960, 205961, 205962, 205963, 205964 (Histon and Impington Community Land Trust), 210085 (Constructed Pathways), 210411 (Cambridge Regional College), 210710 (Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce)
I would like to begin by welcoming the ambition, evidence base and overall direction of the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The emphasis on sustainable growth, net zero commitments, and the integration of transport, housing and place-making is positive and necessary for a city under sustained pressure. This feedback is intended to be constructive and to highlight a strategically important inner-city area that currently feels under-recognised, despite its central location and imminent change. West Chesterton Ward is an overlooked neighbourhood but is highly strategic. Elizabeth Way is recognised but needs stronger ambition to improve this area. Chesterton Road has significant potential for increased footfall and activity.	201702 (A Rahman)
The strategic area between Elizabeth Way, Sandy Lane, Humberstone Road, Montague Road, St Andrew's Road and Chesterton Road has been omitted. New homes are planned in Sandy Lane	208021 (S Stickley)

CB4 1HZ, but do not appear on the local plan and this will impact the strategy for active travel and green space in the area.	
There should be a reference to the planning of a new roundabout at the junction of East Road/Newmarket Road and Elizabeth Way bridge to address congestion and potential conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. If a new roundabout is implemented without current underpass access, it should utilise Walnut Tree Ave for cycle and pedestrian access, linking to riverside cycleways. Clarification is needed on how the new roundabout will connect to Newmarket Road and the new cycle/pedestrian link between East Road and Sun Street, which is part of Anglia Ruskin plans. There are currently no cycleway road markings near 73 Newmarket Road/Tyre Repair workshop at the roundabout, nor clear signage directing towards Walnut Tree Ave.	201843 (T Jewell)
Concerns raised around traffic pressure and over-reliance on reducing car usage with no clear alternatives.	202355 (E Tse)
Support for policies in the Cambridge Urban Area.	202827 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
Support sites in Cambridge but more are needed.	203580 (H Thomas)
Arts, sports, youth, leisure and other community facilities need to be given more prominence in your plan including how these will be connected by walking/cycling routes and/or public transport.	203603 (S Berridge)
New buildings should be aesthetically pleasing in keeping with the city's architectural heritage and must adhere to existing height restrictions. There should be affordable housing in the city centre	203603 (S Berridge)

especially with particular consideration given to key workers and lower paid earners such as cleaners.	
Beautiful open spaces should be maintained and new green areas for recreation and wildlife created throughout. Everyone should be able to access nature easily.	203603 (S Berridge)
Support for the plan – but supports higher densities around stations.	204070 (J Shoemaker)
Planning policies must facilitate the delivery of essential healthcare infrastructure and involve consultation with the NHS to support estate transformation. Site allocations should consider future healthcare requirements while avoiding overly prescriptive approaches to ensure appropriate healthcare mitigation decisions.	205056 (NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board)
Site allocations lacking an explicit requirement for on-site health facilities should include wording that references the need for financial contributions for health and infrastructure mitigation, aligning with the IDP approach.	205066 (NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board)
Proposal that Petersfield is a Nature Recovery from the Ground Up ward.	205308 (J Neal)
Support for proposals to deliver an eastern entrance at Cambridge Central Station to unlock higher-density development to the east and south-east and support for further densification of research and employment development around Cambridge North, the Science Park, and the Business Park.	208034 (Railfuture East Anglia)
Concerns raised about cleanliness of the city, toilets not being open, and critical of expensive redevelopment of Guildhall, Market Square and Corn Exchange.	208761 (E Diaz)
We welcome the inclusion of proposals to deliver an eastern entrance at Cambridge Central Station to unlock higher-density development to the east and south-east. We support further densification of	208034 (Railfuture East Anglia)

research and employment development around Cambridge North, the Science Park, and the Business Park.	
We welcome the preparation of HIAs for many of the site allocations in the Plan. There are a few sites where there is no HIA. We appreciate that some of these are policy areas. In those cases, we would suggest that the policy should still include reference to nearby heritage assets and potential mitigation measures and enhancements that will be sought in the policy areas. There do not appear to be HIAs for two University Sites in Cambridge – Mill Lane and the Museums sites. We appreciate there may be a reason for this but would nonetheless recommend that an HIA should be prepared for each of these sites.	208921 (Historic England)
We welcome that many of the policies refer to heritage as well as potential mitigation and enhancement measures identified through the HIAs. However, as currently drafted, some of the policies are quite vague and generic, some of the policies do not currently include all of the recommendations including diagrams from the heritage impact assessments, some of the policies are imprecise about what further evidence may be needed, when and why. Therefore, the policy wording could usefully be further tightened and strengthened to ensure that robust policies are in place that will promote opportunities where these heritage assets can be used to support sustainable growth (including heritage-led regeneration) and secure the benefits of positive placemaking within the historic city and wider sub region;	208922,208924, 210186 (Historic England)
We welcome the preparation of HIAs for many of the site allocations in the Plan. There are a few sites where there is no HIA. We appreciate that some of these are policy areas. In those cases, we would suggest that the policy should still include reference to nearby heritage assets and potential	208921 (Historic England)

mitigation measures and enhancements that will be sought in the policy areas. There do not appear to be HIAs for two University Sites in Cambridge – Mill Lane and the Museums sites. We appreciate there may be a reason for this but would nonetheless recommend that an HIA should be prepared for each of these sites.	
We welcome that many of the policies refer to heritage as well as potential mitigation and enhancement measures identified through the HIAs. However, as currently drafted, some of the policies are quite vague and generic, some of the policies do not currently include all of the recommendations including diagrams from the heritage impact assessments, some of the policies are imprecise about what further evidence may be needed, when and why.	208922 (Historic England)
In terms of heritage policy wording for sites, we recommend: i.use the phrase 'Conserve or where appropriate enhance…' ii.mention specific heritage assets. iii.specify appropriate mitigation and enhancements as identified through the HIA. iv.refer to the HIA (with hyperlink). v.use Concept diagrams to illustrate key site considerations/ recommendations For larger sites, or where there are very complex heritage issues, we would expect to see a policy requirement for masterplanning informed by both the Council's HIA and also a further, more detailed, heritage impact assessment as well as Historic Landscape Characterisation and Landscape Character Assessment. We welcome the inclusion of a criterion relating to archaeology where needed.	208924 (Historic England)
Matters including asset encroachment (Policy WS/HS) and utilities infrastructure (see our comments relating to Policy GP/QD) should be a consideration for any site allocation where we	209164 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

have existing assets, or where the site is in close proximity to our operational sites and should therefore avoid the need to introduce separate clauses within any of the affected site allocation policies. Anglian Water can provide a list of assets within the proposed site boundaries, if this would be helpful to the Councils. The following sites have sewer pumping stations located within or adjacent to the site and as 'above ground' assets this will be land within Anglian Water's ownership, and may have implications for site layout and design:• S/C/CLT: Clifton Road Area; • S/CE: Cambridge East; • S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus; • S/CB: Cambourne Town Centre; • S/ED: Eddington; • S/NEC: North East Cambridge	
HE welcomes the ambition in paragraph 3.1.2 to 'enable Cambridge to accommodate growth of the highest quality whilst protecting and enhancing the historic environment and the key public spaces which are an important part of what makes the city so special to local people'.	210186 (Historic England)

Policy S/AMC/NEC: North East Cambridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was general acknowledgement that the policy context for the NEC area would need to change as a result of the removal of Housing Investment Funding for the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP), including its impact on the ability of the NEC area to support the quantum of homes previously allocated.

There was strong support for the recognition of the NEC as an important area for business innovation and employment, with a number of NEC landowners and developers noting that this position should be retained in any revised policy as it was not dependent on relocation of the CWWTP. Several landowners and developers raised issue with the proposed quantum of commercial floorspace for NEC, perceiving this as a potential "cap" on development, and the requirement for outline permissions if bringing forward an application for only part of a strategic site.

There was support for the requirement to improve public transport routes and active travel to and around site, prioritising walking and cycling. However, resident and community groups raised concerns with the practicality of using a trip budget to manage vehicle numbers, the ability to manage congestion and on-site parking, and rail capacity.

The comments of residents, community groups, and Historic England also highlight potential impacts of NEC growth on neighbouring areas. This included impacts on Fen Ditton and Milton Country Park; on the general cityscape, sensitive landscapes and heritage assets/features; on local social infrastructure and services; and on residential areas as a result of

parking displacement.

The same groups also highlighted what they considered were omissions from the policy, including provision for a cultural venue and an alternative to the Fen Road level crossing.

A number of landowners and statutory undertakers raised concerns that the policy did not go far enough to protect safeguarded uses.

Response to the main issues raised in representations:

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

The revised policy continues to promote NEC as an innovation district through an "Area of Major Change" designation, responding positively to the general support for intensification and diversification of development in the area whilst reflecting the level of uncertainty around its precise development capacity and what constraints may apply. It acknowledges that the CWWTP is likely to remain on site during the plan period but highlights significant development opportunities within the wider NEC area for additional high-quality commercial floorspace and ancillary uses and, where conditions allow, housing, making efficient use of brownfield land within the City. The revised policy recognises the importance of NEC in contributing to Greater Cambridge's future economic growth through provision to intensify commercial floorspace within the existing science and business parks for research, innovation and knowledge-based industries.

The indicative commercial floorspace capacity has been removed, with the onus placed on applicants to demonstrate compliance with the trip budget and that their proposal will not have adverse impacts on the road network, taking into account cumulative

impacts arising from existing or planned development. A specific policy requirement has been added to ensure the effectiveness of transport mitigation measures will be monitored and can be enforced.

- A further requirement has been added to ensure that all development within NEC coordinates measures to prevent parking displacement.
- The representations regarding potential impacts on the wider area would appear to reflect the more significant housing quanta of 8,500 homes proposed for NEC in the Regulation 18 consultation. More modest housing provision (c.650 units) is now expected within the plan period and will likely take the form Build-to-Rent that generates a lesser need for supporting social infrastructure.
- The infrastructure needs of NEC, reflecting the revised development mix and quanta, will now be accounted for within the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan, and the policy retains explicit requirements to ensure that these needs are met on-site through development proposals or enhancing off-site capacity and accessibility.
- While there is no policy requirement for provision of a city scale cultural venue within NEC, there is still a policy expectation for community, cultural, retail and social spaces aligned with the vision for the innovation district and to ensure that the broader design ambitions for the area are realised, reflecting the desire to active ground floors and avoid the closed, campus-style layouts that have tended to dominate the area in the past.
- More explicit references to safeguarded uses have been added to the policy, reflecting that a range of uses highlighted already benefit from safeguarding in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021. The need to apply the agents of change principle to ensure the operation of these uses are not prejudiced is also retained. In response to other comments made around safeguarding land, the policy should be read alongside all policies of the Local Plan as a whole, noting in particular that Policy I/SG sets out various infrastructure projects (including East West Rail) which are subject to safeguarding to prevent conflicts between development proposals and existing or planned infrastructure.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
General support for the vision for NEC as proposed in the policy	210230 (Vistry Group), 211500 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)
Concerns raised re feasibility of residential allocation and associated measures following the withdrawal of funding for the relocation of the CWWTP.	201179 (Save Honey Hill Group M Starkie), 202573, (Save Honey Hill Group M Starkie), 202582 (Save Honey Hill Group M Starkie), 202597 (Save Honey Hill Group), 202967 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust, M Baker), 201481 (L Woolfenden), 201485 (Fen Ditton Village Society),

	201847 (H Warnock), 202130 (M Asplin), 203581 (Horningsea PC, E A Williams), 205491 (J Pratt), 202739 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future, S Nicholas), 203584 (The Crown Estate, WSP), 204278 & 211502 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9), 205471 (L Cotton), 208762 (Heatons, on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd), 209165 (Anglian Water), 209970 (Granta Land Ltd), 210231 (Vistry Group), 211591 (Places for People)
Please see our comments in relation to Policy S/JH and Policy S/DS. We note that paragraph 3.1.3 sets out the Councils' intention to continue engagement with relevant partners to confirm a refined position for the site. Anglian Water recognises that our current position and strategy to invest in the existing Cambridge WRC, because of the withdrawal of funding for the CWWTPR, and in the absence of	209165 (Anglian Water Services)

alternative funding being secured, will have a significant bearing on the site allocation and future updates to the spatial framework. We will continue to liaise with the Councils as we progress our plans to increase dry weather flow capacity of the WRC and enable growth across the Cambridge WRC catchment to come forward	
Support for continuing to explore funding for the CWWTP relocation and retaining the residential allocation for NEC; include explicit support for co-living and build to rent; safeguard relocation site as least to end of DCO period.	203523 (Cambridge Ahead, E Pritchard), 204863 & 204873 (Bidwells on behalf of Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure), 210069 (Mrs Veronica Cox)
Concerns around the effective discounting of land within the CWWTP Consultation Area for residential purposes	203324 (Save Honey Hill Group, M Starkie), 204761 (Fen House Property Ltd, I Litterick)
Concerns around lack of feasibility evidence for dismissal of on-site consolidation option for CWWTP and lack of consideration of this option as an appropriate strategy; this is contradictory when the strategy justifies protection of the green belt on the grounds that these needs can be met elsewhere, yet delivery of this site is reliant on green belt development.	202589 (Save Honey Hill Group, M Starkie), 202591 (Save Honey Hill Group, M Starkie), 202593 (Save Honey Hill Group, M Starkie), 202594 (Save Honey Hill Group, M

	Starkie), 202598 (Save Honey Hill Group, M Starkie)
Investment in CWWTP will be required as it remains on site and other measures, e.g. Waterbeach pipeline.	209165 (Anglian Water)
Support for recognition of the NEC as an important area of business innovation and employment, not dependent on relocation of the CWWTP	204278 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9); 204863 & 204873 (Bidwells on behalf of Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure), 205491 (J Pratt)
Concerns around business space quanta and potential cap on development	203391 (St John's College Cambridge, Savills), 203584 (The Crown Estate, WSP), 204278 & 211501 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9), 204863 & 204873 (Bidwells on behalf of Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure), 210077 (The Crown Estate)

Support for flexible approach to development of Milton Road Garages site and that policy should take recent planning decisions into account	204718 & 210714 (Brockton Everlast Inc, Savills)
Concern that the policy does not do enough to safeguard all the existing mineral infrastructure within NEC in line with NPPF: Paragraph 223 (part e) of the NPPF (2024) and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan	208762 (Heatons, on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd); 210544 & 210599 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Policy should refer to the requirement for the site specific FRA to include hydraulic modelling of the watercourses within the site to inform site layout and design levels, development should prioritise areas less vulnerable to flooding.	211184 (Environment Agency)
Specific reference to Agent of Change principle should be included re new development near any existing critical infrastructure	208762 (Heatons, on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd)
Concerns re intensive development of NEC area impacting local landscape and sense of place.	201179 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Land required for the relocation of the CWWTP is not identified on the policies map.	201179 (Save Honey Hill Group M Starkie), 202597 (Save Honey Hill Group M Starkie), 202109 (M Asplin), 203581 (Horningsea PC)
Comment re plans for a cultural venue as part of redevelopment; support for Create Cambridge's involvement.	202141(Cambridge Junction, M Ridler), 202308

	(Cambridge Junction, L Mills), 204170 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge, M Burman), 202323 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge, S Yusuf), 205403 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge, E Hine), 202754, 202872 (Cambridge Junction, R Tinkler), 202874, (Cambridge Junction, B Groisman), 202424 (Kettle's Yard, S Biller); 204686 (NEUBAU Architecture, B Lenz); 204399 (New International Encounter, L Elmer); 203027 (The Arts Theatre Cambridge, V

	Beechey); 203631 (University of Cambridge, Z Svendsen), 203871 (University of Cambridge, J Fritsch), 205048 (University of Cambridge, L Sheerman); 205004 (Wysing Arts Centre, R Cooper); 202057 (H Chamberlain), 202199 (H Tam), 202387 (J Webber), 202412 (T Shaw), 202461 (K Jones), 202686 (T Altmann), 202716 (W Townsend), 202783 (S Lee), 202932 (R Tarry), 202973 (T Flinders), 203341 (N Ellis), 203437 (S Ashworth), 203485 (L Heap), 203536 (D Lever), 203851 (N Yeni), 204700 (A Giarlis), 205081 (H Paterson), 205137 (J

	Walsh), 205299 (AC de Azevedo Lamha), 205318 (N Oakley), 205331 (L Howse), 205393 (A Seiglow)
Support for improved and more cohesive active travel network to and around site, including upgraded river crossing; walking and cycling as routes to public transport	201809 (J Baumberg), 202003 (D Langley), 202304 (R MacDonald), 202646 (A Lawrence), 203707 (T Preud'homme), 204596 (D Potts), 205405 (A Williams), 205422 (S Nuttall), 205475 (P Colledge), 205481 (R De Beaux); 204278 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9), 207601 (Natural England, C Duerden)
With or without the Hartree proposal, the Cambridge North development area represents a step change in intensity and movement demand. However, the current planning framework lacks a coherent transport-led spatial strategy. Movement through the Cambridge North station area is already compromised, with a loss of segregation and lack of coherent surfacing that risks bringing pedestrians	211769 (Camcycle)

and cyclists into unnecessary conflict. Beyond that there are bottlenecks such as the shared-use path at Moss Bank, which is three metres wide and already functioning as a critical failure point. This constraint is not adequately acknowledged in the Plan or in the previously issued North Cambridge Area Action Plan, despite the scale of growth proposed. More fundamentally, the river crossings are insufficient. Without a new or significantly improved bridge, high levels of cycling to and from Cambridge North will not be achieved. The Local Plan should treat a new or substantially upgraded river crossings as essential infrastructure.	
Need for alternative to the Fen Road level crossing, including safeguarding land for future infrastructure	202830 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group, K Porrer), 203726 (W Clements), 204625 (R Robertson), 202646 (A Lawrence), 202739 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future, S Nicholas)
Concerns regarding traffic issues: volume & HGV traffic, parking provision, impact on surrounding areas and the practical applicability of the trip budget.	201225 (S Williams), 204625 (R Robertson), 202338 (H Brown), 202646 (A Lawrence), 203584 (The Crown Estate, WSP),

	204278 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9), 204863 & 204873 (Bidwells on behalf of Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure), 203833 (A Chan)
Concerns re feasibility of car free zones, minimum cycle parking standards, EVCP requirement	204863 & 204873 (Bidwells on behalf of Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure)
Support for trip budget approach, noting the position is being reviewed and updated.	210579 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Remove requirement for outline planning applications	204863 & 204873 (Bidwells on behalf of Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure)
Support for requirement for outline planning applications, but object to reference to outline covering the whole site misleading given the impracticalities of preparing this across multiple landowners and sites.	210083 (The Crown Estate), 211511 & 211512 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)

Concerns around rail capacity, especially given lack of proposed connection to East West Rail.	202739 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future, S Nicholas)
EWR Co has identified the requirement for land within the North East Cambridge site to construct and operate the new railway. This includes new railway infrastructure, a construction compound and a Maintenance Delivery Unit (MDU). Land required for EWR within the North East Cambridge site is included in the EWR safeguarded area. To avoid a conflict between the proposed North East Cambridge allocation and the EWR Safeguarding Directions, EWR Co requests that draft Policy S/NEC is amended.	211906 (East West Rail)
Proposal for enhanced bus service serving NEC area	203777 A Chan
Support for illustrative spatial framework, clarify that it is not prescriptive	204278, 211496, 211497, 211498, 211499 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9), 204863 & 204873 (Bidwells on behalf of Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure)
Concern that design requirements should include landscape buffer to transition between NEC and river/fenland; site should reflect countryside rather than urban location.	202739 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future, S Nicholas); 210088 (Historic England)

Concern that roof terraces and cafes cannot always be opened up to the public – should not be a blanket requirement.	211505 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)
Concerns around surrounding open spaces - Fen Ditton, Milton CP at capacity; green spaces should be for year round use and not roof terraces/courtyards; concern re requirement for roof terraces to be public	202739 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future, S Nicholas), 204278 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)
Support for providing green and blue infrastructure and sustainable connections along the river Cam and into the Wicken Vision Area.	211076 (The National Trust MEE Planning Team)
Concern that development within NEC could impact neighbouring Conservation Areas: HIA should be included in evidence base and policy, along with reference to the nearby CAs and river.	210088 (Historic England)
Paragraph 3.1.2 - HE welcomes the ambition to 'enable Cambridge to accommodate growth of the highest quality whilst protecting and enhancing the historic environment and the key public spaces which are an important part of what makes the city so special to local people'.	211978 (Historic England)
Figure 17 - There are 4 heritage assets shown on this figure. These are not designated heritage assets. Are they non designated heritage assets? Review and amend accordingly.	211979 (Historic England)
Support for removal of some hedgerows/vegetation to facilitate crossing points over the First Public Drain	210081 (The Crown Estate)
Objection to 20% BNG on site requirement	204278 & 211507 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)
Concern around high demand for secondary schools; suggestion to safeguard land as contingency	201701 (J Skinner), 201356 (R McDonald), 202338 (H

	Brown), 205481 (R De Beaux), 210587 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Support for investment in leisure facilities, for example a swimming pool, rowing channels, a new country park within walking distance	203590 (A Carpen), 202338 (H Brown), 201777 (Eastern Region Rowing Council, R Moseley), 205481 (R De Beaux), 207601 (Natural England (C Duerden)
Identifies inconsistencies in active travel and car parking provisions, as well as concerns regarding biodiversity gains and access to nature spaces, potential nuisance impacts and lack of secondary schooling and nursery provision, despite there being an acknowledged shortage of places in North Cambridge.	210840 (Hannah Brown)
Wording regarding healthcare facilities; contributions specified for emergency services.	205059 (NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board), 207507 (J Lawson on behalf of Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service), 205072

	(NHS Property Services Ltd on behalf of NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board
Clarity required around potential to infill sites to rear of Lovell Road	201319 (N Upstone)
Water supply - no plan for filling proposed new reservoir	201847 (H Warnock)
We broadly welcome the allocation of this strategic brownfield site. It offers an exciting opportunity for regeneration in a highly accessible, sustainable location. It will be important that the policy ensures the protection and enhancement of the historic environment including the conservation areas, river corridor and wider city scape. We appreciate there are still some uncertainties about the site and the funding for the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant. However, we acknowledge the approach being taken to retaining the draft allocation whilst not relying on the housing numbers to meet the need. Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there are several Conservation Areas nearby including Riverside and Stourbridge Common, Fen Ditton, Baits Bite Lock and Horningsea as well as their associated listed buildings. The River Cam, the meadows and its setting are an important part of the wider setting of the City. Development within this area therefore has the potential to harm the significance of these assets through development within their settings. We recognise that a the HIA for North-East Cambridge has been prepared. However, this does not	210088 (Historic England)

appear to have been included as part of the evidence base for this Plan. It is important to include this as part of the evidence base. Furthermore, it is important to incorporate the recommendations of the HIA into the Policy. This includes recommendations such as increased landscaping along the eastern boundary. The HIA should also be referenced in the policy. We welcome criterion 7c. There is currently no reference to nearby conservation areas and the River. This should be included in the policy. There should also be a new criterion requiring careful consideration of impacts on the Conservation Areas and River as well as views into the City and an appropriate urban edge. We continue to have concerns about potential increases in heights in North-East Cambridge in both the existing Science Park and also the land to the east of Milton Road. We remain concerned about impacts on views from Ditton Meadows and the Conservation Areas as well as wider views approaching the City from the north-east and east. Heights must be carefully managed through appropriate criteria in the policy.	
Existing buildings near the station are incongruous with the surrounding countryside views and do not act currently as community spaces despite reliance in the policy on the space, highlighting a need for better integration. Additionally, the urban/rural fringe is not clearly defined, which could lead to planning inconsistencies.	210838 & 210839 (Hannah Brown)
Figure 17: There are 4 heritage assets shown on this figure. These are not designated heritage assets. Are they non-designated heritage assets? Review and amend accordingly; Paragraphs 3.1.6 and 3.1.24 seem to be the same. Delete duplicate paragraph	210187, 210188 (Historic England)

The University supports the general direction of the policy to densify the site and make the best use of the available land. There are a number of detailed comments in relation to the policy wording which are attached in a table with comments set against the relevant policy/paragraph numbers. There is inconsistency across the plan of naming the site. Eddington should be used for all references to the site.	202528 (University of Cambridge – M Parsons)
Reflect hybrid planning permission 22/02771/OUT. Retaining CWWTP should not prejudice other parcels. Should make explicit reference to build to rent and co-living tenures being acceptable. Removal of specified quantum of employment floorspace. Remove restriction to Class E(g) and defer to definition in policy J/NE. Remove requirement for car-free zones near to hubs or centres as this is incompatible with the allocation. Remove requirement to exceed minimum cycle parking standards. Replace existing trip budgets with information included within the North East Cambridge Transport Position Statement 2025 Add 650 parking spaces at Chesterton Sidings. Allow for the reprovision of 425 Network Rail Spaces Remove EVCP requirement as this doubles up on building regulations. Allow for development to progress without being halted by parking displacement. Remove requirement for outline planning applications. Condition design codes and Stewardship strategies. Spatial framework- should be clear this is not a prescriptive tool, remove heritage asset at Chesterton Sidings, remove local centres as this is not referred to in other retail policies.	Bidwells (204863)
National Highways will object to any structures placed within the highway boundary and recommend this is reflected within the policy moving forward. In principle, National Highways are supportive of upgrades or new crossings for the A14, such as Jane Coston Bridge and underpasses, to assist with	209005 (National Highways)

the wider connectivity requirements, subject to the correct structural and safety assessments completed and appropriate agreements ensuring ongoing maintenance and required funding are met. For the overall trip budget to be met, it is crucial individual sites do not exceed their trip budget, and breaches are controlled appropriately to reduce trips back in accordance with the agreed budgets. National Highways would need to understand the impact of this development and the cumulative impact on the A14 junction 33 should the trip budget not be met and ensure appropriate mitigation measures are secured as part of the plan making process.	
The current car dependency of Science Park is problematic due to long commuting distances and inadequate public transport coverage, particularly for those commuting from eastern settlements and outskirts of Cambridge.	203777 (A Chan)
A network of highway-running buses is needed, well connected with the local bus network, to create viable public transport alternatives to driving.	211023 (A Chan)
Proposal for two bus interchange on the A14, one at the busway crossing and another at the Milton crossing, utilising existing routes for better transfer options and potentially fostering express or orbital bus services.	211024 (A Chan)
Suggestion of bus gates in Milton to restrict through traffic while allowing bus access onto the new bus-only Milton crossing, aimed at reducing A10 congestion and improving local traffic flow. Suggestion of moving the Milton park and ride further out after implementing the above.	211025 (A Chan)
Concern at requirement for development to be within 5 minutes walk of high quality public transport and active travel routes, which may not always be achievable. Notes that people are generally willing to walk further than this.	211508 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)

Amend Policy S/NEC and the Policies Map to explicitly identify and justify the 34ha Green Belt land take required for the CWWTP relocation.	202577 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Amend Policy S/DS to resolve the internal contradiction with Policy S/NEC by clarifying whether development needs can, in fact, justify Green Belt harm in this instance. Relying on a project that requires VSC for Green Belt harm while the Local Plan claims such circumstances do not exist for general development is internally inconsistent and unsound under NPPF 36(d).	202582 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge (8,350 dwellings/ 22,545 population) (p.103): Under the subheading 'Uses' Section 4 – add a new criterion g. as follows; "g. Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding"	207474 (James Lawson Planning on behalf of Cambridgeshire Constabulary)
Suggestion that policy amended to reflect that the proposed new district centre is contingent on relocation of the CWWTP.	210078 (The Crown Estate), 211503 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)
Suggestion that the policy should be less prescriptive around location of medium to higher density development and tall buildings.	210079 (The Crown Estate)
Concern that the trip budget specified is out of date, dating from preparation of the AAP in 2021 and do not reflect the latest plans for the area.	210080 & 210082 (The Crown Estate), 211506 & 211509 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)
Lack of detail on the vernacular and density of buildings, which is important for high-density development at an edge of city site. Lack of clear, quantifiable floor space allocation for community,	210837 (Hannah Brown)

retail, open space and active space (contrary to the defined floor spaces for commercial and industrial use).	
Reference to design character drawing on industrial heritage should be reviewed as this does not apply equally to the area west of Milton Road.	211504 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)
Objects to prescriptive limits on car parking spaces and restrictions on through traffic from Milton Road to Kings Hedges Road.	211510 (Trinity College Cambridge, DP9)

Policy S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Concerns were raised about Policy S/LAC, citing excessive reliance on large strategic allocations for meeting identified housing needs. The NHS requested that policies set out explicit requirement on-site health facilities and financial contributions. Concerns from Anglian Water were expressed about specific sites' impacts on sewer pumping stations. Concerns were raised from National Highways about not having a cumulative impact assessment to ensure the impact on the SRN is appropriately managed and mitigated. In particular, the impact on the SRN including junctions on the M11, A11 and A14.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Since the Draft Plan stage Policy S/LAC has been removed to streamline the plan and ensure that each site stands on its own merits. Comments have been noted and amended on corresponding policies.

The development strategy has been informed by evidence which sets out that the impact of larger sites rather than incremental development has less carbon impacts and reduces impacts on villages across Greater Cambridge. This model also makes the delivery of infrastructure easier to deliver as it is supported by a sufficient critical mass. Therefore, justifying the allocation of larger strategic allocations to meet housing needs.

In response to Anglian Water, for these sites the sentence has been added to say that development should not preclude operation and maintenance of sewer pumping stations located within or adjacent to the site. In response to the NHS, the IDP will set out the contributions for healthcare on specific sites, this is not duplicated for every site, and financial contributions are required on all proposals depending on scale it is therefore not included in policy wording. In response to National Highways, a transport assessment will be undertaken on major planning applications to understand the impact on the local road network, and the wider transport strategy will identify and manage issues across the wider transport network. Additional transport modelling has also been carried out on the local plan to inform mitigation requirements.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Suggest amendment to Part 2a of the policy replacing "make the development acceptable" with "achieve an outstanding standard of development". Supporting information to be similarly amended.	202741 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
Matters including asset encroachment (Policy WS/HS) and utilities infrastructure (see our comments relating to Policy GP/QD) should be a consideration for any site allocation where we have existing assets, or where the site is in close proximity to our operational sites and should therefore avoid the need to introduce separate clauses within any of the affected site allocation policies. Anglian Water can provide a list of assets within the proposed site boundaries, if this would be helpful to the Councils. The following sites have sewer pumping stations located within or adjacent to the site and as ‘above ground’ assets this will be land within Anglian Water’s ownership, and may have implications for site layout and	209164 (Anglian Water)

design: • S/C/CLT: Clifton Road Area; • S/CE: Cambridge East; • S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus; • S/CB: Cambourne Town Centre; • S/ED: Eddington; • S/NEC: North East Cambridge.	
The College objects to Policy S/LAC, citing excessive reliance on large strategic allocations for housing needs, which risks timely delivery due to infrastructure dependencies. A more balanced approach is recommended, with additional housing land allocated across various sites to reduce delivery risks and ensure timely housing provision. The College requests reconsideration of land at Wilberforce Road for allocation. Concerns regarding the site's suitability include landscape impact and loss of protected open space, but the College argues that development can be designed to minimise harm.	203930 (Bidwells on behalf of Emmanuel College (Wilberforce Road))
The respondent notes that the current wording of the policy should be amended to correct the reference to Cambridge Retail Park from an allocation to a designation, as it is included as a designated Public Realm Improvement Area (PRIA).	204121 (Bidwells on behalf of Railpen)
The respondent highlights that the indicative dwelling or floorspace capacity for site allocations may vary and should be determined through a design-led approach.	204121 (Bidwells on behalf of Railpen)
The respondent objects to proposed Policy S/LAC, citing excessive reliance on a few large strategic allocations for housing needs, which poses risks to timely delivery due to complex infrastructure requirements. A recommendation is made for a more balanced approach that includes additional housing land across various sites, sizes, and locations to reduce delivery risks and ensure timely housing provision. Nomination of sites along Lond Road for intensification.	204134 (Bidwells on behalf of Emmanuel College (Long Road))
Site allocations lacking explicit requirements for on-site health facilities should include wording for financial contributions towards health and infrastructure mitigation, aligning with the IDP approach. Early engagement is essential to deliver the infrastructure in the IDP.	205078 (NHS Property Services)

This policy identifies site allocations within the city centre. Whilst National Highways do not offer specific comments on these sites due to the distance from the SRN, National Highways suggest these sites are included in a cumulative impact assessment to ensure the impact on the SRN is appropriately managed and mitigated. In particular, the impact on the SRN including junctions on the M11, A11 and A14.	209007 (National Highways)

Policy S/C/SMS: Garages between 20 St. Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge (now Garages at St Matthews Street and Norfolk Street)

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Concerns were raised about density and impacts on trees. An objection was raised by Historic England to better reflect the heritage assets within and close to the site boundary. The requirements from the HIA should also be incorporated onto the site including requirement for archaeology assessment.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The capacity for the site has been considered in the local content of two to three storeys. The surrounding terrace to the south of the site has a dwellings per hectare of 70 and the homes to the north of the site has a dwellings per hectare of 92. This would make 12 dwellings in this location acceptable in the local heights context.
- The protection of trees is set out in Policy B/TC to protect the retention of trees. Any future planning application will need to comply with this policy and provide an arboricultural assessment to assess the impacts on trees.
- The policy has been amended to mitigate impacts against heritage assets. The policy has been amended to include contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology assessment requirement to address comments made by Historic England.
- The name of the policy has been amended to more accurately reflect the location of the site.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Questions if the site has capacity for 12 homes.	202532 (J Neal)
Point 1A any future development must do much more than simply “retain and incorporate the existing mature tree”: it must ensure the tree’s RPA (Root Protection Area) is entirely undamaged, and that the space under and around that important tree remains fully available for future public enjoyment.	202532 (J Neal)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the site lies adjacent to the boundary of the Mill Road Conservation Area and close to the grade II Listed Church of St Matthew. Development within this area therefore has the potential to harm the significance of these assets through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. While some of the recommendations of the HIA are included in the policy wording, reference should also be made to contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology criterion.	210089 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/HTR: 137 – 143 Histon Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) supports the allocation of this site and the site capacity. Comments were made by CIP to ensure the design is co-ordinated with development on the ATS part of the site. The protection of trees wording should be reviewed to ensure it does not inhibit the development of the site.

An objection was raised by Historic England to better reflect the heritage assets within and close to the site boundary. The requirements from the HIA should also be incorporated onto the site including requirement for archaeology assessment.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Support noted from CIP.
- The policy has been amended to mitigate impacts against heritage assets. The policy has been amended to include contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology assessment requirement to address comments made by Historic England.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
CIP controls all of site bar ATS site, application should reflect planning application for 70 units.	204205 (Carter Jonas on behalf of the Cambridge Investment Partnership CIP)
It should be noted that the CIP application is not comprehensive development as ATS site has not come forward but the application has been designed in a way to combine the two sites.	204205 (Carter Jonas on behalf of the Cambridge Investment Partnership CIP)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area lies adjacent to the site. Development of the site has the potential to impact upon the Conservation Area and its setting. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. While some of the recommendations of the HIA are included in the policy wording, reference should also be made to contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology criterion.	210090 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/HGH: Henry Giles House 73-79 Chesterton Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support for the allocation.

Comments were made in relation to strengthening the wording around the retention of trees and the use of similar styles to the surrounding local architecture and improving active travel connections.

The site promoter commented that the capacity of the site should be reviewed.

Historic England commented that the site is an especially sensitive location and development should be contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and the addition of an archaeology criterion.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Support noted.
- The approach to the design of the site has been set out to reflect the local character and massing. In response to the increase of capacity, there is potential for a higher capacity to be accommodated where further evidence can be developed to ensure impacts on neighbouring buildings / heritage assets are managed. This has included revisions to the policy to set out the need for development to respond to the local context including, contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology criterion.
- In response to Historic England, the suggested amendments have been made.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
It is proposed that the policy is strengthened in relation to design and character on Chesterton Road to reflect the style of those between Carlyle Road and Alpha Road; removing "where possible" to ensure full retention of the silver birch tree on Carlyle Road; and requiring, rather than encouraging, active travel links from Chesterton Road through to Grasmere Gardens.	203770 (Cambridge Green Party)
Formerly the site of Sir Horace Darwin's Cambridge Scientific Instrument Company, the architectural style should demonstrate clear historical links with early scientific instruments *or* take inspiration from The Tivoli / 1930s Art Deco era.	203772 (A Carpen)

Support for the site allocations. Request for review of capacity to be increased because the site is highly sustainable.	203929 (Twenty5Planning Limited on behalf of the TT Group)
The site lies within the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area, adjacent to the Central Conservation Area and fronting the river, the of the river opposite Jesus Green. Although we have no objection to the principle of redevelopment on this site, this is a sensitive location with the potential to impact on the historic environment. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. While some of the recommendations of the HIA are included in the policy wording, reference should also be made to contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology criterion.	210091 (Historic England)
TT Group support the continued proposed allocation of this site. The attached representations demonstrate that the quantum of development should be revised and uplifted to optimise the delivery of this highly sustainable site, in accordance with the NPPF and PPG.	203929 Telereal Trillium Investment Properties

Policy S/C/HRC: Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support for the site allocation from all representators including Cambridgeshire County Council who own the site and Historic England. The policy was supported as is with no amendments.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The policy is supported by those who commented on the policy and following a review no changes are required to this policy. A minor editorial change has been made for clarity of expression.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Support for site allocation.	202115 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. No comments	210092 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/PDC: Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support for the allocation of this site Cambridgeshire County Council with no amendments and Historic England, with some minor amends relating to heritage. Historic England confirmed that there are designated heritage assets within the site and have requested an amendment to the HIA.

Comments were made by a local resident to ensure that the walkability, access to local facilities, access to green space and management of surface water flooding were considered in the development. The respondent suggests focusing on larger open spaces further out for development instead of this site, which is bordered by established residents.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to comments raised by a local resident about the density of the site and impact on existing buildings and character. The site allocation has been subject to further testing at the Regulation 18 stage which has informed a reduction of units onsite to reflect neighbouring densities around the site. This review has concluded that 40 dwellings is suitable in this location and achieves an appropriate density for its setting.
- In response to comments raised about concerns about flood risk, any development on the site will be required to comply with Policy CC/FM Managing Flood Risk. Surface water flooding implications will be managed through the development management process. As a site allocation, this allocation has been reviewed in the Local Plan's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The site is not within Flood Zone 2 or 3.

- In response to Cambridgeshire County Council comments made about an increase on capacity on this site back to the previously adopted version of this site allocation, a further review of the site has been undertaken and it is the view of the Council's that 40 dwellings is more suitable in this location and is reflective of the local character.
- In response to local resident's comments raised about protected open space, the boundary of the Protected Open Space has been reviewed to include the playing fields adjacent to the site only as it is a more accurate reflection of what constitutes open space. This will also allow for the design of the scheme to utilise the full site allocation.
- In response to Historic England, the HIA has been revised to reflect the removal of this site allocation from the historic core.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Support for site allocation.	202112 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council)
Suggestion to increase capacity to 67 dwellings.	202112 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council)
Concerns raised about allocation of site and impact on walking, access to local facilities and recreation including green spaces.	201022 (D Wilson)
Concerns raised about the density of the site and impact on existing buildings and character.	201022 (D Wilson)
Concerns raised about runoff and potential flooding issues.	201022 (D Wilson)
Respondents suggested that larger open spaces would be more suitable for development.	201022 (D Wilson)

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies very close to the Trumpington Conservation Area. Any development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of the conservation Area through development within its setting. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We question paragraph 1.10 of the HIA – the site is not far removed from Cambridge but lies within the city limits. Maybe more accurate to say removed from the historic core. Criterion 1 reflects the recommendations of the HIA.	210093 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/PPS: Police Station Parkside

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support for the site allocation.

Comments were made by the Police and Crime Commissioner as the site promoter about modifying wording around

Concerns were raised from Historic England about building heights and strategic viewpoints. The Cambridge Liberal Democrat Group commented on cycle provision and car free development onsite, as well as retention of existing buildings.

Further responses were made from a local resident about strategic viewpoints.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to the Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group, to provide flexibility for the re-design of the site to facilitate its redevelopment the wording has not been revised. The provision of cycling parking will apply to the planning application on this site and these standards are set out separately in development management policy
- In response to a local resident comment, Strategic Viewpoint E Limekiln Road has been included in Point D as well.
- In response to the Police and Crime Commissioner, the retention of trees onsite is a clear ambition for the Councils' therefore it has been left in the policy with no amends. The discussion of the removal of any trees will be assessed through

the development management process using development management Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population. The wording of point d has remained unchanged as the impact on strategic views is important to protect and the degree to which these are unacceptable will be demonstrated by evidence provided at the development management stage and assessed by the Councils'.

- In response to Mothers CAN Cambridge, the suggestion that the site should be car free, the Policy I/EV: Parking and Electric Vehicles sets out standard for car parking for development, it will not be duplicated in the site allocation. Due to the City Centre location, the predominate means of travel for residents of this development is likely to be public and active travel.
- In response to Historic England, the policy has been reviewed to include other Strategic Viewpoints and Strategic Viewpoint E Limekiln Road has been included as well. The policy has been amended to include the HIA recommendation that development is limited to approximately 4 residential storeys.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Support for the site allocation.	202832 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
Respondent has set out that the site coming forward should enhance and improve the current building and that this should be reflected in the policy wording.	202832 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
Development should not impact on views from Lime Kiln in South East Cambridge.	203774 (A Carpen)

Provision of existing cycle parking should be retained and any new cycle requirements be in addition to what is existing.	204175 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
Support for flexibility of uses defined in the policy.	204175 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
The criteria set out as 1. a. to d. and 2. are generally supported.	204175 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
The policy should consider whether there are circumstances where harm to a heritage asset might be outweighed by a public benefit.	204178 (Savills on behalf of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire)
Minor wording suggestions are needed for clarification of ask in the policy.	207777 (Savills on behalf of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire)
Site boundary should be revised to reflect land ownership.	204178 (Savills on behalf of Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire)

Supportive of protection of existing trees.	204727 (Mothers CAN Cambridge)
The development should be car free with no parking permits for residents.	204727 (Mothers CAN Cambridge)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA recommends that height is limited to 3-4 storeys. This should be specified in criterion g to add greater clarity regarding height.	210094 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/NCA: North Cambridge Academy, 108, Arbury Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support for the site allocation including from Cambridgeshire County Council who supports the policy with no amendments. North Cambridge Academy were also supportive of teh principle of the allocation.

Comments were made in support of the Community User Agreement and for development of sports facilities by local residents.

Concerns were raised about impacts on local views and on parking by local residents. Concerns were also raised about open space designations within the site allocation and need for flexibility in policy wording to achieve the optimal layout by the Meridian Trust.

Further responses from Historic England raised concerns about building heights being reflected in the policy to respond to the SA.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The site allocation has been reviewed in the context of the representations made. The protected open space is retained onsite as there will be sports pitches proposed onsite. The proportion of affordable housing will be set by development management policy H/AH Affordable Housing and policy H/HM Housing Mix. These policies will ensure that the development provides a mix of housing to meet the identified need.

- A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been prepared to support this site allocation to identify any potential impacts on the surrounding local character and heritage assets around the site. The mitigation measure proposed is a building height of 3-4 storeys and further Heritage Assessments to be undertaken to support any future planning applications.
- The number of units has been tested as suitable in this location. The HIA has suggested that the development has the potential for 3-4 storeys and therefore 40 dwellings can be delivered on this site.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The number of units proposed is too high and there is not sufficient local infrastructure to support them.	201287 (M Jordan)
The cumulative impact of development in the local area so should be looked at.	201287 (M Jordan)
Support for site allocation.	202211 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council)
Support, the development of new sport facilities at North Cambridge Academy will be good for the school, the area, and the city. The plan to make the facilities open to the public after school hours is excellent.	202165 (M MacGinley)
Concerns raised about the draft allocation proposals map showing protected open space over significant areas of the site allocation.	202147 (LSA Planning on behalf of Meridian Trust)
Concerns raised about the flexibility of the site allocation.	202147 (LSA Planning on behalf of Meridian Trust)
A proportion of the new housing should be identified as key worker (above and beyond the affordable housing requirements) and linked to North Cambridge Academy staff needs.	202744 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

Concerns raised about overlooking and impacts on historic views, specifically of the historic chimneys of the Museum of Technology.	202446 (G Dawes)
Support requirement for a Community Use Agreement for sports facilities.	205426 (A Williams)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA recommends that height is limited to 3-4 storeys. This should be specified in criterion g to add greater clarity regarding height.	210095 (Historic England)
The respondent supports the principle of mixed-use development for approximately 150 dwellings and sports facilities but seeks clarity on the draft allocation proposals map. The outlined site boundary appears to coincide with the respondent's original submission, but the designation of Protected Open Space over a significant portion of the site raises concerns about flexibility for development. The design of sports facilities should consider safeguarding measures for pupils and ensure functionality for community use outside school hours. The respondent highlights the need for careful consideration of pedestrian and vehicle access related to the sports facilities and residential development. There is a request for flexibility in the overall site allocation to achieve an optimal layout for the mixed-use development, particularly concerning the northern part currently designated as open space. The respondent requests the removal of the open space designation from the northern part of the site to facilitate flexibility for the development.	202147 (Meridian Trust)
Sport England supports, in principle, the ambition for North Cambridge Academy to develop as a mixed-use sporting hub, providing enhanced sports facilities and adequate replacement playing field is provided alongside residential development. As the allocation involves the loss of playing field land, it	209215 (Sport England)

must clearly demonstrate compliance with paragraph 104 of the NPPF. Sport England supports the policy requirements for: • Expansion of the existing sports hall; • Provision of a new 3G pitch, four tennis courts and a MUGA; and • A Community Use Agreement securing public access outside school hours. For examination soundness, the policy should explicitly require that any loss of playing field is replaced by provision that is equivalent or better in quantity, quality, accessibility and management arrangements. Recommend that replacement facilities are delivered in a timely manner and secured through appropriate planning conditions or obligations.	
This representation has been prepared on behalf of the Meridian Trust and Cambridgeshire County Council, (hereafter referred to as 'The landowners"), in relation to their land interests with regard to the draft allocation S/C/NCA: North Cambridge Academy. The landowners are supportive of the principle of the new draft allocation that includes approximately 150 dwellings, sports and recreation. The overall site boundary that is outlined in black appears to coincide with our original submission that outlined the site in red. It would appear that the entire site within the black line as shown above, is shaded pink and then part of the overall site allocation is overlain with green hatching that designates this area as Protected Open Space. If correct, this latter designation forms the majority of the overall allocation.	202149 (LSA planning-North Cambridge Academy)
The sports facilities need to be designed in a manner that they will function with the existing school in respect of safeguarding and security measures for pupils and work effectively outside of school hours for the community. Care will be needed to ensure appropriate pedestrian and vehicle access can be provided along with other associated works for these facilities and the residential development. The	202505 (LSA planning-North Cambridge Academy)

policy clearly sets out what is expected to be delivered at points 1a and b in terms of sports facilities, but the current land use designations reduce the flexibility of where these facilities and the housing could be located.	

Policy S/C/ER:1-99 Ekin Road and 1-8 Ekin Walk

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made in relation to the need for Council housing including ensuring homes meet high energy efficiency standards.

Concerns from Historic England were raised in relation to reflecting the recommendations from the HIA regarding building height that is limited to 3-4 storeys and adding greater clarity around this expectation in policy.

Further responses were made by Cambridge Investment Partnership as the Site Promoter to support the approximate amount of homes onsite, impact on protected open space, to have flexible building heights to allow for Building Regulation changes, to remove unacceptable impacts on views and to protect and / or enhance the open space.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The policy has been revised to set out that building heights should be limited to approximately 3-4 storeys to address Historic England comments about needing to specify a building heights to mitigate impact on skyline and representations made by Cambridge Investment Partnership for flexibility on building heights to allow for Building Regulation impacts.
- Cambridge Investment Partnership also asked for wording to protect and / or enhance the Protected Open Space. The wording has not been revised to protect the open space, however the assessment of impact on open space will be assessed through the planning application process using Policy BG/PO: Protecting open spaces.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for site allocation.	204206 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
A planning application has recently been submitted for the site under 26/00039/FUL. There are some suggested policy amendments needed to reflect some more specific details of this application.	204206 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
The respondent supports the requirement to protect and enhance the protected Open Space but suggests rewording to 'protected and/or enhanced' due to the land being highway.	204206 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
The respondent supports the aspiration for appropriate building heights but recommends revising the wording to allow for necessary increases in height to meet modern construction standards. The wording around protection of skylines and conservation areas should be amended for clarity.	204206 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
The wording around protection of open space should be amended to reflect that some of this land is adopted highway.	204206 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Land at Ekin Road, Cambridge, (CIP) submitted on 12 January 2026 - planning application (reference 26/00039/FUL): Most council homes exceed the "Cam Standard" for energy efficiency and climate resilience; the development will have green roofs, play areas, and social spaces. When combined with	201537 (G Kalombo)

nearby East Barnwell developments, there will be 254 new homes in Abbey ward (198 council homes total), a net gain of 97 council homes across both sites.	
There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA recommends that height is limited to 3-4 storeys. This should be specified in criterion g to add greater clarity regarding height.	210096 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/DR: 2-28 Davy Road and Garage Blocks

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support for the allocation of the site from Historic England.

Comments were made by a local residents on the need for more innovative design in proposals for the site.

Further responses were made by Cambridge Investment Partnership to reflect the capacity of the latest proposals for the site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The proposals for the site are designed to complement the existing character and have been designed in accordance with the HIA.
- The site allocation has been revised to reflect the most recent proposals onsite in terms of capacity. This is to reflect representations from Cambridge Investment Partnership.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The design should make provision for detailing and artistic imagination.	203775 (A Carpen)

Support for site allocation.	204209 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
The site owner would like to increase the site capacity to 68 new homes, an increase of 36.	204209 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
The respondent supports retaining mature trees but suggests that part (a) be amended to allow for justified tree removals through an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.	204209 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion c.	210097 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/HPC: 1-78 Hanover Court, 1-49 Princess Court and Garage at Newtown Garages

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the site allocation from Cambridge Investment Partnership. Comments were made by Historic England who welcomed the preparation of the HIA, the criterion that reflected the findings of the HIA and the identification of heritage assets in the policy wording.

Further responses were made by Cambridge Investment Partnership to reflect the capacity of the latest proposals for the site. Cambridge Investment Partnership also supports the part a and part d of the policy. Part b should be modified to allow for tree removal, and part c should be removed.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Support is noted from Historic England.
- In response to the Cambridge Investment Partnership, the retention of mature trees is retained as wording in the policy as the retention of trees is a key policy for the Local Plan to maintain and enhance urban greening. The removal of any trees will be negotiated through the planning application process, and development will be assessed against Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population.
- In response to the Cambridge Investment Partnership, the capacity of the site allocation has been revised to reflect the latest planning application for 165 homes.

- In response to the Cambridge Investment Partnership, Point 1c has been retained in the policy, relating to the electricity substation, to reduce impacts on residential amenity and outlook.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Support for site allocation.	204211 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Support for flexibility on uses using the wording approximately and for the design considerations set out in policy.	204211 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Support for the retention of trees but suggests rewording to allow for justified removals through an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.	204211 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Reference to electrical substation should be removed.	204211 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Support is expressed for part (d) on archaeological investigation, with a request to amend it to include a desk-based assessment as the first step.	204211 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)

The site is located within the New Town and Glisson Conservation Area and close to a number of listed buildings including the grade I The Church of Our Lady of the Assumption and the English Martyrs and Grade II* Wanstead House and numerous GII listings. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome the criterion which reflect the HIA.	210098 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/GER: Former Garage Block, East Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Historic England who welcomed the preparation of the HIA, but felt that its recommendations should be brought out more clearly into the policy including the wording around the building heights limit of 3 storeys in point e.

Concerns were raised by a local resident about the development being in keeping with the local character, especially the adjacent residential area and streetscape along East Road.

Further responses were made by Cambridge Investment Partnership to include justification for tree removals through an Aboricultural assessment, and suggested addition to point g to require development proposals fronting East Road to respond to its existing and emerging context.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- To address comments relating to building heights from Historic England, Point e has been amended to include - Development heights must be a maximum of 3 storeys. This is in direct response to Historic England's comments to ensure the policy wording reflects the HIA and adds greater clarity on the acceptable heights in this location.
- In response to comments from local residents and Cambridge Investment Partnership, Point g - Development proposals fronting East Road to respond to its existing and emerging context. has been added in direct response to a local resident's comment and a comment from the Cambridge Investment Partnership to ensure the design of the

development fits in with the adjacent residential area and streetscape along East Road.

- In response to the Cambridge Investment Partnership, the retention of mature trees is retained as wording in the policy as the retention of trees is a key policy for the Local Plan to maintain and enhance urban greening. The removal of any trees will be negotiated through the planning application process and development will be assessed against Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Concerns raised about the design of the building and impact on residential area. The adjacent properties are only two storeys, and therefore there is a risk of overlooking and dominating the setting from any tall buildings.	204221 (R Robertson)
Support for site allocation.	204215 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
The design of any building proposed for this site must primarily fit in with the adjacent residential area to the south and not the streetscape of East Rd. So much of the adjacent housing is only two storey there is a risk it would be badly overlooked and dominated if a tall building was allowed to be built on the garage site.	204221 (R Robertson)

Support for the retention of trees, but suggests rewording to allow for justified removals through an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.	204215 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
It is suggested that the policy reflects the requirement for the development proposals fronting East Road to respond to its existing and emerging context.	204215 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies close to the Mill Road Conservation Area and St Matthews Church (GII listed). Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA recommends that height is limited to 3 storeys. This should be specified in criterion e to add greater clarity regarding height.	210099 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/SH: 1-33 Stanton House, Christchurch Street

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support from the Cambridge Investment Partnership for the allocation of this site. Parts a and b of the policy are supported. It is suggested that the policy wording be amended to say that there is capacity for approximately 29 homes, resulting in a net loss of 5 units, including suitable replacement sheltered accommodation. This is due to a needed for general needs housing as well as replacement sheltered accommodation.

Comments were made by the Liberal Democrat Group to make it clearer that the impacts on the existing terraced housing and flats on Christchurch and Napier Streets should be considered.

Further responses were made by Historic England relating to the HIA. The HIA recommends that 'Development at a scale similar to the local prevailing building height and existing buildings on site should be appropriate. Site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings' and this should be included in the policy. Historic England welcomed the preparation of the HIA and confirmed that there are no designated heritage assets within the site and the site lies adjacent to the Kite Conservation Area and Christ Church (grade II).

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to the Liberal Democrat group, the supporting text has been revised to make it clearer that the impacts on the existing terraced housing and flats on Christchurch and Napier Streets should be considered.
- In response to Cambridge Investment Partnership, the support is noted and the capacity of the site has been reworded to

address the suitable replacement sheltered accommodation issue.

- In response to Historic England, the supported is noted and the recommendation from the HIA has been included in the policy wording.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The impacts on the existing terraced housing and flats on Christchurch and Napier Streets should be considered.	202834 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
Support for policy.	204216 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Support for flexibility in wording but reference should be made to sheltered accommodation.	204216 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the Kite Conservation Area and Christ Church (grade II). Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. Criterion 1a is quite vague in relation to building heights. Given the heritage sensitivity of the site, greater clarity is needed regarding building heights. The HIA recommends that	210100 (Historic England)

‘Development at a scale similar to the local prevailing building height and existing buildings on site should be appropriate. Site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings’. This should be included in the policy	

Policy S/C/SCL: Land South of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support from local residents to see the long awaited site come forward.

Comments were made on the site allocation in relation to building heights in this predominately residential location and the impact on local character.

Comments were made on the site in relation to the impact on Cherry Hinton brook chalk stream and the concerns raised by the Environment Agency.

Comments were made by residents to improve the cycle routes between David Lloyd and Brookside.

Comments were made by Stantec on behalf of Mission Street and BGO Propco Newton Ltd questioning the archaeological requirement as this was not an issue with the planning application.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to local residents concerns about heights, the planning application for this site has now been approved and it was assessed for its impacts on local character and on balance the decision is that this site is suitable for this density and the proposal has been found acceptable.
- The impact of development of the chalk stream has been mitigated through the development management process with conditions, as recommended by the Environment Agency. This will mitigate the impacts on Cherry Hinton brook and other environmental concerns.
- The cycle route between David Lloyd and Brookside and surrounding cycle network improvements are beyond the

scope of this site allocation and planning application to be able to improve.

- In response to Stantec regarding archaeological impacts, point 1c has not been removed from the policy to ensure that the DBA is considered should another planning application come in.
- In response to Historic England, the latest version of the HIA has set out the revised viewpoints to be Viewpoint F, these are equivalent to the Viewpoint 7 and 10 mentioned in policy which have been rationalised. No changes are required to the policy wording.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The building height is too tall and should be more reflective of local context.	201226 (S Williams)
Concerns raised about impact on the Cherry Hinton Brook.	201245 (S Williams)
Objection to policy due to over congestion on the Tins Pathway.	202697) (M Downs)
Objection to the policy due to access and safety.	203771 (C Bone)
Significantly-improved developer-funded active travel routes should be designed in and built, and amenities should be expanded to enable local residential access. Provision should be made for a new rail/light rail stop on the railway line.	203829 (A Carpen)
The cycle paths around the site should be improved.	202634 (A Lawrence)
Support for the development of the site.	202634 (A Lawrence)
The requirement for a desk based archaeological assessment should be reviewed in the context of the EIA.	204039 (Stantec on behalf of Mission Street and BGO Propco Newton Ltd)

Policy S/AMC/SCL fails to take the following matters into account: The site proposed for the country park is severely constrained Opportunities for public access have not been addressed. The part of the site previously ear-marked for public access is subject to flooding. Local water courses and bodies are vulnerable to pollution from toxic land fill. There is insufficient emphasis on the protection of flora and fauna. Management issues have not been given sufficient attention.	204669 (J McGill)
Concerns raised about biodiversity, safety, access and drainage and contamination.	205152 (H Anderson)
Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of this asset including through development within its setting. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. Criterion c refers to building heights of no taller than 6 storeys. In the absence of a Heritage Impact Assessment this is inappropriate and should be deleted. This needs to be explored through an HIA and masterplanning. Delete reference to 6 storeys.	210120 (Historic England)
here are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome reference to St Andrews church. Part of the HIA refers to viewpoint 7 and part refers to viewpoint 10. The policy itself criterion 1b refers to Viewpoint F. Please check and clarify which viewpoint it is.	210101 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/BRN: Land at Barnwell Road and Newmarket Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for this site allocation from Cambridge Investment Partnership. They suggest that the wording need to allow for justified tree removals with an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and replacement planting.

Comments were made by a local resident that there should be a larger community centre and community halls and that there should be shared provision of facilities.

Comments were made by Historic England to confirm that there are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby and to welcome the preparation of the HIA. Historic England have asked for clarification of the correct naming of viewpoints.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- A Community Facilities Strategy and Cultural Strategy has been prepared to support the Regulation 19 Local Plan and this has identified where there is a need for these facilities based on existing provision and anticipated growth. These studies have concluded that this is not a priority in this location.
- In response to Cambridge Investment Partnership, their comments are noted and the retention of mature trees is retained as wording in the policy as the retention of trees is a key policy for the Local Plan to maintain and enhance urban greening. The removal of any trees will be negotiated through the planning application process, and development will be assessed against Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population.
- In response to Historic England, their comments are noted and the Viewpoints are correctly labelled as per the latest evidence base. In response to heights, half of this site has permission and the heights will be tested for the remainder of the site for sensitivity through the development management process.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for site allocation.	204220 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
CIP plans to develop remaining land in future applications, although detailed designs are not yet prepared.	204220 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
The policy should be more flexible about the wording regarding tree retention and removal.	204220 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridge Investment Partnership)
Provision should be made for a much larger community centre and community halls given the densification of the housing in the area.	203776 (A Carpen)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. Part of the HIA refers to viewpoint 11. The policy itself refers to Viewpoint M. Please check and clarify which it is. Is it one in the same? What height is considered suitable for this site?	210102/ 210103 (Historic England)
Sport England notes that planning permission (23/04687/FUL) has been granted for the redevelopment of this site. The Local Plan should outline that sport facilities (bowls green and tennis court) as part of the planning permission will be replaced, in accordance with condition 59, as required by planning	209216 (Sport England)

permission 23/04849/FUL. Outlining this demonstrates that the loss of these sports facilities have been assessed against paragraph 104 of the NPPF and that replacement mitigation provision has been secured.	

Policy S/C/TRP: Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Historic England to confirm that there are no designated heritage assets within the site and that the site lies adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area. Historic England welcomes the preparation of the HIA and policy criterion 1b and 1c.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to Historic England, comments are noted and no policy changes have been made in response as the policy wording reflects the heritage assets in this location.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area through development within its setting. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criteria 1b and 1c.	210104 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/OPK: Parcel Com4 Orchard Park

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Historic England to confirm that there are no designated heritage assets within the site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to Historic England, comments are noted and no policy changes have been made in response as the policy wording reflects the heritage assets in this location.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby.	210105 (Historic England)
Sport England objects to the part loss of playing field at this site. The Orchard Park SPD (2011) identified the playing field to remain as public open space. With this said, the planning permission referenced 22/01632/FUL resulted in the loss of the playing field. Sport England cannot find a record of being consulted on that planning application despite being a statutory consultee for development affecting playing fields. Furthermore, having reviewed the Officer's Report, there is no consideration	209217 (Sports England)

afforded to paragraph 104 of the NPPF. If a future planning application were submitted, the Local Planning Authority should accord with the statutory requirement to consult Sport England.	

Policy S/C/BFS: Brookfields

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support from Historic England, who commented to confirm that there are no designated heritage assets within the site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to Historic England, comments are noted and no policy changes have been made in response as the policy wording reflects the heritage assets in this location.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Part of this site lies within the Mill Road Conservation Area. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area. We welcome criterion 1a, 1b and 1c.	210106 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/CJ: Cambridge Junction and Cambridge Leisure, Hills Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Respondents asked for Safeguard the Junction to be safeguarded into the future. It is essential that there is no deterioration in the nature and standard of facilities. Temporary provision for all cultural functions must be secured before any demolition or displacement reprovision is delivered as an early phase; no gap in provision. Any future Junction is at least equivalent in standard and capacity, including audience, back-of-house, technical capability, servicing. Need more meeting rooms. Long-term operational/financial viability should be assessed. Avoid creation of conflicts with sounding uses. Must ensure that these or equivalent leisure uses are re-provided at the same level within the development proposals.

One comment stated that the Cambridge junction site is very new and would have a high carbon footprint to replace.

Historic England advise that whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies close to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area through development within its setting.

Landsec said they were is continuing to explore development options for the Cambridge Leisure site, both in respect of its existing property assets and also the possibilities for the site, either as a standalone regeneration project (allowing future integration with

neighbouring sites for regeneration purposes) or as part of a broader regeneration scheme on the eastern side of Cambridge Station. They ask for the policy wording to be made more flexible.

Other comments included consider impact of building height on surrounding areas e.g. Rustat Avenue, and the need local retail provision.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy and supporting text note the cultural importance of The Junction and that, where it is appropriate, temporary venue spaces and meanwhile uses should be provided during the construction phases. This is considered to be a reasonable approach in order to strike a balance between the retaining an important local and sub-regional facility and the practicality and feasibility of it remaining operational throughout the construction process of a comprehensive redevelopment. The policy contains a requirement that any reprovision of this use must support the enhancement of it as a live performance and cultural venue.

The policy identifies the importance of the commercial leisure offer at Cambridge Leisure and seeks to retain this as part of the redevelopment of the site.

The Local Plan contains policies regarding the reuse of existing buildings and materials and so this is not repeated in this site allocation policy.

The policy has been updated to provide further criteria in relation to building heights and the impacts of development on nearby heritage assets. Additionally, the policy and indicative spatial framework identify some support for retail provision in this area, particularly around the proposed railway station entrance.

The comment from one of the existing long leaseholders is noted. The policy seeks to strike a planning balance between providing flexibility and a clear expectation for future development proposals.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The Cambridge junction site is very new -- 20 to 30 years old. You cannot pretend you care about the climate crisis and at the same time wilfully knock down existing buildings just because you fancy it. The carbon footprint of concrete is huge. There will be huge opposition to this particular 'development', based on opinions I have already heard from people I have told about it. Why don't you practice designing/approving buildings that will have a long sustainable life -- you clearly didn’t do this the first time round, on this site?	201227 (S Williams)
Limit height of development next to Rustat Avenue developments. All have south-facing balconies to enjoy sunlight. Incentivise supermarkets (Aldi/Lidl/or something else) to take up retail space in Leisure Centre. Currently only expensive convenience stores, so have to drive to get food. For flats, incentivise developers offering residents their own management companies from the start. Go without Estate Management Companies from developments as much as possible to save flat owners the pain. Work to support public access from one side of train station to the other (EWR). Consider removing listing status Cambridge station. It's old, at capacity and of limited value.	201652 (T Foets)

We have suggested amendments to the policy wording for robustness and to more sufficiently safeguard the Junction in the future. It is essential that there is no deterioration in the nature and standard of facilities provided by the Junction. Policy wording should be amended to better recognise the Junction as "a locally and regionally important venue". We suggest the addition of 'that meet the needs of the venue' after 'a range of flexible spaces' within the second sentence. Design and layout requirements for this allocation must also avoid conflicts between the Junction and neighbouring uses in line with the NPPF's "agent of change" principle.	202013 (The Theatres Trust)
I support Cambridge Junction: • Temporary provision for all cultural functions must be secured before any demolition or displacement reprovision is delivered as an early phase; no gap in provision • any future Junction is at least equivalent in standard and capacity, including audience, back-of-house, technical capability, servicing • long-term operational/financial viability assessed alongside spatial design delivery governed through a structured process (CJ/Council governance, RIBA stages, shared brief before developer engagement) • Agent of Change applied so residential development doesn't restrict Junction operations • I cannot support this allocation unless continuity, equivalence and viable delivery mechanisms are secured.	202131, 202745 (Cambridge Junction), 202190 (H Tam), 202452 (K Jones), 202676 (T Altmann), 202709 (W Townsend), 202774 (S Lee), 205275 (N Oakley), 202857 (Cambridge Junction), 202981 (T Flinders), 202994 (Arts Theatre Cambridge) 204996 (H Paterson), 205263 (AC de Azevedo Lamha), 205339 (A Seiglow), 202286, 202291,

	205347 (Cambridge Junction), 202377 (Kettle's Yard), 202379 (J Webber), 202389 (T Shaw), 202918 (R Tarry), 204438 (A Neenan), 204660 (NEUBAU Architects), 204892 (Wysing Arts Centre), 203862, 203640, 202804 (University of Cambridge), 203843 (N Yeni), 203471 (D Lever), 203468 (L Heap), 203423 (S Asworth), 203316 (N Ellis), 204358 (New International Encounter), 204681 (A Giarlis), 205289 (L Howse), 204805 (L Matthews), 204150 (Cambridge Junction) , 202007 (H Chamberlain), 205012 (University of Cambridge),

	205090 (J Walsh), 204822 (G Shaw)
The Junction is an amazing venue providing a wide and varied menu of arts events. It should be supported to develop and grow, but without losing its unique ethos. The size of the concert space is great	202595 (M Salters), 203596 (P Tribble)
Could bullet 1c be revised to ensure that the same amount of equivalent leisure space be retained as follows: Redevelopment of the existing commercial leisure units (including cinema, bowling alley and food and beverage outlets) must ensure that these or equivalent leisure uses are re-provided at the same level within the development proposals;	202835 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
Cambridge Junction is part of Arts Council's National Portfolio of organisations receiving regular, core funding from us. The organisation has strong impact both regionally and nationally. We see the redevelopment of this site as a fantastic opportunity to improve facilities and provision which would benefit both audiences and creatives alike. We would advocate strongly that new plans ensure that the organisation is able to thrive both artistically, financially and in terms of expanding reach.	205045 (Arts Council)
Re The Junction, could a revamped/replacement facility take architectural inspiration from the railway history of the railway sheds it was built on. Furthermore, the site needs to have a significantly greater number of meeting rooms and rehearsal spaces. Provision for The Junction could involve working with Hills Road Sixth Form College to help meet some of its needs for independent study spaces, which could help sustain the venue.	203825, 203769 (A Carpen)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies close to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the	210107, 210108, 210109 Historic England)

significance of the Conservation Area through development within its setting. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criteria m, n and p. The HIA recommends that height is limited to roughly 6 storeys. This should be specified in criterion n to add greater clarity regarding height.	
Landsec is continuing to explore development options for the Cambridge Leisure site, both in respect of its existing property assets and also the possibilities for the site, either as a standalone regeneration project (allowing future integration with neighbouring sites for regeneration purposes) or as part of a broader regeneration scheme on the eastern side of Cambridge Station. The emerging planning policy within the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan must flexibly and proactively facilitate these objectives in the interests of good plan-making. Landsec is generally content with the broad intent and direction of travel that the draft policy adopts, but some areas remain where alteration to the policy wording are requested. In particular, it is suggested that there needs to be more flexibility in certain areas of the policy wording to be more adaptable to the rapid nature of change in market and economic conditions, particularly in respect of historical main town centre uses. Detailed wording changes are provide din individual representations.	209176, 209177, 209178, 209179, 209180, 209181, 209182, 209183, 209184, 209185, 209186, 209187, 210304, 210305, 210306, 210307, 210308 (Landsec)

Policy S/C/CLT: Clifton Road Area

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd support the aspiration for regeneration for a mix of uses but suggests modifications to the draft allocation to ensure it reflects a deliverable, commercially robust proposition. The allocation needs be flexible to accommodate market changes over a 10 15 year horizon, as development is unlikely before 2030. The uncertainty surrounding the scope, form and programme for the delivery of an eastern entrance to Cambridge Station and the implications of this for the Site. The site could likely deliver 150 build to rent homes.

Historic England advise there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. The site is also close to the GII listed Railway Station. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings. The policy should be mor specific regarding building heights.

Cambridge Past Present and Future consider the eastern station entrance essential. Othe comments included the Junction is important for cultural life and should be supported. New buildings should reflect the area's old railway history, taking inspiration from the old railway sheds that were on the site. Another comment questioned the long term future of the area as an industrial site.

Rustat Neighbourhood Association fed back from a meeting where they discussed the site. The aske for more resident input on planned EWR entrance and other issues. Station drop offs could impact on area by pocket park entrance, research is needed. Another representor raised this point, and apart from disturbance to residents in Rustat Avenue whose flats overlook the Pocket Park, there will almost certainly be traffic issues at the Davy Road / Rustat Road junction which need to be anticipated and accommodated.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy provides flexibility to enable a wide of suitable land uses to come forward through the comprehensive redevelopment of the site. Since the consultation on the draft Local Plan, East West Rail have consulted on their project and provided some further details on the likely timescales of the new station entrance being delivered.

The number of homes likely to be delivered on the USS land is noted.

The policy has been updated to better reflect local heritage assets and the likely impacts of tall buildings in this location. The NPPF is clear that Local Plans should not prescribe architectural forms for development, however, the policies in the Local Plan do outline a requirement for context led development.

The possible impacts of station drop off on local communities is noted and reflected in the policy wording.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
I'd like to voice support for the policy of retaining the existing retail outlets when/if the Clifton Road area is redeveloped	201935 (I Rudy)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. The site is also close to the GII listed Railway Station. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion g. The HIA recommends that height is limited to 1-2 storeys. This should be specified the policy criteria to add greater clarity regarding height. We welcome the inclusion of a Spatial Framework at Figure 39. We welcome reference to the Holford Plan in the supporting text.	210109 (Historic England)
What are the functions that the city/tradespeople need that the site's firms currently provide? e.g. Builders' merchants and component suppliers? Can clear provision be made? See the recently built homes on the old Water Works? Please put in standards to prevent such lazy, poor quality architecture and building designs being used. Cambridge deserves better. New buildings should reflect the area's old railway history, taking inspiration from the old railway sheds that were on the site. They should be of a type that is considerably more aesthetically pleasing than what Brookgate has built in the Cambridge Station redevelopment - and visibly so.	203778 (A Carpen)
The Junction is essential for cultural life in Cambridge, providing a venue for diverse age groups to engage in arts and social activities. The respondent emphasises the importance of the Junction in	205330 (N Saad)

encouraging youth participation in arts and music, highlighting its role as a positive alternative to social media and street corners. The respondent advocates for continued funding and support for Create Cambridge, recognising its significance in the local cultural landscape.	
Rustat Neighbourhood Association met with c 30 residents on 17 January 2026. Agree need to retain retail and leisure facilities. Densification implies building up. Do not build up where blocks light for existing residents on Rustat Avenue/Road. Housing for residents/families required. Mixed use site has different needs: Many students and visitors as well as residents. How will site cater for all? Water scarcity and holding developers to environmental standards a key concern. Interface with planned EWR entrance on Clifton Road/Gloria Carpenter Park not well developed. Requires more resident input. How will Local Plan interface with other Plans/consultations. The plan for a new railway bridge coming into Clifton Road and accessible via the Gloria Carpenter parklet requires considerably more detailed thinking through to avoid detrimental impacts on existing and envisaged residents in the Rustat Road area. “Drop off” is problematic as people often need to wait in their cars for arrivals. Residents are concerned that people will drop passengers off in Rustat Road by the Pocket park entrance (opposite Davy Rd). There needs to be an impact study of projected outcomes in different scenarios. There are concerns about congestion and bike-safety at the Clifton Rd/Cherry Hinton Rd junction. There are concerns regarding the pollution and noise impacts that would arise from the proposed development of the site. Impact assessments required. Any bike parking at the Eastern entrance must be fully secure to prevent theft. he grade-II listed station building and new footbridge must be designed to protect heritage character.	201484, 205774, 205775, 205776, 205777, 205778, 205779, 205780, 205781, 205783, 205784, 205785, 210303 (Rustat Neighbourhood Association)

More regular consultation with residents is needed.	
I fully support the redevelopment of the Clifton Road area. There is considerable scope to make better use of the site by mixed-use and by intensification along the lines of the policy document. any building at the Cherry Hinton Road end should be no taller than two stories, probably rising to three stories as gardens get larger. Given the overall growth plan for Cambridge and South Cambridge and especially the proposed housing development of the Cambridge airport site to the east, the need for a new station entrance is compelling and will have real benefits for rail passengers. Will come with very substantial traffic and people flows in the area of the proposed new entrance. Needs to be a thorough traffic assessment on this, and the implications need to be incorporated into the site master plan. Apart from disturbance to residents in Rustat Avenue whose flats overlook the Pocket Park, there will almost certainly be traffic issues at the Davy Road / Rustat Road junction which need to be anticipated and accommodated.	201520, 205799, 205800, 205801, 205802, 205803 (R Crabtree)
Support the aspiration for regeneration for a mix of uses. Suggests modifications to the draft allocation to ensure it reflects a deliverable, commercially robust proposition. We recommend the allocation be flexible to accommodate market changes over a 10-15 year horizon, as development is unlikely before 2030. The relationship between existing, to be retained and proposed uses within the Site and wider area. The high likelihood of the Royal Mail depot remaining fully operational in its current location, which reduces the developable area of the Site and maintains physical, amenity and viability challenges for the remainder of the draft allocation. The uncertainty	209233, 209234 209235, 209236, 209237, 209238, 209239, 209240, 209241 (Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd)

surrounding the scope, form and programme for the delivery of an eastern entrance to Cambridge Station and the implications of this for the Site. The initial Site review indicates the opportunity to deliver approximately 150 Build to Rent (BTR) residential homes. Support the principle of an active travel-based approach to the new station entrance. However, we consider that the broad parameters for a station entrance should be established at the Site Allocation stage so as not to place unnecessary constraints on the development of the wider site supportive of the future phases of the Chisholm Trail, but policy requirement currently unreasonable, needs flexibility. Requirement for reprovision of all existing floorspace unreasonable.	
Just wanted to question the long term existence of Clifton Road industrial estate, Royal Mail still makes sense but everything else a little less. Residential zones have already encroached which sometimes does cause noise pollution friction, and it seems like a good spot for future housing development. Since COVID commercial activity seems to have slowed a little since ARM left and I think ANSYS/Synopsis will follow suit soon. Otherwise, though pls carry on, very happy with more development. If you ever need a counter-protest for Davy Road let me know as I am extremely YIMBY on Coleridge.	202430 (S Potts Tamman)
This policy is tentative about an eastern access to the station (“any possible future new eastern entrance”). An eastern entrance is essential for the continued safe functioning of the station and to open up opportunities to reconfigure the main station forecourt. Figure 39 is inaccurate and too schematic to be helpful in shaping future development. This policy should set out principle and parameters for the components required for an eastern entrance to the station, including detail on pedestrian routes, cycle parking, a taxi rank, bus stops, and traffic management on Clifton Road, Rustat Road, Davy Road and Fanshawe Road.	202778 (Cambridge Past Present and Future)

Policy S/C/SRW: Station Road West

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the site allocation from Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd

Comments were made by local residents in relation to the architectural design and considering the railway history of the site.

Comments were made by local residents and Cambridge Past, Present and Future in relation to improving pedestrian access, decluttering the public realm and reducing car dominance.

Comments were made by Historic England confirming that there are no designated heritage assets within the site and welcoming the preparation of the HIA and requiring the policy to consider wider Strategic Viewpoints.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The connectivity of the site with the wider area for pedestrians to gain safe access to the station is an important ambition and wording has been included in the policy to reflect this and ensure that pedestrian access and experience is prioritised.
- The HIA has set out the key considerations for design to reflect the local character and designated heritage assets and the wording in the policy has been reviewed to reflect the recommendations of the HIA.
- In response to Historic England, comments are noted and the wording for not impacting negatively on Strategic Viewpoints has been included.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Concerns raised about impact of the Grade II Listed Railway Station.	201228 (S Williams)
A more detailed vision for the station is needed to manage the transport interchange, congestion and heavy flow of people including reducing the dominance of cars outside the station entrance.	202796 (Cambridge Paste, Present and Future)
The design of the station should be more imaginative and reflect character of railway history in the area.	203830 (A Carpen)
Support for the allocation of the final undeveloped parcel as part of wider CB1.	204832, 204839 (Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd)
The policy should reflect the relevant planning applications and be more flexible to respond to economic circumstances.	204832, 204839 (Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd)
The location is highly sustainable for build to rent and co-living.	204832, 204839 (Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd)
The quantum of development should be context led.	204832, 204839 (Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd)
Active travel access needs to be improved to the station.	207459 (A Carpen)

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. The site is also close to the GII listed Railway Station. Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion1a, 1b and 1c. The HIA refers to several viewpoints. The policy only refers to Viewpoint E. We recommend including the following wording: '…should not negatively impact Strategic Viewpoints particularly Viewpoint E Limekiln Road.	210110 (Historic England)
Support for the allocation of the final undeveloped parcel as part of wider CB1. Need to consider 21/00264/FUL and 18/1678/FUL for development that has previously been considered acceptable on site. Inappropriate to outline a fixed quantum of floorspace. This should be context-led and be capable of responding to changing economic circumstances. Failure to acknowledge that a hotel was previously considered acceptable. Need to recognise the highly sustainable location for build to rent and co-living. Overall, the Site should be allocated for mixed use development. Conflicting requirements on height and massing. Point (b) prescribed height, whereas point (a) states it should be context-led. Therefore, suggest removing point (b). Subjectivity around 'negatively impact on strategic viewpoint E' should be amended to 'have regard for Strategic Viewpoint E'. Redline boundary should be amended to remove railway tracks.	204832 (Brookgate Land Ltd and Network Rail Infrastructure)

Policy S/C/BJH: Betjeman House, Hills Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the site allocation from Pioneer Group Ltd. Pioneer Group Ltd also commented that the allocation should be modified to reflect the site allocation and be renamed Botanic Place.

There was broad support from Historic England who confirmed there were no designated heritage assets and that they welcomed the policy wording criterion under point 1a, b, c and d.

Comments were made by local residents in support of the demolition of Betjeman House.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to Pioneer Group Ltd, the policy has been renamed Betjeman House, Hills Road (Botanic Place)
- In response to Historic England, comments are noted and no changes have been made in relation to this comment.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The policy should reflect the current live planning application.	207455 (Pioneer Group Ltd (Railpen))
Support for the site allocation.	207455 (Pioneer Group Ltd (Railpen))

The site is no longer residential and should be non-residential and reflect the planning permission for 54,000 sqm of floorspace for commercial class E.	207455 (Pioneer Group Ltd (Railpen))
Support for demolition of Betjeman House and replacement with lower density development.	201229 (S Williams)
This site is located in the Glisson Road and New Town Conservation Area, lies adjacent to the grade II* Botanic Gardens, a registered park and garden and close to the grade II listed War Memorial and milestone. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion1a, 1b,1c and 1d. We appreciate the site is under construction but welcome the reference to the scenario should the permission not be completed. We welcome the reference to the retention of the Flying Pig House.	210111 (Historic England)

Policy S/C/OPM: Old Press/ Mill Lane

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by the University of Cambridge raising concerns about the conflicting policy wording around heritage assets.

Comments were made by Historic England to reflect the assets onsite and to complete an HIA for this site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to the University of Cambridge, the boundary has been amended to reflect the suggested change.
- In response to Cambridge Past, Present and Future, the support for criterion 1a and 1b is supported. The Pitt Building has been amended to be included in the boundary. The wording around heritage assets has been amended to address these comments.
- In response to Historic England, amendments have been made to the policy to reflect the amendments suggested. HIAs are not prepared for site allocations that existed in the Cambridge Coty Council or South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan. This is the same across the Local Plan and therefore the HIA has not been revised. Furthermore, the development on this site is underway and close to completion.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**

The University requests that the site allocation boundary (red line) is amended to remove the University Centre and other smaller properties to avoid confusion due to changes in land ownership.	202445 (University of Cambridge)
If the University Centre is removed from the allocation, the key principles relating to access, public realm and active frontages would continue to be adequately addressed through other policies.	202445 (University of Cambridge)
Concerns raised about treatment of heritage assets and their protection.	202797 (Cambridge, Past, Present and Future)
The University requests that the site allocation boundary (red line) is amended to remove the University Centre and other smaller properties. The inclusion of the University Centre adds unnecessary complexity to the allocation. Its removal would allow the policy to focus on providing greater clarity and deliverability for a site that is now in separate ownership.	202445 (University of Cambridge)
There are a number of designated heritage assets within the site boundary including part of the Central Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings including Cambridge University Centre, The Mill Public House, The Mill The Mill Bridge and Paved Surround, Mill Haven - West House and Mill Haven - East House, Cambridge University Press (Pitt Press), Telephone Kiosks, 1 Mill Lane, House Adjoining Number 74 on The North, 74 Trumpington Street, 8-11 Little St Marys Lane, Number 1 Little St Marys Lane including gas lamp and Emmanuel Church all listed at grade II. The site is adjacent to other listed buildings including Little St Mary's Church (grade II*), Pembroke College and Pembroke College Chapel both listed at grade I, St Botolph's Church also listed at grade I as well as numerous grade II listed	210112 (Historic England)

buildings. This is a highly sensitive location in terms of heritage. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. There does not appear to be a Heritage Impact Assessment for this site. An HIA should be completed for this site. Paragraph 3.1.103 states that there are no grade I, GII* or GII buildings within the site. However, there are a number of GII listed buildings within the site and there are highly graded assets nearby. Paragraph 3.1.103 therefore needs to be amended to correctly recognise the presence of designated heritage assets. Amend criterion a as the Pitt building is within the site. Also, there are other highly graded nearby assets (Pembroke, Little St Marys and St Botolph's) that need to be listed.	
The College welcomes the allocation for a student accommodation-led scheme. We are uncertain whether the Old Press/Mill Lane site qualifies as a "university or college campus site" under Affordable Housing policy H/AH and believe it should be treated as such.	208236 (Kings College)
It is also not clear why the site area includes Little St Mary's Lane etc when the southern portion of the site has already been developed by Pembroke College and so the impact of any development on this residential street has already occurred. The College suggests the plan is amended to exclude this. It is also not clear why the site plan is different from that for Policy S/PRIA/OPML (or indeed why separate policies are needed).	208237 (Kings College)
As the implication of S/C/OPM is that the room capacity will be determined by the acceptability of detailed proposals, it seems unnecessary to specify 256 rooms. If a number is considered desirable,	208238 (Kings College)

then ‘around 260 rooms’ would make more sense. The phrase ‘for university related sites’ seems unnecessary / unclear and should be deleted.	
Restricting uses to those in only subsections a), b) and c) of Class E is unnecessary. Other Class E uses may be equally suitable.	208239 (Kings College)
As a consequence, we would suggest the following revised wording for bullet point 2: Allocation to provide mixed use student accommodation (approximately 260 student rooms) and faculty buildings, commercial business and service in Class E and other ancillary facilities. Site capacity to be subject to detailed proposals. In point 1) limb b) is unnecessary as a Heritage Impact Assessment is required by Policy GP/HE and the Council’s validation requirements anyway. Our experience from other schemes is that the phrase ‘active frontages’ in limb c) can be taken by members of the public to mean retail units. As active frontages can also sensibly include building entrances / designs which ensure natural surveillance of the street, the expectation should be clarified by providing a definition of ‘active frontages’ (this would also relate to policy J/FD 2 where a similar aspiration appears).	208240 (Kings College)
We would also comment as follows on the supporting information to the policy: The last sentence in paragraph 3 appears incomplete and so the meaning is unclear. Although the aspirations are understood, there is duplication with the PRIA policy. However, to say that redevelopment must ensure that safer streets etc are created is unacceptably onerous when works will be carried out in the public highway etc over which the College has no control. Replacing the word ‘must’ with ‘should take reasonable opportunities’ would suffice. The landscape etc aspirations in paragraphs 5 and 6 are similarly understood but could be in conflict with the desire to retain aspects of	208241 (Kings College)

the site's formerly industrial character which was a feature of discussions during the development of the 2018 Masterplan.	
This policy should reference the requirement for a sequential approach to be taken to the site layout, with more vulnerable development located within areas at lowest risk of flooding where possible. A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will need to demonstrate that safe access and egress is available and there will be no displacement of water or loss of floodplain storage. The site assessment recommends that habitable floor levels are set above the maximum fluvial flood level with a suitable freeboard. There are likely to be opportunities to reduce flood risk as part of this development, such as by integrating water storage areas into the landscaping, use of SuDS and reducing the built footprint in the floodplain.	211177 (Environment Agency)

Policy S/C/NMD: New Museums, Downing Street

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by the University of Cambridge raising concerns about the existing SPD and how it is outdated and what this means for future development.

Comments were made by Historic England to reflect grading of the heritage assets onsite and to produce an HIA for this site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The SPD will remain in place once this Local Plan is adopted until a new Local Plan comes in under the new system and is updated, which will be after 5 years. It will remain a material consideration in decision making. There are elements of this SPD that have been superseded by policies in the Local Plan. The Local Plan policies will take precedence and apply, this includes policies relating to environmental standards. The core principles of the SPD have been reflected in policy.
- In response to Historic England, amendments have been made to the policy to reflect the grading of the heritage assets. HIAs are not prepared for site allocations that existed in the Cambridge Coty Council or South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan. This is the same across the Local Plan and therefore the HIA has not been revised. Furthermore, the development on this site is underway and close to completion.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The current policy approach relies on the NMS Site SPD, which is outdated and does not fully align with current or future site aspirations. Sustainability objectives in the SPD are outdated compared to more ambitious targets in the Local Plan. If the site remains in the Local Plan, a more flexible approach should be adopted, requiring a Development Framework with the first planning application.	202435 (University of Cambridge)
There are a number of designated heritage assets within the site boundary including part of the Central Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings including the Cavendish Laboratory of Experimental Physics, Mond Laboratory, The Arts School, The Laboratory of Physical Chemistry, and the Zoological Laboratory all listed at grade II. The site is also surrounded by numerous listed buildings including Corpus Christ (grade I), Pembroke (grade II* and grade II) and St Benet's Church (grade I) Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. This is a highly sensitive location in terms of heritage. There does not appear to be a Heritage Impact Assessment for this site. An HIA should be completed. The recommendations of the HIA should be included in the policy wording. Include St Benet's Church in criterion 1b.	210113 (Historic England)

Policy S/PA/CC: Cambridge City Centre

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the designation from Historic England, Pioneer Group Ltd,

Comments were made by local residents to manage impacts on and acknowledge the physical constraints of Cambridge's historic core.

Comments were made by Cambridgeshire County Council for a typo and to increase cycle parking provision.

Further responses were made by local residents to designate the Riverside areas.

Comments were by made by the NHS about healthcare provision.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Support for the designation is noted.
- Eastern gate has not been added to point 4 because it has a more unique vision than a mixed use allocation.
- In response to Cambridgeshire County Council, the typo has been included. The provision of cycle parking is included under promotion of sustainable modes of transport.
- There are no current plans for the Lion Yard Central Car park to be redeveloped.
- The ARU campus does not have a specific designation as there is already development coming forward around this area and it is covered in part by the wider Eastern Gate designation.

- The Riverside does not have a policy designation because it is covered by policy BG/RC River Corridors which sets out policy to protect and enhance the river setting.
- Healthcare provision is dealt with by the IDP, and the requirements for healthcare provision set out in the relevant site allocations.
- The Historic Core of the City of Cambridge has been accounted for in the Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy and the in HIAs developed for each site allocation to provide mitigation and design measures to manage the impact on the local designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
We support this policy but would like to see policy 1c revised to make specific mention of the historic skyline, our suggestion would be: “preserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting, the historic skyline, open spaces and the River Cam”. It could be argued that the historic skyline is ‘setting’ but this is not clear and therefore is open to interpretation.	202798 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
The draft policies map identities the City Centre designation as a ‘Policy Area’. However, it proves extremely difficult to review the boundaries using this tool, particularly given the number of designations in this central location. It is considered that any final policies map should provide clear distinctions and colour coding for the various ‘Policy Areas’ so it is easier to read the map, including an ARU campus designation.	203958 (Anglia Ruskin University)

Riverside should be designated a PRIA because: (i)It is a key link in the City's sustainable transport infrastructure, as the entry point to central Cambridge for three Greenways; (ii)It is a unique stretch of accessible urban riverfront that connects three green spaces and combines distinctive heritage assets with unspoilt river views; (iii)Work is underway with GCP to realise the area's potential as a vibrant destination with city-wide benefit; (iv)It sits alongside Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and close to four Areas of Major Change, surrounded by development proposals with major implications for the area.	204425 (Riverside Area Residents Association)
I believe that Riverside should be added to the list of areas for PRI for redevelopment or improvement. It is a beautiful city-wide asset, providing a riverfront promenade between 2 commons and a nature reserve and a number of important historic sites, some pre-dating the university itself. The improvement of this area should be captured in the Local Plan, so that plans which are taking place anyway by the GCP, and others, can be mindful /in accordance with the policies in the Local Plan. I have included a request for this under GP/QP	205006 (A Sheedy)
Site allocations lacking explicit on-site health facility requirements should reference the need for financial contributions for health and infrastructure mitigation, aligning with the IDP approach. Engagement with Council Officers during early plan preparation is welcomed, along with the opportunity to contribute to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. An additional assessment by the ICB in Stage 2 of the IDP process will provide targeted evaluations of key site allocations and health infrastructure needs, offering more detail for each site allocation.	205086 (NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board)
The policy takes no account whatever of existing pressures on, and the physical constraints of, Cambridge's historic core. The policy also takes no account whatever of chaos caused within limited	205295 (J Preston)

public realm whenever major developments are proposed. Existing cycle parking cannot cope with current demand let alone that already in the pipeline, pavements are cluttered with Voi scooters, and the Council's idealist vision of cafes around the Market Square is belied by takeaways and delivery mopeds. The policy is totally premature and unjustified in the absence of thorough analysis of existing issues and of the capacity of the centre to absorb any more growth.	
The Lion Yard Central Car Park should be a key site for repurposing (if not full redevelopment). If 50,000 homes are planned for Greater Cambridge area, where will be the additional amenity space be for residents & visitors in the city centre? A paradigm shift is required to reduce vehicular traffic and associated health issues arising from pollution, plus road safety. A sustained modal shift away from private vehicles can be encouraged by reducing central parking to essential users only. Car Park floors can be repurposed as residences, offices, shops, eateries and even rooftop green spaces, improving the public realm.	205313 (North Newtown Residents Association)
Whilst we consider the policy to unnecessarily duplicate wider policy, the overall approach to encouraging development within the City Centre, and specifically at Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area, is supported.	207439 (Pioneer Group Ltd)
Support for policy.	210114 (Historic England)
We support the policy that is proposed. However, could an additional note be added to Supporting Information that the City Council is embarking on a placemaking project to develop a city centre vision which will be wider than planning policy but may suggest direction to achieving goals reflected in this	204190 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)

policy, and that city centre development coming forward should have regard to this project as it develops.	
I support this policy - I would add one point. In point 4 - add the Eastern Gate Public Realm Improvement Area. The Western end of Newmarket Road before the Elizabeth Way roundabout also presents an opportunity for mixed-use intensification.	202910 (M Cleminson)
Page 162, paragraph 3.1.117 Typo - The city centre has therefore had to evolved to ensure it remains a vibrant place to visit.	210521 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
An important issue for the city centre is the lack of public cycle parking. This policy should include the need to increase the amount of public cycle parking as part of new development wherever possible.	210585 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summaries of Representations: Sites Areas of Major Change

Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Support from Historic England to the criteria requiring a new, strong landscape framework that is guided by and incorporates existing positive landscape and townscape features and heritage assets. Broad support from Anglian Water, but clarity was sought on what the reference to water management was referring to. Cambridgeshire County council suggested adding reference to Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP).

Pioneer Group are concerned rather than supporting development the policy places additional controls, conflicting with the aspiration for growth in these areas. Railpen also considered a number of the requirements disproportionate.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan policies.

The policy wording has been revised to be more positively prepared and has been streamlined to avoid duplication with other Local Plan policies. The policy name has also been amended to make it clear that this policy will only apply to Areas of Major Change within Cambridge and therefore not those within South Cambridgeshire. It is also clear that it will only apply to larger schemes, where a comprehensive and coordinated approach is often required to maximise positive planning outcomes. Whilst specific plots or sites within an Area of Major Change are likely to come forward at different points in time, the intention of the policy is to avoid piecemeal development and ensure that overall, these areas are supported by the necessary supporting infrastructure that may be more than what is expected to be delivered by an individual proposal. It also emphasises the need for a joined up approach with relevant public bodies, who may be responsible for the delivery of said infrastructure.

Reference to water management features has been added to the supporting text to provide greater clarity. Reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) has been added to the Supporting Information.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Areas of Major Change should be considered as areas of opportunity in which development is actively supported and encouraged. As demonstrated by the wording "Excluding very minor development, development proposals within AMCs will only be permitted in the following circumstances..." it is considered that the policy seeks to negatively control development contrary to the presumption in favour. This will unnecessarily restrict the opportunity of the very change the AMCs are designed to facilitate. The policy seeks to establish controls which are not necessary and which increase the burden	207440 (Pioneer Group)

of planning policy upon development viability. This fundamentally conflicts with aspiration to see growth in these areas. Wider requirements of the AMC policy are picked up elsewhere within the emerging Plan and should therefore be deleted. See attached proposed revisions to the policy	
Anglian Water supports this strategic allocation policy which requires that the necessary infrastructure to support the development has been secured and a phasing strategy is in place where the phased provision of infrastructure is required - this is consistent with Policy I/ID. We agree with clause 4, that the redevelopment of these areas of major change, should protect existing assets including “water management”. However, the supporting text should qualify what this term encompasses. These sites also offer the opportunity to improve the public realm, achieving betterment through provision of SuDS and water reuse.	210190 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
We welcome criterion 4b.	210115 (Historic England)
The respondent supports coordinated development but believes the criteria in Part 2 (a)-(c) impose unnecessary requirements that could hinder deliverability and flexibility of development sites. The policy does not consider that sites are at different stages of development, as exemplified by the Beehive Centre, which already has planning permission and extensive coordinating documents. The requirement for a site-wide masterplan and coordination documents is seen as disproportionate, especially for less complex sites where phased development is appropriate.	203196, 203909 (Railpen)
Page 165, paragraph 4a could refer to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP): https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-roads-and-parking/transport-plans-andpolicies/rights-of-way-improvement-plan. Rights of Way Improvement Plan should be referenced where connectivity/community & social inclusion is discussed. Often there is a reference to ensuring facilities	210512 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

and developments are connected better by active travel (walking, cycling, wheeling etc.) but there is already a network that can be built upon or improved for this.	

Policy S/AMC/AS: Abbey Stadium

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Cambridge United supports the designation of the Cledara Abbey Stadium as an Area of Major Change and is supportive of the Draft Policy's recognition that development on the site would be supported. There main concern was that the policy needs to be flexible in order to make the best use of the site. They recognise that the movement of people on match days can be disruptive and are committed to working with stakeholders through a through a Matchday Management and Travel Plan.

Comments were made by multiple representations to raise issues about congestion and traffic, and by local residents and about the environmental impacts of development. Further responses were made by Sport England about meeting standards for the Football Association. Historic England gave views about how the policy should consider local heritage impacts.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to concerns about congestion, a requirement for a Transport Mitigation Assessment has been added into the policy area.
- The environmental impacts of the development will be managed by the development management policies which set out

requirements for biodiversity under BG/BG and urban greening under BG/UGF, as well as open space provision under BG/EO.

- In response to Historic England, the suggested changes have been made.
- A HIA has not been prepared for this site because it is a policy area, where the policy guides the form of development, but not proposing allocation of specific development.
- In response to Sport England, a sentence has been added to the supporting text to reflect the need for proposals to meet the standards of the Football Foundation and Cambridgeshire Football Association.
- Broad support from Cambridge United Football Club for the policy is noted. The policy supports potential non-match day uses at the stadium and does not preclude redevelopment of the stadium coming forwarded through a phased approach. Part 1 (a) of the policy notes that subsequent planning applications should support the delivery of the vision and it does not require a single application.
- Noting the existing active travel and public transport that serve the site and wider area, the policy requires, at the planning application stage, for a Transport Assessment to be prepared which would consider transport impacts and mitigation measures in more detail, depending on the scale and nature of the proposal. Therefore the policy does not prescribe specific transport interventions but does note that highways, active travel and public transport enhancements are likely to be necessary and will need to be taken into account as part of the preparation of the Transport Assessment.
- All development proposals should be context led and mitigation measures should be identified and implemented where necessary. This is supported by a suite of policies across the Local Plan including within the Great Places chapter. Given the relationship between the greenspaces in the City and the adjacent built form, it will be important that any redevelopment of the stadium is context led and supports the Plans aspirations for high quality design.
- Any development proposals that result in the loss of protected open space or any other designations are covered by other policies in the Local Plan and so are not repeated here.

- There has been no specific proposal identified by the football club for an alternative stadium location, nor confirmation that the club are actively seeking to relocate. The plan therefore does not identify a site allocation for a new stadium elsewhere. A future development proposal to relocate the stadium would need to be considered on its merits against the policies set out in the Plan, including those that relate to sports and culture. If the stadium was to relocate, then it is at this stage that the open space designation would be considered as part of future plan reviews. It would be premature to remove the protected open space designation at this stage.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Football stadium is a source of traffic and anti-social behaviour.	200985 (C Campos)
The sites impact on environmental regeneration, and open space should be considered and there are further opportunities for biodiversity.	202811 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
Objection to the absence of specific reference to the Grade I listed Leper Chapel in the policy.	202811 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
Impact on traffic on match days should be considered. Traffic solutions away from residential areas should be considered.	202914 (M Cleminson)
Concerns raised about lack of capacity for more access routes to the site.	204639 (S Schwitzer)
The site is located adjacent to the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area, as well as a number of grade II listed buildings and close to the Grade I Leper Chapel. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets	210116 (Historic England)

including through development within their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. Criterion j should refer to a heritage impact assessment (not historic). It should also refer to the grade I listed Leper Chapel.	
Can we please ensure that developments to the Abbey Stadium are mindful of how clogged up parking can get in Riverside on match days. Please can they be sensitive to the pressures placed on neighbouring areas and find solutions to parking issues away from residential areas.	202914 (M Cleminson)
Sport England supports the principle of this policy. To ensure that the redevelopment of the stadium and the improvement of the sporting facilities are fit for purpose, we request that the supporting information includes a requirement for the design of the proposals to meet the standards of the Football Foundation and Cambridgeshire Football Association.	209218 (Sport England)
Pleased that civic leaders have given their public support to Cambridge United's vital role in Cambridge. However, Cambridge United is capacity constrained. At the moment we are able to meet fan demand but on current trends that will likely soon become a bigger challenge. Over the last 10 years there has been a 31% increase in attendance, and the occupancy has been over 90% in the last two seasons. In this context, the Club would like the Draft GCLP to provide planning policy support for the Club to improve the Cledara Abbey Stadium, potentially in phases, to increase the capacity and facilities on matchdays, but also to ensure that the stadium is used on non-matchdays as an	209104 (Cambridge United Football Club)

important facility for the local community. However, if, as seems likely, the Cledara Abbey Stadium cannot be improved in a way that is financially viable, to safeguard the Club's long-term future, the Club will work with the Council and others to identify potential alternative sites to ensure that its current capacity does not constrain both the Club's and the city's wider ambitions.	
The Club supports the designation of the Cledara Abbey Stadium as an Area of Major Change and is supportive of the Draft Policy's recognition that development on the site would be supported. However, to be effective and to facilitate the improvement of the stadium, the policy needs to be flexible. The Club is concerned about the restrictive nature of some elements of the draft Policy. There is a need to add more flexibility to the draft Policy to ensure that the Club can make the very best use of the site in a way that is viable and sustainable. See proposed wording for policy in Appendix A of the accompanying attachment. The key aim of any potential stadium redevelopment would be to increase the capacity and number of fans able to attend games, while also enhancing the matchday experience through an improved hospitality offer, and encourage wider non-matchday use by the local community. These aspirations should be explicitly referenced and supported in the wording of the draft Policy.	209105, 209106 (Cambridge United Football Club)
Comment on criterion a). While a masterplanned vision for future development on the site is appropriate, there needs to be recognition that a degree of flexibility is required, and that this masterplan may not be delivered all at once, owing to viability and time constraints. As such, while reference to a wider masterplanned vision of the site is understood, there should recognition and allowance for flexibility built into the criterion to allow a phased development.	209107 (Cambridge United Football Club)

Comments on criteria b) - e). Cledara Abbey Stadium is already well served by existing transport infrastructure, and the Stadium also has access to Park & Ride services and is well connected to the wider transport system via established pedestrian and cycle routes. It is recognised that the movement of people on matchdays can cause disruptions. The Club would, therefore, be committed to bring forward further measures as part of any planning application to address this issue. However, it should be recognised that there are wider factors that impact the highways network, and any impact associated with the Club is typically restricted to a limited period of time on matchdays (circa. 25 days per annum). Therefore, rather than a blanket policy requiring any redevelopment to solve issues that go beyond the Club, we believe a nuanced approach should be taken. The Club believes that improvements to matchday traffic can be made through soft interventions and would commit to delivering these through a Matchday Management and Travel Plan associated with a redeveloped stadium (and the associated capacity uplift). These interventions would focus on promoting active travel, encouraging behavioural change to reduce private vehicle use at peak times, and improving overall travel planning for supporters. The Club would also commit to working proactively with the local authority to manage and enforce appropriate parking controls in the surrounding area, ensuring that matchday operations minimise impacts on nearby residential streets and deliver a more sustainable and coordinated transport strategy.	209108 (Cambridge United Football Club)
Comment on criterion f). The Club want to protect all trees on the site, but that simply might not be possible were the stadium to be improved. This should be explicitly recognised. The reality is that the	209109 (Cambridge United Football Club)

stadium is adjacent to open space. Tree planting will not 'soften 'the impact. Seeing the stadium from the open space will not be a surprise to anyone as it has been there for nearly 100 years.	
There is also a greater need for flexibility in the policy wording in relation to where development can take place, and the policy boundaries. Draft Policy S/AMC/AS explicitly recognises that the Cledara Abbey Stadium site is constrained to the west and south (through ecological assets, open space and allotments). However, there is little flexibility in the policy wording that allow encroachment into these areas if, on planning balance, the benefit of ensuring delivery outweighs the harm (which would be mitigated or compensated wherever possible). If there is limited encroachment on land that is protected by other Plan policies, the encroachment must be justified in accordance with those policies, and this does not need to be re-stated in the Policy. However, it should be recognised in this allocation that improving the Abbey Stadium and safeguarding the long-term future of the Club and its role in Cambridge will be given significant weight in assessing the impact of development.	209110 (Cambridge United Football Club)
The design led approach should not seek to limit development, but to make the best use of the site and ensure operational requirements of the Club can be fulfilled.	209111 (Cambridge United Football Club)
The Club's stated preference to date is to remain at a redeveloped Cledara Abbey Stadium. However, given the many and obvious constraints, the Owners and Board recognise that this might be neither financially viable nor deliverable. The Club is open-minded about relocation to a site elsewhere. In this situation, the Club would like to work in partnership with the Council and others to help identify an appropriate alternative site that meets both the Club and the city's needs. The Abbey Stadium is the	211868 (Cambridge United Football Club)

only home Cambridge United has ever known and, whilst securing the Club's future and maximising the moment of opportunity the city is now in may require a move, we know this is a very sensitive and emotive issue. Should a defined allocation not be forthcoming, it would be helpful to include a broad statement of support for the Club's relocation (in the correct circumstances) either within draft Policy S/AMC/AS, or within a bespoke policy that explicitly deals with the Club's relocation within the Plan. This would be in line with Paragraph 98 of the NPPF, which requires Councils to plan positively for the provision of cultural facilities.	
Should the Club find an appropriate alternative site, and develop a new football stadium on it, it would be appropriate for the current site to be redeveloped for residential or commercial use. In such a scenario, the need to protect the pitch as open space would fall away. As such, to make best use of the land (which is brownfield) the draft policy should recognise the development potential of the site should the Club find an alternative site. This approach would be consistent with paragraphs 104 b) and 124 of the NPPF. It is recommended that the Policies Map is amended to remove the protected open space designation and ensure the site's future development potential is not compromised if the Club needs to relocate.	211869 (Cambridge United Football Club)
Page 116, paragraph 1e should refer to Newmarket Road Park & Ride rather than Newmarket Park & Ride.	210522 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Policy S/AMC/BC: Beehive Centre

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by local residents critiquing the allocation of the land for lab uses as the sector is in decline, and the development does not protect surrounding communities from loss of light. Comments were made by Historic England to make more specific reference to heritage assets. Cam Skate sought reference to community and leisure uses.

Further responses were made by local residents about overheating and urban heat island effects.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The redevelopment of the Beehive Centre is not an allocation of the Local Plan, they have already gained planning permission. The implications of it will be reflected in this area of major change to ensure mitigations are enabled for the public realm, pedestrian experience and suggested uses.
- Suggested amendments have been made to address comments from Historic England and Cambridge Past, Present and Future with respect to heritage assets.
- Pedestrian and cyclist movements have been reflected in the policy wording to ensure there is connectivity and safety for local residents in this area. Active travel is a priority for this area due its central location.

- Reference to the Transport Strategy has been tidied up in the policy wording in response to Cambridge, Past, Present and Future.
- Point 4b has been amended to address comments made by Cam Skate.
- Suggested changes from Railpen have been made where it is considered these provide greater clarity on the Councils' vision for this area.
- The urban heat island effect is managed by policy C/SD and S/DC which set out requirements to demonstrate how overheating is managed through the Sustainability Statement and how overheating is managed in buildings and the public realm through the cooling hierarchy.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies immediately adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. We welcome criterion 4 but recommend the addition of the word 'height'. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. We appreciate that the site has been granted planning permission by the SoS. However, the policy needs to be robust, should the permission not be implemented and alternative proposals come forward for the site.	210117 (Historic England)

The respondent expresses concern that the anti-car sentiment in planning policies has not been fully considered, particularly for car owners who commute and have independent children. They argue that restrictions on car use will lead to a less happy community, as cars enable 70% of residents to maintain their quality of life. The respondent believes that issues attributed to cars are symptoms of a larger problem, namely that the area is not a high-density city like London and cannot support a large population.	202705 (D Whant)
They suggest that if growth is necessary, it should occur in surrounding villages and towns, supported by a network of transport hubs. The respondent feels that Cambridge has lost its appeal due to development that has not considered long-term consequences.	202705 (D Whant)
The use of vitality and viability is unclear. The clarity of the policy needs to ensure the site's strategic role and planned evolution of the site.	203421, 203928 (Railpen)
The area is currently not very cyclist or public transport friendly. I would suggest better coordination between the retail park, beehive centre, and Tesco. Move shops to sites along Newmarket Road and parking to the back, so people could seamlessly access the shops from the bus stop instead of having to walk through an exposed parking lot. This is also a less historically sensitive area of Cambridge, so I support densification to provide much needed housing or office space.	203794 (A Chan)
More attention to urban heat islands and how areas of significant development work alongside existing housing must be a key factor here. The Beehive should never have been allowed to cause the impact that it did at outline planning and the Local Plan must protect homes especially those not in conservation area. The east especially shouldn't be taken advantage of - many communities use bikes but lack safe access due to urban sprawl and the retail park.	205340 (B Smith)

This is not a comprehensive statement that does enough to protect Silverwood Close from the loss of light and overwhelm by the planned buildings presented at the outline planning stage. I object most strongly to this, in part it's an enormous waste of land that would suit housing very well since lab-space is on the decline, and there is no protection to neighbouring residential buildings with clarity of height, noise and proximity to boundaries.	205388 (B Smith)
Frustration exists regarding the redevelopment of the Beehive, which lacks a residential component; a policy requiring mixed-use development for larger projects is suggested to address the city's housing needs.	207392 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies immediately adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. We welcome criterion 4 but recommend the addition of the word 'height'. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. We appreciate that the site has been granted planning permission by the SoS. However, the policy needs to be robust, should the permission not be implemented and alternative proposals come forward for the site.	210117 (Historic England)
No mention of community, sports, leisure, culture or creative hubs within the policy which we see as integral to supporting the vitality of this area given its city centre location.	210563 (Cam Skate)

Policy S/AMC/EB: East Barnwell

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the policy area from the Cambridge Investment Partnership.

Historic England confirmed that there are no designated heritage assets near the site.

Comments were made by Sport England to set out that under the 23/04687/FUL sports provision was re-provided.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Support noted.
- No comment noted from Historic England.
- In response to Sport England, the suggested amendments have been made.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
There are no designated heritage assets within the area or nearby. No comments.	210118 (Historic England)
Support the principles.	203403 (Cambridge Investment Partnership)

The East Barnwell area includes the site allocation S/C/BRN. For clarity, we advise you refer to the planning permission 23/04687/FUL and explain that the permission included the replacement of the sports provision to be lost as part of the planning permission 23/04849/FUL. This would demonstrate that the loss of these sports facilities has been assessed against paragraph 104 of the NPPF and that replacement mitigation provision has been secured.	209219 (Sport England)

Policy S/AMC/FBG: Fitzroy/ Burleigh Street/ Grafton Area

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the designation from ARU.

Comments were made by the Cambridge Liberal Democrat Group to include more reference to leisure provision.

Comments were made being critical of the negative preparation of the policy area, providing a shopping list of requirements rather than positive proposals.

Further responses were made by local residents about concerns about the urban heat island effect.

Historic England made representations to reflect more of the heritage assets in the policy wording.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The policy area is drafted in a way to establish which land uses support the vision for the area and what the constraints are and what is needed to support development in this area. It is not worded to prevent development but support sustainable development in this location.
- Leisure provision is covered by policy point 1A.
- The suggested amendments from Historic England have been made.
- The urban heat island effect is managed by policy C/SD and S/DC which set out requirements to demonstrate how

overheating is managed through the Sustainability Statement and how overheating is managed in buildings and the public realm through the cooling hierarchy.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The site contains several designated heritage assets including the Arts Theatre Workshop and Store listed at Grade II* and 17 Fitzroy Street and 38 Newmarket Road both listed at garde II listed. Part of the Kite Conservation Area is included in the Policy Area. There are also numerous listed buildings nearby. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. We welcome criterion 1b, 7b and 8. The Policy should make more reference the role of heritage in the re-vitalisation of retail areas. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit | Historic England for further suggestions	210119 (Historic England)
Leisure use is missing from this policy so please add the following to Grafton Shopping Centre Point 4 “Retention of significant public leisure use".	202842 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)

Can this policy make reference to Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets' purpose as a focal point for local services to the immediately surrounding Kite community as well as an extension to the city centre. Please add that there should be priority given for retention of convenience shopping and larger anchor stores which serve both audiences	202842 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
ARU supports this policy and development opportunities at the Grafton Centre. ARU particularly supports the specific reference to the site being suitable for uses associated with ARU's East Road campus. It would be an opportune area for further ARU based development, reinforcing the perception of an East Road campus and interconnectivity across the multiple hubs.	203991 (Anglia Ruskin University)
The policy is constructed in a negative manner. Rather than establishing a baseline that development within the AMC is acceptable, it establishes a shopping list of requirements, many of which conflict with the requirements of existing and emerging national policy.	207441 (Pioneer Group Ltd)
The policy fails to recognise the existing permission or flexibility in the use class order.	207441 (Bidwells on behalf of the Pioneer Group)
The site is at risk of heat island affect due to impact of labs proposed around the Grafton Centre. Concerns about the prevalence of science labs in the City Centre and impact on community and safety in the public realm.	208877 (R Lambert)
Can this policy make reference to Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets' purpose as a focal point for local services to the immediately surrounding Kite community as well as an extension to the city centre. Please add that there should be priority given for retention of convenience shopping and larger anchor stores which serve both audiences. Leisure use is missing from this policy so please add the following to Grafton Shopping Centre Point 4 "Retention of significant public leisure use".	202842 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)

Policy S/AMC/SCL: South of Coldham's Lane

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by local residents on impact on green infrastructure, chalk streams, connectivity, parking and safety.

Comments were made by Historic England requiring an HIA and requesting further detail on the heritage asset within and adjoining the site.

Comments were made by Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook about active travel connections, enhancing biodiversity and water safety around the country park.

Further responses were made by Cambridgeshire County Council regarding the impact on local pits.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- A review of the policy structure and configuration to reflect the distinct four areas of the site allocation that are emerging through wider changes to the context of Cambridge East with the introduction of new Cambridge East Station, and setting out a clearer vision for where the biodiversity needs to be protected and enhanced on local wildlife sites and which parts of the site are suitable for redevelopment.
- In response to Historic England, amendments have been made to the supporting text to highlight the heritage assets adjoining the site
- In response to Cambridgeshire County Council, the policy wording has been revised to highlight the LNRS and show which areas have importance for green infrastructure and wider ecological enhancements and connection to wildlife corridors.

- In response to wider comments about restrictions to parking and selling food. Selling food is covered by licensing and is not the role of the Local Plan site allocation. The issues relating to parking will be picked up by a Transport Assessment supporting any future planning application and a policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles.
- In terms of comments relating to density, the building height has in this location has been informed by evidence in the HIA and also by the local character.
- In terms of concerns around impacts on chalk streams, policies in the wider plan include policies to require water supply and water quality consideration at the planning application stage.
- In terms of active travel and connections, wording has been added to the policy to improve connections between Tin's Lane and Coldham's Common and wider active travel connections.
- In response to Misson Street & BGO Newton Ltd, the policy has been restructured to better reflect the latest proposals.
- In response to concerns about site contamination including impacts on soils, wording has been added to the policy to ensure the mitigation of these issues.
- In response to Historic England, the wording has been amended to reflect the nearby heritage assets. A HIA has not been provided for this site as it is a site allocation from the Cambridge City Council Local Plan, and this is consistent across the Local Plan.
- The policy area has been restructured to make clear that there should not be impacts on the City Wildlife Site and protected open space. A separate section has been set out for this area to set out the requirements for ecological enhancement and recreation. Public access and safety has been added into the masterplanning section as well as flood mitigation to address representations from Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook. Active travel connection to Cherry Hinton, Coleridge and Romsey has been added to point 3g to address representations from Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook. In response to concerns raised about water safety, point 3f has been added to address concerns about public safety and water access in the Country Park.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**

Mill Road Conservation Area slightly overlaps this policy area along Burnside. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of this asset including through development within its setting. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. Criterion c refers to building heights of no taller than 6 storeys. In the absence of a Heritage Impact Assessment this is inappropriate and should be deleted. This needs to be explored through an HIA and masterplanning. Delete reference to 6 storeys.	210120 (Historic England)
I object, I live very close to the start of the Tins pathway. An entry point here would be very difficult because the path is already quite busy. It would be impossible for any more cars to be using Burnside which is single file traffic. The last thing this area needs is a kiosk selling snacks. Changes to plan: Absolutely no parking. and nowhere selling food.	202697 (M Downs)
These ?20 metre high buildings are going to be cheek by jowl with houses on Wolsey Way and our garden on Orchard Estate. We will only a few feet away. They are much too high to be so close to a residential area and will dwarf the rest of the built environment. Local residents are not being kept informed on the results of the drilling tests, to see if it is even safe for foundations to be drilled. You have a rare chalk stream several metres downhill from this site. It is obvious the leachate will end up in the water.	201230 (S Williams)

Significantly improved developer-funded active travel routes should be designed in and built, and amenities should be expanded to enable local residential access. Provision should be made for a new rail/light rail stop on the railway line.	203829 (A Carpen)
We object to the proposed development of the lakes area because we do not feel sufficient thought has been put into the following: - access - the busy corner of where The Tins meets Brookfields and Burnside is already dangerous at peak times with all manners of transport and is an inappropriate site for the main entrance. - safety - since the plans were originally submitted a young person has drowned in the lakes. 24 hour access to the area without monitoring / security does not seem sufficient to prevent further accidents.	203771 (C Bone)
The application of a maximum storey height on buildings is inflexible when assessed in the context of other emerging spatial strategies and projects including East West Rail. The draft policy is also inconsistent with other parts of the draft Plan, including Policy S/C/SCL, and also with planning permission 23/04590/OUT. We propose that S/AMC/SCL paragraph 2c) should be amended.	204031 (Mission Street &BGO Propco Newton Ltd)
Policy S/AMC/SCL fails to take the following matters into account: The site proposed for the country park is severely constrained. Opportunities for public access have not been addressed. The part of the site previously ear-marked for public access is subject to flooding. Local water courses and bodies are vulnerable to pollution from toxic land fill. There is insufficient emphasis on the protection of flora and fauna. Management issues have not been given sufficient attention.	204669 (J McGill)
I do not think that the new plans for S/AMC/SCL South of Coldhams Lane take into account the detailed comments and recommendations made by local groups and individuals regarding the previous 2018 Local Plan. There are still many aspects which are vague and not showing how concerns will be	205152 (H Anderson)

addressed. Maintaining biodiversity, safety (including site supervision), future management, access (including vehicle parking and road safety), pollution and drainage issues are not properly outlined and could therefore open to misinterpretation if these plans go ahead.	
FCHCB have significant concerns about the policy for this AMC, as outlined in our full statement. For the urban country park: 1. Any public access must be strictly supervised, to avoid repetition of the 2024 fatality. 2. Access to the country park should prioritise active travel, given constraints on vehicle access and parking. 3. Proposals for governance and management to date need full revision 4. The risk of pollution of Cherry Hinton brook and the lakes from leakage/run-off from the land-fill site (containing highly toxic materials), must be made clear, along with the need for protection of the wildlife, evidenced by the designation of the area as City Wildlife Sites.	204667 (Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook)
Point 1a. Add: retain as much biodiversity and green space as possible, since this parcel of land is designated as both City Wildlife Site and protected open space.	210441 (Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook)
Point 1c. Reword first sentence of this point as follows; "In the area to the south-west: deliver a new urban country park through enabling periodic, highly supervised public access that will ensure the safety of all visitors whilst maintaining the important biodiversity and ecosystems of this wetland area. "	210442 (Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook)
Point 2a. Add after 'public access' the following phrase "... (covering both safety of the public and protection of wildlife) ....".	210443 (Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook)

Point 2d. Add to last sentence: .... streams, "as well as the variability in rainfall and water table levels which are having a major impact on drainage and periodic flooding of associated residential areas (such as Burnside and Brookfields)". This is important as the current proposal for the main entrance to the country park is in an area prone to flooding and immediately adjacent to the brook.	210444 (Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook)
We propose an additional Point f, since the proposal does not address access from the south of the AMC: "Ensure a safeguarded active travel access route from Cherry Hinton, Coleridge and Romsey wards and the city centre, to help to eliminate traffic congestion and parking in associated residential areas to the south of the Area of Major Change".	210445 (Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook)
In relation to the Supporting Information section: This recognises that “Outline planning permission was granted in January 2025 for offices, research and development, along with delivery of a country park.” but fails to mention the numerous issues that have been raised since then, including (a) that 72 conditions have to be met before the application for the northern parcels of land can go further because the construction is proposed for a location that is a toxic land fill site, and (b) that the area proposed for public access and a country park is highly dangerous (evidenced by the 2024 fatality in the lakes). It is irresponsible of the Local Plan to imply that this area would be suitable for unlimited public access and what most people would consider a normal country park. We request that the Supporting Information section provides more information and appropriately flags up the constraints of this location. We have provided our objection to the 2024 planning application as an uploaded separate document.	210446 (Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook)

Recommend the wording of the policy be expanded to include strengthening of the important wildlife corridor and delivery of Local Nature Recovery Strategy priority habitat and to take note of local wildlife sites.	210610 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summaries of Representations: Sites Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA) in Cambridge

Policy S/PRIA: Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA) in Cambridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Two main areas were highlighted by comments seeking further policy development in the plan.

The Elizabeth Way Bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project was highlighted as an opportunity for public realm improvement, making the area more accessible for active travel but also opportunities for cultural provision.

The Riverside Residents Association and others highlighted the Riverside Area Vision, proposing that the area needs careful planning and investment to make it safe and attractive for both pedestrians and cyclists, especially given predicted traffic increases from converging Greenways. Development should be supported if it aligns with the Riverside Vision and emerging thinking on the area's future potential as a strategic asset for the City as a whole.

Another comment welcomed the Mill Road policy area.

Anglian Water and Cambridgeshire County Council considered the policy should reference sustainable drainage. Historic England welcomed the aims of the Policy. Cambridge Past Present and Future considered it needed to be supported by a heritage strategy. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority highlighted the need to consider impacts of the policy on the functioning of the transport network. There were also comments highlighting the need to support active travel.

Railpen suggested amendments of the policy, proposing that developers could prepare and submit steering documents to guide the development of an area that could be taken account of in planning applications.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Comments regarding specific PRIAs have been addressed under these individual policy areas and therefore are not address here.

The supporting text of the policy now makes reference to the historic environment and should be read alongside the relevant policies in the Great Places chapter of the Local Plan.

The policy does not prioritise place making over vehicle movement, especially at junctions, as suggested by the representation. The policy is clear that a context led approach is required for development proposals in these locations, which reflect the needs of the area. This may include transport and movement as well as placemaking matters such as the quality of the public realm and the improvement of existing shop fronts.

SUDs and water management is not specifically referenced in the policy as this is covered by other policies within the Local Plan. However, the broad principle of the representation is noted and broadly supported elsewhere in the plan.

The policy has been amended to reflect that facilities and amenities should extend beyond the provision of shops and services. However, part 3 of the policy continues to require a policy framework to guide overall change in these areas as a ‘steering document’ is not a commonly recognised term.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
S/PRIA/EG and Elizabeth Way Bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub Project: Support development within the designated PRIA of a Cultural Hub offering accessible programme. The area surrounding the bridge and underpasses is lacking a sense of place. Introduce community, sports and cultural programme and upgrades to the public realm to promote safety and identity. Strengthen active transport N/S and E/W connections around the infrastructure for better connectivity, prioritising residents and visitors. Encourage movement along desire lines to and across the river, for local wards Petersfield, Market, Abbey and Chesterton.	201990 (Skateboard Cambridge CIC) 204004 (L Cooke) 203880 (B Greig) 202564 (J Neal) 204049 (A Giarlis) 203135, 201833 (NEUBAU Architecture Ltd (B Lenz, Architect)

	204242 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge) 205237 (University of Cambridge) 201800 (NEUBAU Architecture Ltd)
I support the development within the PRIA of a cultural hub offering an accessible programme. I oppose demolition of the underpass. RIBA guidance puts avoiding demolition as the number one way to improve sustainability of development. This is due to embodied energy and intensive energy and CO2 output required for demolition works. Therefore, I support the regeneration of the underpass into a cultural hub, using inventive architectural interventions. This would strengthen active travel and improve safety due to increased footfall. I would also improve place making and community.	204329 (K Fisher)
Riverside is a vibrant connected urban riverfront destination with city-wide benefit that celebrates Cambridge's relationship with water. Riverside unites Stourbridge Common and Midsummer Common through an elegant inclusive promenade that enhances community life, local heritage and ecological sustainability, and makes walking and cycling joyful experiences. We recommend that Riverside becomes its own Public Realm Improvement Area, focusing on Environment & biodiversity, Connectivity, Character, Heritage & identity, Safety & accessibility and Vehicular movement & parking.	203766 (Cambridge Green Party)
Riverside is a vibrant connected urban riverfront destination with city-wide benefit that celebrates Cambridge’s relationship with water. Riverside unites Stourbridge Common and Midsummer Common	204631 (M Cleminson)

through an elegant inclusive promenade that enhances community life, local heritage and ecological sustainability, and makes walking and cycling joyful experiences. It should become a PRIA focusing on Environment & biodiversity, Connectivity, Character, heritage & identity, Safety & accessibility and Vehicular movement & parking The existence of a Heritage Trail covering both Riverside and the Eastern Gate should be noted – highlighting the historical and cultural importance of both these areas. Please see attached information.	
The Riverside Area Vision sets out objectives for character, identity and heritage, connectivity, creating places that are safe, accessible and inclusive with three activation spaces and integrate the environment and enhance biodiversity. It needs careful planning and investment to make it safe and attractive for both pedestrians and cyclists, especially given predicted traffic increases from converging Greenways. We propose a community-driven review to shape a future Riverside Area Vision which highlights opportunities to make the area a vibrant attraction for Cambridge residents and visitors. Suggest - Proposals within the Riverside Area will be supported if they align with the Riverside Vision and emerging thinking on the area’s future potential as a strategic asset for the City as a whole.	211845, 211846, 211847, 211848, 211849, 211850, 211851, 211855, 211856, 211858 204440 (Riverside Residents Association)
I propose that Riverside should be designated PRIA for the following reasons: 1. It is a key link in the City's sustainable transport plans, as the entry point to Cambridge for three Greenways. 2. its unique stretch of urban riverfront that connects three green spaces and combines distinctive heritage assets with unspoilt river views. 3. Work is underway with GCP to realise the area's potential as a beautiful destination with city wide benefit.	204980 (A Sheedy)

The changes that are planned need to align with local plan policies and the only way to ensure this is to include it in the Local Plan.	
I welcome the draft policy for Mill Road and strongly support its focus on protecting independent shops and creating a safer, low-traffic, people-centred environment. These measures are essential to maintaining the area's distinctive character and supporting its long-term vitality. However, with the traffic filter now in place for several months and no accompanying public realm improvements yet delivered, I urge the Council to begin implementation promptly. Early action on pavements, crossings and streetscape upgrades would show commitment to the plan's aims and start bringing real benefits to residents and businesses.	200984 (F Sanchez Garcia)
I support The Cambridge Cycling Campaign submission. New developments must include adequate links to the surrounding area and links should be part of the Cambridge wide infrastructure without making longer journeys tortuous and complex. Provision should account for future growth in active traffic, climate change strategies and future developments	205009 (A Brown)
The public realm improvement areas should also offer the opportunity to achieve betterment through provision of SuDS and water reuse. Such measures are not implicit in the policy or subsequent site-specific policies, and we consider this should be positively expressed in this overarching policy.	210191 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
We object that this policy does not include any reference to heritage (which is why we believe that a Historic Environment Strategy is required as part of the Local Plan).	202814 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
We welcome the general aims of this policy. Historic England focuses on using the power of heritage to secure vibrant and sustainable futures for places with historic character so that generations to come can continue to enjoy them. Our High Streets Heritage Action Zones have maintained, restored and brought	210121 (Historic England)

buildings back into use for local communities and businesses. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit | Historic England for further suggestions and case studies. We recommend that this policy should include provision for the re-instatement of historic shop fronts.	
I support The Cambridge Cycling Campaign submission. New developments must include adequate links to the surrounding area and links should be part of the Cambridge wide infrastructure without making longer journeys tortuous and complex. Provision should account for future growth in active traffic, climate change strategies and future developments	205009 (A Brown)
The Plan identifies specific locations as Public Realm Improvement Areas that would “benefit from a holistic approach to any future development that comes forward, to provide policy guidance for development that also improves public transport access and infrastructure delivery and seeks improvements to the public realm.” Those public realm improvements reference ‘place making’ over vehicle movement, especially at junctions.” That policy approach will need to be revisited in the light of the forthcoming Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy and any potential impacts the policy would have on the functions of the transport network.	205458 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority)
There is strong support for embedding flood-alleviation principles into micro rain gardens and small parcels of land within new developments, such as spare or under-used corners. Their role in managing surface water and reducing flood risk should be made more explicit. There is also an opportunity to design small green spaces in ways that help residents understand and value their function in preventing flooding. A key question remains whether growth funding for this type of intervention will be distributed across Greater Cambridge as a whole or primarily targeted at areas experiencing new development.	211007 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Part 1(c) of policy S/PRIA should be amended to clarify the reference to local shops, as it is currently not sufficiently defined and may not apply uniformly to all Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIAs). Suggest: ‘help sustain or deliver facilities and amenities appropriate to function and character of the area’. The following would provide a more practical and flexible approach to guiding change while avoiding unnecessary additional policy layers: Part 3 should read “where proposals provide opportunities and potential challenges, site promoters should develop a steering document, approved by the planning authority as part of a planning application to promote and guide overall change during the life of the plan for the relevant area” Para 3.1.156 should read “it is recognised that while development can improve an area’s attractiveness it can also challenge the area’s character, in such circumstances site promoters are encouraged to develop a steering document to guide the area’s reconfiguration. Site specific policies requirements are also included, to highlight key local characteristics along with short and long-term opportunities and area aspirations that development should take account of as part of any planning application.”	204029 (Railpen)

Policy S/PRIA/CRP: Cambridge Retail Park

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were raised about protecting the strategic cycle route linking Riverside, the Beehive and Petersfield, and to safeguard land for a future bridge at Coldham's Common. Camcycle raised concerns about the lack of permeability.

Comments were made by local residents about specific improvements include a direct connection to Cambridge Railway Station, Chisholm Trail and bus services. Cam Skate requested to include leisure, and community uses in the policy wording.

Comments were made by local residents to improve design and heights and integrate with light rail network.

Further responses were made by Railpen on the alignment with nearby sites and the provision of infrastructure and a movement strategy.

Comments were made by Historic England about reflecting local heritage assets.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the issues raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Suggested amendments have been in response to comments raised by Historic England.
- Wording has been added to the policy to protect the cycle route linking Rivers, the Beehive and Petersfield.
- Some of the Railpen suggestions have been incorporated into the policy wording where this aligns with the Council's approach to the site and the preparation of consistent policies.
- There are not currently plans for a future bridge at Coldham's Common and therefore the safeguarding wording has not been added to the policy wording.

- It is too premature to reflect any plans for a light rail network. The issue is currently being explored by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.
- Point 1a has been revised to include reference to leisure and community uses to address representations from Cam Skate.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there are two listed buildings on the other side of Newmarket Road – 247 Newmarket Road and Cambridge Gas Company War Memorial, both listed at grade II. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.	210122 (Historic England)
It is essential we protect the strategic cycle route linking Riverside, the Beehive and Petersfield, as well as safeguarding land for a future bridge to Coldham's Common.	201999 (D Langley)
Development must protect the strategic cycle route linking Riverside, the Beehive and Petersfield.	202297 (R MacDonald), 202514 (H Brown), 202629 (A Lawrence), 202888 (J Williams), 203207 (G Orwell), 203322 (A Hoare),

	203344 (S Hughes), 203658 (V Ashton), 205150 (J Grantham), 205220 (K Brightwell), 205324 (R De Beaux), 205374 (S Nuttall), 205380 (A Williams),
The site should also safeguard land for a future cycle/pedestrian bridge to Coldham's Common.	202297 (R MacDonald), 205220 (K Brightwell), 205324 (R De Beaux), 205374 (S Nuttall), 205380 (A Williams),
Active travel needs to be prioritised from the outset, with provision for walking & cycling being mandatory.	203322 (A Hoare), 203684 (T Preud'homme)
Section 1.d and 1.e talk about active travel mostly within or around the site; it should also be a requirement for development to integrate with public transport for travel to and from the site. This is important as at present the area is poorly served by public transport. Specific improvements would be to ensure: Direct connection to Cambridge Railway Station; Direct connection to the Chisholm Trail; A wider range of Bus services, adding services perpendicular to Newmarket Road.	203585 (P Tribble)
Protect the strategic cycle route linking Riverside, the Beehive and Petersfield. Safeguard land for a future bridge to Coldham's Common. Requirement for the provision of trees along Newmarket Road and open space and amenity space. No/minimal parking provision.	202514 (H Brown) 20888 (J Williams) 203344 (S Hughes)

	203207 (G Orwell) 204562 (D Potts) 204590 (R Hoadley) 202629 (A Lawrence)
Expansion must unlock better walking, cycling and public transport for existing residents Limit car access between Cambourne and Cambourne North Set binding mode share targets Require early delivery of the main active travel network and crossings	202901 (J Williams)
Active travel needs to be prioritised from the outset, with provision for walking & cycling being mandatory. It should require provision of a protected, continuous and direct cycle route linking Riverside, the Beehive and Petersfield. It should also require safeguarding of land for a future pedestrian and cycle bridge across the railway to Coldham's Common	203322 (A Hoare)
Feel very positive with East gate ambitions and ideas. Will improve pedestrian and cycle access to Health and other facilities East/ West of roundabout. There is a need to ensure all current planning applications consider the ambition. Suggest cycle lanes and pathways should ensure they connect to current Newmarket road, (west side), ones which could be improved and greater use of Walnut Tree Ave made. If there is key development at Halfords site consideration needs to be given to impact on pedestrians and cyclists.	202289 (G Wrycroft)
Can this be part of a much wider masterplan that requires a significantly improved standard for building design (again incorporating the findings in neuroarchitecture) and also incorporating / making provision for a new rail/light rail stop at Coldham's Lane Bridge. A station at the bridge by the rail junction to the	203742 (A Carpen)

Cambridge-Newmarket Line would enable significant public transport access to the retail park, to the revamped Beehive sci-tech development, and to the Abbey Stadium, as well as for residents of NW Romsey. See https://cambridgetownowl.com/2023/07/15/why-the-beehive-redevelopment-plans-need-a-rail-station/ note it would enable closer rail access to the Grafton.	
Recommends amending part 1(b) of policy S/PRIA/CRP for clearer integration objectives with the Beehive Centre and the surrounding neighbourhoods; For part 2(a and c), Railpen suggests replacing 'policy framework' with 'steering document(s)' for practicality and clearer urban relationship guidance. In part 3(a and c), Railpen highlights the need to acknowledge the railway line in east-west connections and remove ambiguous references to the Greater Cambridge Partnership. Railpen requests clarity on the 'overarching development and environmental strategy framework' in para 3.1.159, proposing a reference to a 'steering document' instead. Provides detailed wording suggestions.	204083 (Railpen)
The land use should retain retail and ensure that cars can still access the site and not focus too much on active travel and public transport.	203801 (A Chan)
The Retail Park is presently of low quality as public realm, is dominated by car parking and is unattractive for pedestrians. I would support sensitive development (including retail, food, etc) to increase the amenity of the site; and efforts to make it safer and more pleasant as a through route for pedestrians.	205067 (N Spenley)
As with Beehive, the site at Coldham’s Lane, Newmarket Road and Henley Road are close to residential properties including Silverwood Close, New Street which are impacted by the Beehive.	205474 (B Smith)

Height Mers here as does overcrowding, which is not made sufficiently clear, nor is the reduction of traffic (pre-planning discussions showed two multi-storey car parks). Care must be given to traffic on Coldhams Lane which has increased since Mill Road bus gate was introduced. In summary the Local Plan must protect homes from the problems of obfuscation and height that have arisen during Beehive planning applications.	
No mention of community, sports, leisure, culture or creative hubs within the policy which we see as integral to supporting the vitality of this area given its city centre location.	210562 (Cam Skate)
Cambridge Retail Park is one of the most car-dominated sites in the city, yet it sits between dense residential areas and along key walking and cycling desire lines. Its redevelopment is a critical opportunity to reduce short car trips and address fragmented networks. The Plan refers to improving permeability through the site but does not explain how this will be achieved in a location defined by railway severance. Policy S/AMC/BC should be amended to include: ● A requirement for a protected, continuous and direct cycle route through the site that avoids conflict with turning vehicles and aligns with strategic desire lines; ● A requirement to safeguard land and secure delivery mechanisms for a future pedestrian and cycle bridge across the railway to Coldham's Common; and ● A requirement that permeability for walking and cycling is mandatory rather than encouraged, with multiple direct connections beyond the site boundary.	209082, 209083, 209084 (Camcycle)

Policy S/PRIA/EG: Eastern Gate

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments received focused on two main areas.

St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge was identified in previous HELAA assessments, causing concern for future impact on the community if it was to be considered. Comments requested not to allocate the site, siting the importance of the local amenity space, and previous planning refusals.

Ther were a large number of comments supporting the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project. There were objections to the demolition of the roundabout and underpass, opportunities to create a cultural hub, with better connectivity for active travel, space for cultural activities, and an improved urban environment.

There was a suggestion to widen the boundaries, both north to Riverside and west to include the entire ARU Campus along both sides of East Road, and to include locations like Mercers Row, or to extend to the riverside.

Comments supported the re-establishment of the historical local centre and high street function of Newmarket Road, with a range of attractive shop fronts, cafes and restaurants.

Historic England highlighted the historic environment issues in the eastern gate area that would need to be considered. Other comments said that the neglected heritage of the area must be revived and become available for use by the community and wider public.
Railpen sought a change to the current policy wording of part F, as integrate positively with the adjacent areas is not sufficiently clear or measurable as a policy objective.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge was not allocated in the Draft Local Plan but was identified in previous HELAA assessments. Whilst the HELAA sets out the reasons for assessing the site on the grounds of suitability, availability and achievability, the HELAA Red scores are noted, and the site has not been put forward in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Responses highlighted an opportunity to explore the extension of the policy area (PRIA/EG) to incorporate Elizabeth Way up to and beyond the river. The objectives would be consistent with the wider plan objectives and context of policies related to WS/CH: Cultural and creative hubs, Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries, Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces, Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape & public realm, Policy CC/SD: Sustainable development and the climate emergency, Policy WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities, and Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity.

Proposals set out by The Underpass Project, including the Founding Principles are recognised as seeking to revitalise and improve the PRIA, and align with the proposed policy. Whilst the Local Planning Authorities are supportive of the objectives outlined for the project, the PRIA is currently the appropriate type of allocation to achieve the aspiration of the policy and enable opportunity to secure funding and other initiatives through community engagement and participation with stakeholders. The boundary of the policy

area has been amended to reflect the boundary identified as opportunity for improvement within The Under Pass Project, and wording has been amended to incorporate further benefits of the area including improving access to culture offers, providing spaces for creative arts, improving the public realm amenities and landscape, biodiversity and improving health and wellbeing.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge (HELAA Reference 59405) Would be a disaster for this community. Site was given an Overall Score of 'Red'. The exclusion of the site must be permanently enforced. That will protect our vital, extremely limited and increasingly pressurised local amenity space - noting St Matthew's Piece as the only public park in North Petersfield. Unambiguous evidence of this need lies in the sequence of five Planning Refusals since 2021 (none appealed), each pertaining to this area: 25/0432/TTPO, 24/0413/TTPO, 23/0119/TTPO, 22/0271/TTPO, and (most significantly) 20/04514/FUL.	201191 (K Herron), 201192 (R Isaacs), 201193 (J Linney), 201194 (S Bjornson), 201195 (A Lindsay), 201196 (B Smith), 201198 (S Schofield), 201199 (L Kirsop), 201200 (N Adamson), 201201 (B Greig), 201202 (C Horne), 201204 (S Cracknell), 201205 (S Moss), 201206 (G Glover),

	201207 (G Archer), 201209 (B Sylvester-Bradley), 201210 (J Selby), 201211 (R Williams), 201212 (J Chapman), 201213 (P Salin), 201215 (U Stubbings), 201216 (E van Zwanenberg), 201217 (G Haraldsdottir), 201218 (D Schwarz), 201219 (H Schwarz), 201220 (S Salin), 201257 (A Erdil), 201259 (I Harvey), 201262 (L Tubb), 201263 (R Mills), 201264 (C Spooner), 201265 (F Lyall Grant), 201329 (L Franks),

	201401 (J Wright), 201423 (C Aman), 201427 (J Bradley), 201454 (T Neal), 201469 (Cllr R Robertson), 201513 (B Greig), 201741 (J Johnson), 201743 (J Johnson), 201816 (K Russull), 201879 (R Rozier) 203768 (Cambridge Green Party (R Comins, Research Officer)) 203600 (N Glegg) 202935 (Cambridge Glenys Self) 203420 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations (W Blythe)) 201359 (JV Neal), 201187 (J Neal), 201188 (L Kelly),

	201189 (J Murphy), 201190 (B Cijffers), 201270 (D Storey), 201271 (C Carpenter), 201273 (J Ladlow), 201285 (C Douglas), 201289 (J Wickerson), 201290 (Cambridge glenys self), 201291 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network), 201292 (J Connett), 201320 (J Davey), 201328 (J Franks), 201553 (H Phillips), 201840 (G Kent), 201866 (J Hurst), 201960 (P Watson), 201965 (A Furlong), 205573 (J Ord), 205654 (S Buckingham), 207648 (Duxford PC)
Any planning should preserve the existing green space and prevent the felling or reduction of trees on St. Mathews Piece, with a defined exclusion zone to mitigate potential impacts on nearby buildings. The proposed density of developments appears incompatible with policies regarding green space,	202529 (A Brown)

biodiversity, and tree canopy. Developments in the Eastern Gate zone must not exacerbate traffic issues on New Street, which currently serves as a shortcut between Newmarket Road and East Road.	
Part of this site lies within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area. There are also several grade II listed buildings including the Church of St Andrew the Less, 247 Newmarket Road and Cambridge Gas Company War Memorial. There are numerous listed buildings nearby. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. We welcome criterion 2c and paragraph 3.1.162.	210123 (Historic England)
The boundaries of the Eastern Gate area are inappropriate. They fail to recognise the integrity of the Riverside neighbourhood area, which includes all streets from Riverside south, such as Abbey Road, Riverside, Priory, Saxon and Beche Roads, River Lane, and the CHS estate. But even more strange, there is no discussion of the ARU campus. The recent acquisition of the Mackays site on East Road suggests that a Master Plan is needed, either within or separate from the Eastern Gate. Widen the boundaries significantly, both north to Riverside and west to include the entire ARU campus along both sides of East Road.	201794 (Cambridge Group of the Ramblers, J Tuffnell, Secretary)
Support S/PRIA/EG Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project: I support this project. I object to vehicle-led transport strategies and oppose the demolition of the roundabout. I support safer, better connectivity for pedestrians/cyclists and a multi-disciplinary urban	201991 (Skateboard Cambridge CIC (P Elbro, Director)

design strategy which: Creates a cultural hub in and around the infrastructures for cultural, recreational and commercial use, coordinates Transport and bus lanes with urban realm design, encouraging pedestrians/cyclists desire lines N/S towards the river, and promotes a sense of place with priority use for residents and visitors.	204228 (A Giarlis) 204229 (NEUBAU Architecture Ltd B Lenz, Architect) 204336 (K Fisher) 204009 (L Cooke) 204352 (K Fisher) 204388 (K Fisher) 204245 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204212 (L Cooke), 205243 (University of Cambridge)
S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project, I support proposals that seek to increase and intensify planting and biodiversity within the S/PRIA/Eastern Gate. This includes areas above and adjacent to the Elizabeth way bridge, landscaped areas within the East Road underpass, and improvements along the Newmarket Road, including new hedges and trees planted to separate pedestrians and cyclists and other active transport users, from cars. This is a very recent project (2025), and I support development within the designated S/PRIA/EG of a Cultural Hub offering	204321 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204431 (K Fisher), 205265 (University of Cambridge)

accessible Community-led Cultural, recreational and commercial uses, to promote a sense of place and identity for the Elizabeth Bridge, Underpass(es) and environs.	
Support regeneration of the bridge and adjacent underpasses within the S/PRIA/EG With reference to S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project, I support proposals that seek to regenerate and open for use, the empty storage facilities underneath the Elizabeth bridge and within the underpasses. This would enhance the area's vitality and use and benefit from the existing pedestrian and cyclist footfall along the river promenade.	204320 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204430 (K Fisher)
The St Andrew the Less Community Project supports plans for improvements to the Eastern Gate and encourages an addition: 1.g. celebrate and enhance the existing heritage, recognising that heritage can increase pride in place and connectedness for communities. The heretofore neglected heritage of the area must be revived and become available for use by the community and wider public. The development of a heritage trail will also contribute to the vibrancy of this area and Riverside.	204739 (NEUBAU Architecture Ltd (B Lenz, Architect) 204549 (The St Andrew the Less Community Project) 204825 (A Sheedy)
I strongly support the re-establishment of the historical local centre and high street function of Newmarket Road, with a range of attractive shop fronts, cafes and restaurants. Making the road a single carriageway and tree line promenade should be considered and linking previous historical north-south crossings.	204882 (A Sheedy)
The Eastern Gate area should be extended to Mercers Row, to include the historical streets of Oyster Row, Garlic Row and should do everything to return these streets to residential streets and eliminate the rat run from commercial vehicles.	207546 (A Sheedy)

Proposed site plan of S/PRIA/EG - extend the red line boundary I support the variation / extension of the red line boundary to include the East Road Roundabout ‘Underpass’ and also the whole of the Elizabeth Way bridge (above and below) incl adjacent public realm, landscaped areas and highways, North and South of the river Cam (Walnut Tree Avenue, Cutter Ferry Path, Cutter Ferry Close a.o.) (as submitted by the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) project)	204426 (K Fisher)
Support Safer and more comfortable travel: I support any improvements to create a more comfortable and simplified pedestrian movement along the Newmarket road/East Road/Elizabeth Way and roundabout, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists, providing safer junctions and analysing desire lines for better connectivity between adjacent wards and the river.	204409 (K Fisher) 204303 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead))
I do not support the planned demolition of the underpass, and it was rejected by a majority of respondents (refer to GCP public consultation process) Demolition is not a viable or sustainable solution for the transport problems. I support alternative options brought forward which would regenerate the infrastructure and coordinate it with other as-found 70s leftover spaces, creating a public realm and cultural hub with better access and manoeuvrability for pedestrians and cyclists to move between the adjacent wards and the river.	204273 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204384 (K Fisher)

Oppose plans to demolish the Newmarket Road and East Road and underpass: I object to any plans proposing the demolition of the East Road Roundabout underpass, which would be an unsustainable loss of a public space. The underpass contains a thriving biodiverse landscape and also has great potential for adaptation as a public common, to include active landscaping, street furniture, skating, exhibitions, workshops and other cultural and public engagement.	204311 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204423 (K Fisher)
Oppose plans to demolish the Elizabeth Way Roundabout, which would be an unsustainable loss of a public space. The underpass contains a thriving biodiverse landscape and also has great potential for adaptation as a public common. We support the Underpass and the Elizabeth Way bridge cultural hub project, supporting proposals that seek to regenerate and open for use, the empty storage facilities underneath the Elizabeth bridge and within the underpasses. This would enhance the area's vitality and use and benefit from the existing pedestrian and cyclist footfall along the river promenade.	203767 (Cambridge Green Party (R Comins, Research Officer))
Support proposed extended site plan S/PRIA/EG I support a phased approach to planning, build and operations which seeks to address the imminent transport issues as a first priority. Following this, any plans should accommodate active modes of transport within the proposed multi-disciplinary urban plan, which seeks to re-imagine this area within the S/PRIA/Eastern Gate as a cultural hub. (as submitted by the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) project)	204317 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204427 (K Fisher)
Support gateways / entry points to residential neighbourhoods: I support any improvements to create an urban gateway/sense of arrival in the city via the Elizabeth Way and the Newmarket Road. I support a	204308 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M

change in perception of the hierarchy between cars and other transport users, contributing to lower speeds and improved safety and visibility for pedestrians and cyclists, elderly residents and children.	Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204410 (K Fisher)
Comment 1c - public realm improvements: I strongly support public realm improvement that will generate a sense of place and safety including lighting, street furniture and new urban programme and uses for this neglected area.	204367 (K Fisher)
Comment 1e - better visual and physical connections: I strongly support better connectivity and signage/ wayfinding for residents and visitors. Active and landscaped transport networks linking adjacent wards with the river will help regenerate neglected pockets within the urban realm, making them accessible for public use.	204373 (K Fisher)
I support the development of a cultural Hub within the designated PRIA, offering a mix of accessible programmes and open access active space in the public realm, particularly on, in and around the Elizebeth Way Bridge. The area has its own identity and is well used, the architecture is of historic significance and many of the spaces are unique. I am in favour on introducing space for community sports and cultural programming alongside the development of some of the existing active transport link and better connections both East/Wast and North/South. I am in favour of keeping the underpass. Issue not raised previously. we are in desperate need of community, youth and arts spaces as well as workshops, storage and experimental space for supporting the city's cultural life. The Elizebeth Way Bridge and Underpass has a range of unique spaces within and around its structure that have the potential to transform access to arts and culture across the North and East of the city. Especially if these are run in conjunctions with existing arts events and organisations.	204294 (T Woodcock)

Vehicular Traffic along Newmarket Road and East Road and underpass: I support the redevelopment of Newmarket Road pedestrian and cycle paths, and the adaptation of Elizabeth Way underpass as a public common. I support the re-design of the car-dominated transport roundabout to include cycle lanes and four required pedestrian & cyclist crossings, which prioritise pedestrians and cyclists and integrate practical and desired lines for better N/S and E/W connectivity.	204300 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204407 (K Fisher)
Better connectivity: I strongly support better integration of pedestrian and other active transport modes with this car-dominated infrastructure, as well as prioritising pedestrian and cyclist desire lines	204255 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204364 (K Fisher)
support: Comment relating to an urban design led approach to S/PRIA/EG with reference to the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project, I strongly support an urban, multi-disciplinary design led approach which seeks to resolve transport issues with a comprehensive strategy that integrates transport with urban disciplines. Any design proposals should respect the conservation character of adjacent wards and offer sustainable solutions to re-invent the neglected 70s infrastructure.	204297 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204403 (K Fisher)
On site provision of functional public spaces and nature: with reference to the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project, development proposals should use S106 or other public funding opportunities to improve on the type and diversity of public realm spaces allocated for spontaneous and non-programmed outdoors recreation, regenerating leftover or neglected highways and public spaces and other opportunities for hard landscaping, as well as re-introducing nature, suds and raingardens.	204293 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead))

Shared highways surfaces should prioritise use for active modes of travel and encourage active engagement from a diverse local community, by increasing street furniture for seating, creating opportunities for urban sports and active landscapes, to encourage integration of young people and to promote an active, outdoors lifestyle. The needs addressed should reflect the demands of local residents and local businesses, in order to generate a local neighbourhood public realm strategy, reflecting a diverse resident demographic.	205260 (University of Cambridge Z Svendsen, associate professor) 204400 (K Fisher)
Support: public realm improvement area opportunity: with reference to the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project, I support the regeneration and transformation of this neglected transport infrastructure, to realise the potential of underused spaces for sustainable redevelopment, and to provide much needed community, cultural and sports uses. This should include a range of ages and users including skate friendly seating, natural shelter, bicycle parking, increased street lighting and active landscapes, access to water as well as safe facilities particularly for women including toilets within F+B offerings.	204290 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead)) 204396 (K Fisher)
support: Comment point 3 - urban design led character appraisal: with reference to the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project, I support the group's intent to adapt a multi-disciplinary approach to public realm improvements and place making. I strongly encourage the integration of pedestrian and cyclist desire	204287 Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead) 204391 (K Fisher)
support: Comment 2d - pedestrian comfort: From a transport perspective, there is currently no direct or safe way to cross N/S or E/W along the Elizabeth way bridge and roundabout, difficult to gain access to the river other than residential neighbourhoods. I strongly support development that seeks to integrate	204284 Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M

and prioritise desire lines for pedestrians, cyclists and other active modes over vehicular transport, creating a safer transport hierarchy.	Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead) 204390 (K Fisher)
support: Comment 2c - re-modelling access to the East Road underpass: The East Road underpass is large at approx. 1,450m2 in area and comprises one-third landscaped areas and mature trees. Designs for the underpass should intensify landscaping and biodiversity, make material improvements of hardscape areas, to allow for active urban sports and flexible-use street furniture, supporting future use as a public square/common.	204279 Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead), 205253 (University of Cambridge)
support: Comment point 1d - new public spaces: with reference to the EW bridge and Underpass(es) project, I support the group's intent to adapt the East Road Underpass pedestrian & cyclist infrastructure as a public common and cultural hub.	204257 Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead) 204370 (K Fisher), 205248 (University of Cambridge)
support: Comment 1f - business and retail parks adjacencies: I strongly support the regeneration of the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) as they have potential to provide synergies and also alternatives to commercial programme in the neighbourhood retail parks. There is a strong case for a sustainably integrated, affordable community and cultural hub appropriately placed within the urban context of the riverside promenade and transport infrastructure.	204260 Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead) 204377 (K Fisher)
support: Comment 2a - restore the balance between people and vehicles: I strongly support better links and a transport strategy prioritising pedestrians and cyclists with the East Road/Elizabeth	204265 Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M

Way/Newmarket Road approach routes and the Roundabout including under passages, there are currently no concessions made to prioritise local, active transport and negotiating the current vehicular traffic condition can be considered dangerous.	Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead) 204381 (K Fisher)
support: Comment point 1a - - character of the area - East Road/Elizabeth Way roundabout: The East Road Roundabout, situated within the Eastern Gate area, is known to be a major high-traffic access node - it is well positioned to promote a ‘sense of arrival’ in the City (currently a neglected asset). I support efforts to mitigate the negative impact of vehicular transport, to prioritise access and connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and other forms of active transport, and to activate the pedestrian underpass as a public space giving it a new identity.	204252 Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge (M Burman, Artistic Director & CEO / Co-lead) 204359 (K Fisher)
With reference to S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub community project, the project sits in catchment area of 5 adjacent wards, connected by a shared infrastructure link, the Elizabeth Way bridge and related underpasses. The area sits within a public realm improvement area with potential to adapt leftover indoors and outdoors spaces for cultural and sports programmes, which would work well in line with the Cambridge tradition of skating and urban skating, providing indoors and outdoors recreation and youth engagement.	205113 (M Cleminson)
Support: principles of sustainable development / retention of concrete infrastructures in a climate emergency: with reference to S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) community project. Object to proposals to demolish the Underpass, proposals were rejected during the 2023 consultation. It would cause unnecessary disturbance and high-carbon emissions to backfill and level the underpass drum 70’s transport infrastructure which contains existing biodiversity and has proven potential as an inviting public square. Support minimal environmental footprint / maximum impact	204269 (A Giarlis), 204393 (NEUBAU Architects),

redevelopment of the as-found underpasses and under crofts, greening of the public realm in and around the transport infrastructure.	
Reference to S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) community project. I support the designation of this asset as a noteworthy architectural asset, albeit where the asset should be championed through regenerative and community-focused practices. The space is currently undervalued and transition experiments such as the 'Out of the dark' urban light show showcased an alternative, community-led and culturally advancing use for the space. Attention should be paid to how the cultural economy of such an asset can be utilised, with a designation and allocation for cultural use in the Local Plan being the first step.	204495 (T Ziromskas)
This is desperately needed but must develop the spaces in response to the developing needs of the growing community and particularly with the responsive development of cultural facilities for young people, creatives, families and actives travellers. Many of whom are already developing innovative ways of utilising existing spaces. It is important that a top down solution is not imposed by 'consultants'. There are organisations working around the Underpass/Under croft project that are far better suited to develop responsive and user led solutions. I object to vehicle-led transport strategies and oppose the demolition of the roundabout.	204678 (T Woodcock)
When considering the Elizabeth Way roundabout development as part of Eastern Gate please look at cycleway markings needed on Newmarket road/Sun Street (West approach) access points and improved signage for cyclists who want to use Walnut Tree Avenue to get to Riverside cycleway. Also, for cyclists joining this junction from Walnut Tree Ave. This access point should be improved to make it	202002 (T Jewell)

the attractive option for pedestrians and cyclists over what is poor condition paving by Halfords and poor signage. The underpass is currently a safer option to cross over.	
Railpen supports the policy and its reference in Part 1 to the Beehive Centre and Retail Park and how the Eastern Gate area and adjoining or nearby sites can collectively deliver a greater beneficial impact to the local area. Railpen requests an amendment to Part 1 (f) of policy S/PRIA/EG as currently worded below: f. integrate positively with the adjacent Cambridge Retail Park (Policy Ref. S/PRIA/CRP), Beehive Centre (Policy Ref. S/AMC/BC), Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area (Policy Ref. S/AMC/FBG) and surrounding neighbourhoods. References to ‘integration’ is not sufficiently clear or measurable as a policy objective.	204092 (Railpen)
The boundary of the Eastern Gate PRIA does not include Riverside. I suggest this should be designated as a PRIA for the following reasons: (i) It is a key link in the City’s sustainable transport infrastructure, as the entry point to central Cambridge for three Greenways; (ii) It is a stretch of accessible urban riverfront that connects three green spaces with distinctive heritage assets with unspoilt river views; (iii) GCP are working to create a vibrant destination with city-wide benefit; (iv)It is adjacent to Eastern Gate PRIA and Areas of Major Change, with development proposals with major implications	205173 (M Evans)
About points 2a and 2b. You just hate car drivers. Soon all cars will be electric, but you will still hate car drivers. It is your fault if we have congestion in Cambridge, as you want to greatly expand the population and the city can't cope with it. Sustainable development means very limited development, and you just can't get your heads around that. You have been completely captured by Camcycle -- their utopia is a paradise for able-bodied single people who live near to the centre and never have to carry bulky loads or multiple children with them.	201232 (S Williams)

The Draft Local Plan acknowledges issues of vehicular traffic dominance and accessibility around the Elizabeth Way roundabout but fails to address the condition of Elizabeth Way itself, a key corridor linking North and East Cambridge to the city centre. Residents report safety concerns on Elizabeth Way, including near-misses for parents with young children, speeding traffic, and cyclists being forced onto pavements due to disappearing cycle lanes. Speeding and red-light running are prevalent issues, exacerbated by the confusing multi-lane layout, which residents believe encourages aggressive driving. There is strong support among residents for reducing Elizabeth Way to two traffic lanes with narrower carriageways to help calm traffic and improve safety. Cycle provision is inconsistent and unsafe, leading to conflicts between cyclists, pedestrians, and fast-moving traffic, with pedestrians often forced off pavements. Residents view Elizabeth Way as one of the most dangerous roads in the city, a result of outdated design prioritising cars, and express a desire to engage in discussions to enhance safety and liveability.	201910 (A Rahman)
This policy is good as far as it goes, but should bring out the important foci for the area. - as a high street for Riverside - as a cultural hub project for the Elizabeth Way Bridge and Underpass - as a revived space for Heritage, particularly celebrating the 13th century church of St Andrew the Less I attach details on all of this.	203004 (M Cleminson)
Please include content on references to developments/discoveries in the field of neuroarchitecture, require Health Impact Assessments to cover the mental stress generated by certain building designs and styles.	203698 (A Carpen)

Please include something about outstanding/iconic buildings for the corner of East Road / Newmarket Road - a huge opportunity for something that is not a dull box.	
The benefits of redevelopment and opportunities to enhance the Eastern Gate are well established and supported. The policy should be more positively phrased in respect of the benefits of development opportunities. However, there is one point of concern within this policy, specifically 'Studies will also be required to justify proposed land uses floorspaces and their redevelopment on a proposal-by-proposal basis'. This is a somewhat 'anti-development' approach, albeit likely inadvertent. It would be constructive if the policy cross referenced that such justification is not required where there is separate policy support for stated uses (i.e. education development as set out in draft policy J/FD).	203996 (Anglia Ruskin University)
RARA seeks to re-establish the historical local centre and high street function of Newmarket Road for Riverside residents, with attractive shop fronts, cafes and restaurants. Making the road a single carriageway and tree-lined promenade should be considered for this currently run down and pedestrian-unfriendly stretch. Please rephrase point 2b to start: "prioritise a pedestrian-led movement hierarchy which emphasises." as in Policy GP/QP. We support point 2c to re-establish the historic route and visual links between Occupation Road and Abbey Road. Please also add to 2c "and the former pedestrian connectivity between Coldham's Lane and River Lane." (photo attached).	2034447 (Riverside Area Residents Association), 205182 (M Evans)
There is a risk of much of this area becoming a heat island. Priority should be given to increasing tree cover, public open space and wildlife corridors. Land currently built on or tarmaced over (for example	204824 (R Randall)

underused garages or little used buildings) should be designated for parks/open space/nature reserve areas. Permission should be refused for anything which might damage existing trees or open space.	
☑ non-designated heritage asset with reference to S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) community project, I support retention as a noteworthy 70's Heritage asset. In 1950 the architect / town planner Lord William Graham Holford produced a report for Cambridge County planning, proposing a comprehensive road framework the scale of which was unprecedented in the history of Cambridge transport planning, leading to construction of the infrastructure in 1969. This introduced environmental and social challenges to the local residential area. ☑ I support regeneration and re-use of the EW Bridge and underpasses as a pedestrian/cycle friendly, cultural hub.	205057 (M Cleminson)
With reference to S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub community project, I support the re-design of neglected pockets of the public realm using a multi-disciplinary approach. The East Road underpass provides a benchmark opportunity for integrating public art and engagement events. It presents a microclimate with existing biodiverse planting and has potential to be more green and provide opportunities for temporary art installations. Development proposals should use S106 or other public funding opportunities to improve on the type and diversity of public realm spaces allocated for spontaneous and non-programmed outdoors recreation, as well as promoting biodiversity.	205188 (E Nowak)
I recommend that the Riverside area is (a) either added to the Eastern Gate Improvement Area, or preferably (b) becomes an Improvement Area of its own. Riverside presents many opportunities: making a pedestrian boulevard along the length of the river, providing an attractive and safe	205526 (D Spiegelhalter)

environment for cycling, enhancing the area underneath Elizabeth Way Bridge and outside the industrial history museum, encouraging biodiversity and wildlife both in and beside the river itself.	
support: Point 2i - support ‘local labour’ promoting and retaining local talent and skills: With reference to S/PRIA/EG and the Elizabeth Way bridge and Underpass(es) cultural hub project, I support local labour and the provision of workspaces for local SMEs to promote Cambridge local small to medium size businesses and start-ups through affordable space provisions including Artists workshops, makerspaces, exhibition spaces, shops a.o. as well as offering apprenticeships.	205276 (University of Cambridge)
Support for Policy S/PRIA/EG is expressed, with a request for it to explicitly recognise Elizabeth Way as a key strategic corridor requiring comprehensive planning beyond just the roundabout. The respondent highlights a critical gap in the Plan's analysis, noting that it focuses on the roundabout while neglecting the strategic importance of Elizabeth Way for connectivity. Concerns are raised regarding the historical context and transport issues affecting the entire Elizabeth Way corridor, which limits pedestrian and cyclist safety. The respondent suggests that the policy should extend its scope to address the scale, layout, and design of Elizabeth Way, promoting a comprehensive strategy for safety and community reconnection. A modification to Policy S/PRIA/EG is proposed to ensure it aligns with the Plan's sustainability, accessibility, and community cohesion objectives, providing clearer long-term direction.	205472 (Cambridge City Council (Cllr J Dalzell))
The introduction of new at-grade crossings along Newmarket Road conflicts with the need for bus priority, suggesting a need for either subways and bridges or a re-evaluation of the bus-based strategy.	207390 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

S/PRIA/HRRS: Hills Road and Regent Street Corridor

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Trinity Hall to include Bateman House as a site allocation. Comments were made by North Newton Residents Association about widening pavements. Further responses were made by a local resident to ask for a masterplan for the area and have consideration for children and the late night economy. Comments were made by Historic England about reflecting local heritage assets and preparing a HIA.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the issues raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to Historic England, the suggested amends have been made to the policy. As this is a policy area a HIA has not been prepared for this area.
- Point 2 of the policy has been amended to include wider pavements in response to the North Newton Residents Association.
- Due to the scale of this site allocation a masterplan led approach is not appropriate across the whole policy area, this policy area sets out key principles to guide development in this area to improve the public realm for children and for the late time economy by improving the public realm and making it safer.
- Bateman House has not been allocated as a site allocation because it is next to the Botanic Gardens and a Conservation Area which are quite significant constraints for any redevelopment. A pre-application should be able to resolve these issues and suggest a way forward for this site.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
82-90 Hills Road Cambridge Trinity Hall supports policy S/PRIA/HRRS, which aligns with the objectives of Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 25 that identifies 82-88 Hills Road as an allocated site for improvements. An updated version of 2018 local plan allocation M5 should be added to Chapter 3 of the draft Local Plan, crucial for enhancing the Hills Road/Regent Street Corridor.	202787 (Trinity Hall)
The quality of architecture in these area needs to be improved.	203696 (A Carpen)
6c - needs clear statement that wider pavements are required the length of Hills Road, from Station Road to Regent Street, in line with improvements proposed in 6a (Regent Street). Footfall from the railway station to the city centre is high; improvements proposed in the 2018 Local Plan have not been implemented. This key route into the city for residents & visitors requires a) reduction in traffic and the space given to it and b) focus on local businesses & public realm so that Hills Road returns as the 'high street' for Newtown & Glisson Road residents as it was.	205179 (North Newtown Residents Association)
The Policy Area lies within New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and the Central Conservation Area. There are numerous listed buildings along Regent Street and Hills Road, including the grade I listed Downing College and Church of Our Lady of the Assumption and the English Martyrs, the grade II* Wanstead House and grade II listed St Pauls Church and there are numerous grade II listings. The Botanic Gardens is a grade II* Registered Park and Garden. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development	210124 (Historic England)

within their settings. There is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. The Policy should make more reference the role of heritage in the re-vitalisation of retail areas.	

Policy S/PRIA/MC: Mitcham’s Corner

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by local residents about the removal of the gyratory at Mitcham's Corner and use of this as public space. Further responses were made by Sport England to reflect the integration of active design principles. Comments were made by Historic England about reflecting local heritage assets. Comments were also made by local residents about the bias against cars.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

In response to comments received, Amendments have been made as per Historic England’s suggestions. In terms of the comments from Sports England, the reference has not been included because it is not specific to this public realm improvement area these active design principles. The policy area can set ambitions for the public realm improvement but not specific interventions in the transport network, this is the role of the highways authority.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
4a and 4b -- you just hate car drivers. Cars don't drive on the pavements and pedestrians don't walk on the road, so their needs are perfectly well-balanced already, thank you	201233 (S Williams)

We are keen to see the removal of the gyratory at Mitcham's Corner, for the traffic volumes to be kept to an absolute minimum and for as much promotion of walking and cycling as possible. There is great potential for this to become an excellent public space. The ugly gyratory is well beyond its "sell-by-date". Despite the gyratory's existence, there is already a burgeoning community. Removal of more traffic will further encourage this and could provide Cambridge with another place and neighbourhood that it is proud of	201304 (M Bleazard)
Mitchams corner needs a complete redesign, prioritising people over cars, and with as many homes, shops and restaurants etc as possible.	203583 (H Thomas)
The Policy Area lies within Castle and Victora Road, De Freville and the Central Conservation Area. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.	210125 (Historic England)
Sport England encourages the integration of Active Design principles, or alternatively reference to our Active Desing Guidance, to maximise opportunities for physical activity.	209220 (Sport England)

Policy S/PRIA/MR: Mill Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support for the policy from local residents, although concern was raised about bias against cars in the policy wording. Comments were raised about needing more bus routes. A comment suggested plans for pedestrianisation should go further. It was stated that there is no mention of trees, nature or greenery, and that more sustainable drainage and more green public space is needed. Historic England highlighted the importance of considering local heritage assets. Kings College considered the policy repeated other policy requirements.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Amendments have been included to address representations from Historic England and local residents about heritage assets. It is the role of highways authority and wider transport strategy to manage bus routes. It is an important role of the local plan to support active travel. Point 3c of the policy has been added to reflect greening and sustainable urban drainage. The Transformation Project is noted, however it is not appropriate to include this in the policy wording. The principles of improving the public realm and the high street are reflected in the policy wording.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Support for the policy.	200981 (M Lucas-Smith), 201279 (F Samuel), 205267 (A Williams), 205466 (P Lythgoe)
Concerns raised about bias against cars in the policy wording.	201234 (S Williams)
Plans for pedestrianisation of Mill Road needs to go further.	201279 (F Samuel), 203808 A Chan)
Safety of pavements is an issue so support the policy.	201715 (K Mak)
A new public use should be found for the Old Library.	202824 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 205327 (J Preston)
Need to specifically mention preservation or enhancement of the Conservation Area.	205327 (J Preston)
Parts of the Policy Area lies within the Mill Road, Newtown and Glisson Road and Kite Conservation Areas. It includes part of the Mill Road Cemetery – a grade II Registered Park and Garden as well as the Cambridge City Branch Library and Gas Lamp both listed at grade II. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area. The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more	210126 (Historic England)

reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy. The Policy should make more reference the role of heritage in the re-vitalisation of retail areas. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit	
The policy should give guidance on securing a new public use for the Old Library.	202824 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
We would also comment as follows on the supporting information. It is not clear why the site plan differs from that in Policy S/C/OPM. The third paragraph is entirely unnecessary as Design and Access Statements are a requirement of the Councils' planning application validation requirements.	208243 (Kings College)

Policy S/PRIA/OPML: Old Press/Mill Lane

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made about the bias against car ownership.

Comments were made by Historic England, Cambridge Past, Present and Future, and a local resident to highlight the heritage assets in the policy. Historic England set out that a HIA is required. Further responses were made by Cambridge Past, Present and Future to raise concerns about point 1d allowing the demolition of potential heritage assets. Comments were made by Kings College critiquing the duplication of policy between S/C/OPML and raised concerns about the masterplan.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the Mers raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- This site is a Central Cambridge location and therefore in a sustainable location with public transport and active travel connections, and it is therefore the strategy to reduce car parking in this location to reduce congestion.
- In response to Kings College, point 1 of the policy has been revised to align with the site allocation and not the masterplan and design and access statements have been removed from the supporting text. The other policy criterion have been retained to shape any other future development coming forward on this site.
- The policy wording has been amended to reflect the heritage assets on and offsite including the Grade I Listed Leper Church.
- In response to concerns about demolition arising from point 1d, the assessment of the planning balance at the planning application stage will determine whether the value of retaining the building outweighs the delivery of open space.
- A HIA has not been completed for this site because it is a policy area.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concerns raised about bias against cars in the policy wording.	201225 (S Williams)
Concerns raised about traffic and configuration of the roads around Mitcham's Corner.	201304 (M Bleazard), 203583 (H Thomas)
Concerns raised about Listed buildings and Buildings of local interest not shown.	205361 (J Preston)
There are a number of designated heritage assets within the site boundary including part of the Central Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings including Cambridge University Centre, The Mill Public House, The Mill The Mill Bridge and Paved Surround, Mill Haven - West House and Mill Haven - East House, Cambridge University Press (Pitt Press), Telephone Kiosks, 1 Mill Lane, House Adjoining Number 74 on The North, 74 Trumpington Street, 8-11 Little St Marys Lane, Number 1 Little St Marys Lane including gas lamp and Emmanuel Church all listed at grade II. The site is adjacent to other listed buildings including Little St Mary's Church (grade II*), Pembroke College and Pembroke College Chapel both listed at grade I, St Botolph's Church also listed at grade I as well as numerous grade II listed buildings. This is a highly sensitive location in terms of heritage. Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. There does not appear to be a Heritage Impact Assessment for this site. An HIA should be completed. The recommendations of the HIA should be included in the policy wording. We welcome criterion 1 a and 1 c, but these should be expanded to better reference the historic environment.	210127 (Historic England)

The respondent supports the policy but raises a concern regarding a non-listed building of heritage value on the eastern side of the Mill Pond, which is significant to the area's historical context. The respondent opposes the potential demolition of the building by its owner for the creation of open space, advocating for its repurposing instead. While the respondent supports the wording of policies 1a and 1b, they express concern that policy 1d could be interpreted to justify the demolition of the mill building. The respondent requests that the conflict within the policies regarding the potential demolition of the mill building be resolved.	202840 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
The College would suggest that this policy is combined with S/C/OPM as there is both repetition and inconsistency between the two policies. It is not clear why this policy requires accordance with the 2018 Masterplan, when Policy (S/C/OPM), which is more fundamentally concerned with the redevelopment of the area not just the public realm, doesn't. The first sentence of the policy should therefore be deleted. Despite being concerned with public realm, this policy strays into more detailed design aspects which are covered in the redevelopment policy – consequently limbs a) b) and c) should be deleted from this policy.	208242 (Kings College)
We would also comment as follows on the supporting information. It is not clear why the site plan differs from that in Policy S/C/OPM. The third paragraph is entirely unnecessary as Design and Access Statements are a requirement of the Councils' planning application validation requirements.	208243 (Kings College)

Summaries of Representations: Sites Edge of Cambridge

Edge of Cambridge Introduction

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group offered general support for the allocations approach. One comment supported the plan in that it did not allocate land at the west fields.

Most comments made on this chapter introduction focused on alternative sites being suggested for allocation. Comments supporting their allocation included issues around strategy choices, and the relative sustainability of the edge of Cambridge supporting green belt release.

One comment raises concern about the amount of development proposed. Historic England requested further consideration of building heights, particularly at North East Cambridge. Mixed comments were received about the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. One comment considered growth was not sufficient. Another comment sought greater protection for the surrounding area. One comment challenged the approach to the Cambridge South East transport scheme.

Response to main issues raised in representations:

Comments are noted, including those which supported the draft plan's approach. Comments proposing alternative sites, and providing information on alternative sites, have been assessed through the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. Strategy choices have also been considered through wider evidence, including the Sustainability Appraisal, and document why it is not considered that exceptional circumstances exist to release additional land beyond that proposed for Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Land adjoining the campus outside the proposed development remains within the green belt. The South East Transport shame is the subject of a Transport and Works Act application, where a public inquiry will consider comments received.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
We support these policies to encourage vibrant and active communities with access to green spaces.	202845 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
While I support the ambition to plan positively for Cambridge's future, I am deeply concerned that, without stronger protections, the city's growth could come at the expense of the very rural landscapes and communities that make this region so special.	209245 (D Hepworth)
Building Heights We have some ongoing concerns regarding the densities and heights on some of the edge of Cambridge sites. Development at very high densities/heights has the potential to impact on the overall	208929 (Historic England)

setting of this historic city. We appreciate that there will inevitably be a trade-off between height versus further urban expansion. We have particular concerns about heights in north-east Cambridge and remain so about impacts on views from Ditton Meadows and the Conservation Areas, as well as wider views approaching the City from the north-east and east.	
Cambridge South East Transport Scheme No need to pursue this route and destroy the landscape at such an astronomic cost when a perfectly good alternative has been proposed by Better Ways for Busways along the A1307 corridor from the A11 to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. This could be done in sections to avoid disruption, much of the route already has bus lanes in place and the cost is a fraction of that proposed by the route across green belt which would ruin good agricultural land. The Gog Magog Hills have been included as a priority for enhancing green infrastructure and will be negatively impacted by CSET and therefore I strongly oppose this ill thought through strategy.	207646 (J Coppendale)
Green Belt Object, as set out extensively in our response to Policy S/GB, when there is a need to allocate so many more housing sites, the blunt application of Green Belt to any consideration of further allocation on the edge of Cambridge, which is shown to be one of the most sustainable locations for growth in the GCLP evidence base, is at best illogical. These representations are accompanied by the submission of the following land parcels for allocation in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan: 1) Southern extension to Peterhouse College (A southern expansion to previously released Green Belt sites GB3/GB4) (HEELA Site ID 200790); 2) An easterly expansion to	209699, 209700 (CEG Land Promotions)

the previously released Green Belt site GB1 (HEELA Site ID 40058b); and 3) Southern extension to Employment site E/3 (HEELA Site ID 200795).	
Cambridge Biomedical Campus With Life Sciences identified as the greatest area of growth, why is the area around the Cambridge Biomedical Campus restricted to that proposed in Policy S/CBC Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) Figure 60. Releasing more Green Belt will meet all of the strategic priorities as set down in the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan.	200995 (P Wheeler)
Cambridge Biomedical Campus The area covering the campus should be extended to protect the area on the opposite side of the railway which provides a green pathway for flora and fauna extending from Trumpington Meadows via Trumpington Community Orchard Clay Farm Community Garden and Hobson Park and onward to Nine Wells. This area is also important for Wellbeing and social inclusion.	201016 (C Wright)
West Fields, Cambridge Pleased site has not been included in the sites for development because it is vital that the Green Belt around the City is maintained for future generations, despite our great need for more affordable housing.	201466 (S Smalley)
Land South of Shelford Road, Fulbourn (referenced as site 51610 / 115137 in the HELAA) Evidence submitted to address HELAA issues. Fulbourn's sustainable location warrants new site allocations due to its access to services, employment opportunities, and transport links. The site will provide improved green spaces accessible to all, supporting the aim for allocations on the edge of Cambridge.	205005 (Miller Homes)

Land at South West Cambridge (Site Ref. 52643) The promoted development providing a mix of uses including between 2,500 and 2,800 dwellings, supporting facilities, GI network and landscaping.	205161, 206827 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)
Land adjacent to A1303 and M11 at Rectory Farm Would make an ideal edge allocation for residential or commercial development. The Madingley Park and Ride site located between Eddington and West Cambridge is becoming increasingly under pressure. Site could serve as a Travel Hub that either alleviates pressure on Madingley P&R or replace it entirely, thus allowing the existing Madingley P&R site (a highly sustainable, brownfield site) to be freed up and used to accommodate much needed housing or employment growth at Eddington or West Cambridge.	206091, 206098 (Wimpole Associates Ltd)
Land East of Gazelle Way, Cherry Hinton Objects, fails to inset site from the Green Belt and does not propose allocation of the site for development. Allocate it for a residential-led mixed-use urban extension to the City to provide approximately 1,500 new homes, employment space, new Country Park and associated community and other infrastructure.	209756 (Endurance Estates)
Land at Fen Ditton (HELAA Ref. 47647 and HELAA Ref. 200770) As a medium-scale site, it can be brought forward without reliance on the provision of significant strategic infrastructure, unlike many of the larger allocations within the Plan. This is particularly relevant given the Plan's own acknowledgement, at paragraph 2.79, that delivery of its vision is dependent on infrastructure provision by a range of external partners, including water supply, waste water treatment, and transport bodies, over which the Councils have limited control.	210226 (Vistry Group)

The College has previously submitted a number of sites as part of the Local Plan. • Land South of Adams Road, Land south of Wilbraham Road, no longer need to be allocated as they are developed • Land north of Madingley Road, Cambridge (HELAA: 40393) is within the built-up area of the city and therefore is not reliant on an allocation to establish the principle of its redevelopment. • A number of other sites are promoted at Great Shelford, Girton, and Coton, are all considered suitable for allocation.	211065 (St.Johns College)

Policy S/CE: Cambridge East

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comment that capacity testing shows the Cambridge East site can accommodate more than the stated ~8 000 dwellings, noting in particular public transport connectivity provided by the proposed station near the site.

Comments were made regarding the proposed uses at the site, including support for and comments regarding the proposal for cultural infrastructure at this site, including proposals for a concert hall and other uses such as a lifelong learning centre; recommendations to include emergency services buildings on site within the policy. Requests for greater flexibility were made by the landowner with regard to specialist housing.

Limited comments raised concern regarding design, heritage and townscape impacts, including concerns regarding proposed architectural style, and impacts on local heritage assets including those arising from the potential height and massing of the proposed development. Comments from Historic England asked that that policy be strengthened to provide greater protection for heritage assets. The landowner requested less prescriptive policy wording relating to heritage assets.

A limited number of comments supported the approach to green spaces including for the green corridor. On the other hand, comments suggested that the development at Cambridge Airport will not protect Green Belt purposes in this area. The landowner

requested less prescriptive supporting text wording regarding potential future changes to the green corridor. The National Trust asked for further engagement to explore connections to the Wicken Fen Vision proposal.

A large number of comments raised concerns about transport impacts, including many concerned that the proposed low car approach was not realistic. The landowner supported the proposed monitor and manage approach to transport included in the policy for addressing Comments were raised that the site needed to review its transport strategy to account for the proposed new station at Cambridge East.

Comments raised concern that greater priority needs to be given in relation to infrastructure provision at this site including for medical needs, to meet the needs of the wider area. Comments were raised by neighbouring authorities seeking clarification about potential infrastructure impacts of this site on their area.

One comment raised concern regarding the potential socio-economic divide between areas of poverty in East Barnwell and newer developments.

Concern was raised over the availability and deliverability of the site, noting in particular that development is dependent on airport becoming available despite uncertainty around relocation of airport operations.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Comments supporting a higher capacity than that set out in the policy have been considered. The capacity identified in the policy is based on consideration of site size and constraints, testing of a range of densities, and assumptions regarding the mix and land take of different uses. Based on available evidence the housing capacity set out at Draft Plan stage is considered to remain robust.

The housing capacity is expressed as “approximately” to allow for more detailed evidence to refine the eventual figure. A specific figure for office and R&D employment uses is not identified in the policy, to provide flexibility regarding the eventual capacity.

The uses set out in the policy are defined responding to the depth of evidence available. A consistent approach has been taken for strategic sites in this plan, both for meeting specialist housing and gypsy and traveller accommodation needs. The strategy approach to meeting such needs is explained in the Strategy Topic paper and is supported by further evidence. The Councils consider that strategic sites play an essential role in the strategy for meeting such needs. Support for cultural provision is noted. At Proposed Submission stage the requirements for cultural uses, as well as leisure uses, are set more precisely than at Draft Plan stage, as supported by Greater Cambridge Cultural Infrastructure Strategy - Stage 2 (2026) and Draft Greater Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study - Interim Study Findings (2026).

The policy wording seeks to balance protection of local townscape and heritage assets with enabling the significant opportunity that the site presents for sustainably located development. The Proposed Submission policy wording has been amended to reflect this balancing further and has also been amended to respond to further exploration of potential listing of heritage assets on the site, resulting in a more flexible policy that focuses on the listed assets. The reference to “contemporary” design has been removed in response to comments.

The Councils consider that the broad approach to green spaces included in the Draft Plan policy remains robust and retains strong protection for the Green Belt corridor whilst retaining flexibility acknowledging the uncertainty associated with a future master plan. Ahead of Proposed Submission the Councils engaged with all relevant local partners including the National Trust to refine the policy wording regarding off site green infrastructure provision.

The Councils recognise that this is a significant scale of development with likely substantial transport impacts, but also that the site will provide benefits to public and active travel connectivity for the whole of eastern Cambridge. The policy includes strong transport requirements to enable a low car living approach, including design requirements, specified transport schemes, and a trip budget approach enforced through monitoring. A new section has been added to the Plan to address the opportunity provided by Cambridge East station.

The Councils recognise the importance of infrastructure delivery supporting development. The Proposed Submission Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which identifies the infrastructure requirements relevant specifically to Cambridge East, including identifying funding and delivery timings. The key transport infrastructure requirements relevant to the site are identified within the policy itself.

The Councils recognise the potential socio-economic divide between areas of poverty in East Barnwell and newer developments. The allocation seeks to mitigate this by requiring the development to integrate well with surrounding communities, including providing an exemplar approach to movement and transport within and through the site that would benefit existing neighbouring communities. The proposed cultural and leisure uses would also provide benefits to neighbouring communities. Other policies in the Plan require new development to provide benefits to local residents, including Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities.

The position regarding the availability and delivery of the site has changed since the Draft Plan stage. In June 2026 Homes England and The Hill Group announced that they have completed the acquisition of the Cambridge airport site, and that Cambridge Growth Company will work in collaboration with Hill to deliver the site. The announcement includes that Marshall will relocate its operations by mid-2029, and that the partners will have a focus on accelerating housing delivery. This announcement provides

confidence that the site will be available and can be delivered in line with the timings set out in the housing trajectory included in the Proposed Submission Plan.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Vistry and The Quy Estate support the vision and objectives for Cambridge East (EC). Importantly, the delivery of CE would generate wider sustainability and infrastructure benefits that extend beyond the allocation itself. In particular, the proposed public transport, active travel improvements and the concentration of services and facilities would materially enhance the sustainability of surrounding areas, including locations such as Fen Ditton. The proximity of Fen Ditton to CE means that it would be well placed to benefit from, and contribute to, the critical mass of services, employment opportunities and sustainable movement networks introduced through the CE development, further strengthening the case for additional growth in this location.	210232 (Vistry Group)
Capacity Comment that capacity testing shows the Cambridge East site can accommodate more than the stated ~8 000 dwellings, especially with the new railway station and increased commercial floorspace.	(Marshall Group Properties)
CGC is supportive of this policy. CGC would welcome the opportunity to work jointly with GCSP on this allocation and in particular on further work which could support the potential for a higher development capacity than that currently identified in the draft Plan given the potential future transport accessibility and capacity related to the EWR station at Cambridge East. The provision of the station would open the	208939 (Cambridge Growth Company)

opportunity for additional employment and mixed use proposals and also on whether there is the potential for future expansion to the east of the allocation for Cambridge East identified in the draft Plan.	
Marshall strongly supports that the policy requires the delivery of a truly mixed-use development. The specific cultural and community uses identified in the policy should not be listed ahead of a masterplan being developed. The policy should allow for flexibility by removing the specialist housing percentage requirements. For the B2/B8 space requirement, additional wording is added to account for any changes in demand, e.g. “unless up-to-date evidence of need for industrial land suggests otherwise.” Support that the Policy does not specify an exact E(g) floorspace quantum but encourage the supporting documents to be consistent with the Policy to avoid confusion.	211778 (Marshall Group Properties)
Marshall objects strongly to the inclusion within Policy S/CE of the requirement for two sites of 12 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and to Policy H/GT, which assumes the incorporation of sites for Gypsies and Travellers within strategic sites.	211779 (Marshall Group Properties)
Uses Support Create Cambridge in asking that: • delivery of a cultural anchor (venue, arts centre or artist studios) is required in Phase 1 • cultural provision is not deferred to later phases, where it is at risk of non-delivery • Create Cambridge is engaged as an advisor/consultee on plans and proposals for cultural infrastructure as part of new developments Early cultural infrastructure is essential to avoid dormitory development and support identity, cohesion and liveability	202058 (H Chamberlain), 202143 (Cambridge Junction), 202200 (Ms H Tam), 202311 (Cambridge Junction), 202324 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge), 202413 (T Shaw), 202426 (Kettle's

	Yard), 202687 (T Altmann), 202717 (W Townsend), 202785 (S Lee), 202877 (Cambridge Junction), 203030 (The Arts Theatre Cambridge), 203852 (N Yeni), 203872 (University of Cambridge), 205089 (H Paterson), 205336 (N Oakley), 205341 (L Howse), 205402 (A Seiglow), 202388 (J Webber), 202933 (R Tarry), 202971 (T Flinders), 205157 (J Walsh), 205052 (Uni of Cambridge), 204842 (L Matthews), 205013 (Wysing Arts Centre), 203541 (D Lever), 203632 (University of Cambridge), 203484 (L Heap), 203439 (S Ashworth), 203345 (N Ellis),

	202462 (K Jones), 202879, 204172, 202755, 205407 (Cambridge Junction / Create Cambridge), 204402 (New International Ecounter), 204689 (NEUBAU Architects), 204702 (A Girarlis), 205309 (A Carolina)
Support provision of a concert hall, need for a modern hall that could seat 300-500 people. Currently we are restricted to churches (seat 200) or the university concert hall which is expensive and no parking.	203817 (Cambridge Wind Band), 203948 (S Hughes), 204794 (Cambridge Graduate Orchestra)
Concern there are major gaps: Proposals for Cambridge East/Airport need to incorporate *a second urban centre for Cambridge* that is sub-regional at scale. Provision for a new large lifelong learning college *must* be incorporated ideally as part of the Cambridge East site as an anchor institution - along with a music venue that has a capacity substantially larger than the Cambridge Corn Exchange, and capable of hosting top tier acts at an affordable price. Provision for a new city hall for the new council. A country park that has a 'nature bridge' over link to Coldham's Common. Ornate twin towers theme. Cambridge East Station	202360 (A Carpen), 203750 (A Carpen)

Under the subheading ‘Uses’ Section 4 – add a new criterion e. as follows; “e. Provision of a fire & rescue service drop down point & contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities funding”	207475 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207508 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service)
Sport England supports the inclusion of sports provision, including criterion 25(h) which requires the delivery of a sports pavilion (Use Class F2). The scale and type of provision should be informed by an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS), Built Facilities Strategy (BFS) and Facilities Planning Model (FPM) for swimming pools.	209221 (Sport England)
We have reviewed the other site allocations in the emerging Plan. Given our current location and history in the Abbey ward, an appropriate location could be within any major new urban extension at Cambridge East. This draft allocation allows for the provision for a wide range and scale of cultural, leisure, shops and community uses to meet the needs of the wider city and sub-region. The allocation notes that this may include civic uses, a conference centre, concert hall, arts centre or leisure facilities. Although this list would cover a new football stadium, it would be helpful to refer explicitly in the Plan to Cambridge East being a potential appropriate location for a new stadium for Cambridge United.	211873 (Cambridge United Football Club)
Townscape Comment that architectural style should not enable styles that have been built in existing large developments in Cambridge	203750 (A Carpen)
Built form paragraph 8, is not sound because it is neither effective nor fully consistent with national policy. By requiring a “contemporary approach” that "embraces modernity", the policy risks being applied as a presumption in favour of a particular architectural idiom rather than focusing on outcomes.	204638 (Cllr T Bygott)

This ambiguity may exclude high-quality development that delivers coherent streets, perimeter blocks and durable public realm through other approaches. Given the scale and permanence of Cambridge East, the policy should be amended to make clear that design quality is judged on urban form, sustainability and place-making outcomes, not architectural style.	
We have some ongoing concerns regarding the densities and heights on some of the edge of Cambridge sites. Development at very high densities/heights has the potential to impact on the overall setting of this historic city. We appreciate that there will inevitably be a trade-off between height versus further urban expansion. We have particular concerns about heights in north-east Cambridge and remain so about impacts on views from Ditton Meadows and the Conservation Areas, as well as wider views approaching the City from the north-east and east.	208929 (Historic England)
Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of heritage assets on site and nearby, including through development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. Section 5.5 helpfully summarises the key heritage sensitivity and Section 6 makes a number of recommendations. Whilst we broadly welcome criterion 5 – 7, these do not sufficiently reflect the recommendations of the HIA. The HIA recommendations include some strategic landscaping and areas of open space at the north-eastern edge of the site as well as a heritage setting for the airport buildings. These must be included within the policy and the Spatial framework (figure 61). We recommend that you Amend policy and figure 61 to incorporate the HIA recommendations in relation to strategic landscaping, open space to	210128 (Historic England)

northeast of site and heritage setting for airport buildings. Criterion 10 should also refer to the strategic views and Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy. Figure 61 Amend scheduled Ancient Monument to Scheduled Monument (NPPF Preferred terminology) Amend throughout the Plan.	
Marshall does not consider that any other buildings meet listing criteria beyond the listed Control and office building. In relation to the retention of Hangar 1, the draft policy promotes more definitive constraint which Marshall considers to be a level of detail not appropriate for the plan but a matter to be worked through as part of the design development process. Marshall considers that the draft wording should be reviewed to recognise the reality that, whilst the separate character of Teversham must be respected, development at Cambridge East will be visible from the village.	211781 (Marshall Group Properties)
Nature Supports the policy recognition given to biodiversity and green infrastructure issues. The policy represents a good framework to avoid adverse impacts on nearby high-value nature sites and to provide high quality green infrastructure including off-site strategic natural greenspace.	202972 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 202849 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 203209 (G Owell)
Concern that the alignment and width of the Green Belt corridor through Cambridge East should be preserved to maintain its function as a vital green link between Coldham's and Stourbridge Commons and Ditton Meadows.	202849 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

Many people, me included, regard Cambridge Airport as part of the Green Belt. I know you say it isn't that any longer. Cambridge East is going to be greatly degraded when that becomes developed. I have found very few details of how much green space will be left on the airport.	201224 (S Williams)
I think that the broad design of Marshall's Airport is adequate. I like the idea of green corridors spreading out of the city through Marshalls and I hope in the long term this can be supported with proper environmental infrastructure such as wildlife road crossings, or wildlife underpasses for Newmarket or Airport Road, although I recognise the likely prohibitive costs of these at present. I am strongly supportive of a Cambridge East Station.	208722 (Cambridgeshire County Council (Cllr M Morgan))
I don't think what you are going to allow on Cambridge Airport will contribute to 'protecting and enhancing the green corridors which extend into the city'. At least you are going to leave some green space, though. Initially I thought you were going to pave over the whole lot.	201253 (S Williams)
We note that the policy requires provision of a country park beyond the site to connect through to the Wicken Fen Vision area and encourage your authority to engage as soon as possible with the National Trust about this.	207602 (Natural England)
The National Trust strongly support the requirement to provide strategic scale green infrastructure beyond the site to connect Cambridge City Centre to the Wicken Vision area, reducing recreational pressure on designated sites. The policy requires provision of a country park beyond the site to connect to the Wicken Vision area. It is noted that the location, scale and character of this site is yet to be determined. Work needs to be undertaken to establish this, in order that it can be identified in the proposed Submission Plan. It also needs to be clear how and when the country park will be delivered, in order that it is available for use prior to the occupation of new dwellings at Cambridge East. The	211077 (The National Trust)

National Trust would welcome engagement in discussions about green infrastructure delivery and suggest that consideration is given as to whether our site at Northfield Farm could assist with this provision.	
Green Corridor protection is ambiguous and risks incremental erosion of landscape and heritage assets, particularly around Teversham. Townscape, landscape and heritage wording, particularly in relation to Teversham, needs greater precision	201181 (Save Honey Hill Group), 203619 (Horningsea PC)
The specific reference to compensatory widening is not appropriate or necessary and, as drafted in the supporting text, is misleading to the reader that this can be expected in response to instances where the green corridor is narrowed. Compensatory widening references should be removed to ensure the policy is compliant with national policy. Marshall also wishes to question whether it is appropriate that the Green Corridor is designated as Green Belt.	211782 (Marshall Group Properties)
Movement Comments about transport include: • The indicative “trip budget” and “monitor and manage” approach lacks binding limits, clear triggers, and enforceability • Development should be conditional on finding solutions to active transport constraints (including Fen Ditton Road underpass for Marleigh cycle route, widen Coldham’s Lane railway crossing) • Set ambitious mode share targets and secure walking and cycling links early • Trip budget is too high • The site must not promote car trips to the city centre, which is facilitated by restricting access to Barnwell Rd and Newmarket Rd.	201181 (Save Honey Hill Group), 202001 (D Langley), 201236 (S Williams), 202301 (R MacDonald), 202370 (C B), 202643 (A Lawrence), 203654 (V Ashton), 203695 (T Preud'homme), 203814 (A Chan), 204570 (D Potts),

• You are promoting a low car use approach -- that is not what residents want • People do not want to park their cars at off-site car barns as you suggest • People will NOT avoid using cars and Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane will be absolute nightmares at rush hour • All homes need easy (walking) access to shops and jobs, and wider recreation • Ensure the layout is friendly to bus route planning, with rights of way access to bus stops, direct bus routing, utilise bus gates • Policy wording must be sufficiently robust to ensure any transport infrastructure which is critical to accommodating sustainable growth in this location is secured and adequately planned for. Concern that there could be potential impacts within East Cambridgeshire. • Need improved links to Addenbrookes and along Barnwell Rd to access secondary schools and station. • I would like to highlight the importance of walking and cycling connectivity across Marshall's to Marleigh and Teversham. I think that it should be thought that any benefits of Marshall's redevelopment can be shared with Teversham. How an adequate viable bus service to Teversham is provided should be considered as part of the transport design for Marleigh.	204593 (R Hoadley), 204659 (East Cambridgeshire DC), 205156 (J Grantham), 205391 (A Williams), 205406 (N Saad), 205436 (S Nuttall), 205343 (R de Beaux) 202849 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 208723 (Cambridgeshire County Council (Cllr M Morgan))
CCC Active Travel Strategy 'wheeling' refers to travel using a wheelchair, mobility scooter, pushing a pushchair etc. rather than cycling.	210527 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
The existing transport strategy needs to be reviewed in light of the recent announcement of a station within the site as part of EWR and the proposed provision of an eastern access to Cambridge station, both of which have the possibility to significantly impact the operation of the site in transport terms.	210580 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Broadly supportive of this policy framework in relation to transport as it reflects its own ambitions and complements the transport strategies that we have developed. The proposed monitor and manage	211784 (Marshall Group Properties)

approach means that infrastructure delivery uncertainty can be managed and should not serve as a hinderance to Cambridge East moving forward. Supports the principle of an evidence driven approach to deriving a trip budget but clear that this does not need to be prescribed by the policy. The Policy should recognise that the extant trip making from the site can be used to support a first phase of development.	
The current capacity of the trip budget has been identified at approximately 1,500 trips in the AM peak and 1,800 trips in the PM peak. This level of trips is understood to have been tested with the regional model and is considered to be able to be accommodated within the local road network, including the local SRN junctions. National Highways would require as part of the local plan process to understand the impact of this development and the cumulative impact on the A14 junction 34 prior to agreeing the trip budget and agreement of appropriate mitigation measures should the trip budget not be met.	209008 (National Highways)
EWR Co is now considering including a new Cambridge East station within its plans for EWR. At this stage, the design of this station is still in its early, feasibility phase. EWR Co is aware of challenges around the site and will continue to explore how this opportunity could be realised to support economic and housing growth in the area. If third-party funding is not secured, the station will be removed from EWR Co's plans. The Councils' full support for a new station at Cambridge East is also welcomed, with EWR Co agreeing that this would provide a 'step change in public transport connectivity' for the Cambridge East development site and eastern Cambridge more widely. EWR Co recommends that land required for Cambridge East station is included in Policy S/CE: Cambridge East, rather than the AMC, as the new station is closely related to the former, with which it will need to be closely integrated with and will help to unlock. EWR Co would welcome consideration by	211885, 211904(East West Rail Company)

the Councils as to how to maximise the density of development of the Cambridge East site and amendments to Policy S/CE to achieve this, given the benefits in terms of sustainable travel that a new EWR Cambridge East station would bring.	
Given that the Station now has the same status as a station at Cambourne upon which a new community is being planned as part of the Local Plan, Marshall considers that the Policy should sensitively reflect the opportunity.	211785 (Marshall Group Properties)
Proposed trip budget risks normalising high levels of car use rather than driving mode shift. The framing of the trip budget also lacks spatial context. Trips into the city are extremely problematic, and must be discouraged. General vehicle access to Barnwell Road should therefore be removed as well as the numerous site accesses onto Newmarket Road. Plan underestimates the level of investment required in the surrounding active travel network. ● Review car trip budgets and introduce binding walking, cycling and public transport mode share targets ● Make delivery of key active travel links a planning condition and phasing trigger, supported by a co-delivery plan between the councils, highways authority and developers, including pooled funding where necessary. ● Explore and understand the need for connectivity across Coldham's Common with financial safeguarding to deliver a bridge from the Cambridge Retail Park to Coldham's Common.	211768 (Camcycle)
Aviation safeguarding, noise, and height constraints are insufficiently defined, creating uncertainty and risk of abortive development	201181 (Save Honey Hill Group), 203619 (Horningsea PC)

It is unclear how access to medical facilities will be provided; Addenbrookes A and E cannot cope, also dentists.	202370 (C B)
There should be greater priority for infrastructure to support the significant growth in east Cambridge. It has long suffered in comparison to most other parts of Greater Cambridge.	203785 (T Panter), 209123, 209124, 209125, 209126, 209127, 209128, 209129, 209130, 209131, 209132, 209133 (R Patel)
The overall level of growth planned for Greater Cambridge and two planned developments (Policy S/GF: Land Adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm and Policy S/CE Cambridge East) are expected to impact upon West Suffolk given its proximity and the functioning of the surrounding towns of Newmarket and Haverhill. This will require collaborative working with West Suffolk and a full assessment through the preparation of the local plan evidence base.	204788 (West Suffolk Council)
Concern exist regarding the potential socio-economic divide between areas of poverty in East Barnwell and newer developments. There are reported anti-social behaviour issues in the new Marleigh development. The overstretching of NHS primary care services in the area is a major concern.	205406 (N Saad)
Marshall would welcome the opportunity to explore further what parameter plans would be required and the level of detail that these are expected to contain. The policy should make reference to viability and the unique circumstances that exist on the site.	211783 (Marshall Group Properties)
The concept plan is not representative of a masterplan for the site and so it should not be assumed that features on the concept plan are fixed. The concept plan and policy wording should be clear what is	211780 (Marshall Group Properties)

already consented and what it proposed. The red line should also be adjusted to include the green corridor.	
Concern over the availability and deliverability of the site: • The policy contains multiple interdependent risks relating to airport operations, transport capacity, green corridor protection, water/flooding, and safeguarding and development is pendant on airport becoming available despite uncertainty around relocation of airport operations • Comprehensive development of the airport site is dependent on a change in airport status, meaning the entire site is available for development. Uncertainty regarding relocation of the airport function must be resolved. • Questions whether the assumptions in the GCLP for Cambridge East are realistic given recent announcements that Marshalls has cancelled its planned move from Cambridge Airport to Cranfield. Note Marshall still aims to vacate site by 2030, predicated on identifying and relocating to a new premises. • The site at Cambridge East comprises land at Cambridge Airport that was safeguarded from the previous plan, which was also identified as a growth area as part of the Cambridge Local Plan (2003). Noting the significant amount of time that this allocation has been identified within previous Local Plans, we raise significant concerns over the delivery of this site within the timescales anticipated, particularly noting larger sites by their very nature can take longer to be delivered. • Marshall announced in October 2025 that the business will not be moving to Cranfield but that the company is still committed to moving its aerospace business from its Cambridge Airport base by 2030 (with development anticipated to start in 2032). Notwithstanding this aspiration, there is still no certainty that the airport will move within these predicted timescales, particularly given that an alternative site to relocate to has not yet been secured. As a result, development at Cambridge East could be significantly delayed which could result in limited or no housing delivery for a number of years, particularly within the first 15 years of the plan period.	201181 (Save Honey Hill Group), 203619 (Horningsea PC), 205234 (K Brightwell), 203340 (A Hoare), 202891 (J Williams), 202515 (H Brown), 209969 (Granta Land Ltd), 211042, 211055 (Wates Developments (and Landowners)), 211592 (Places for People)

There is a risk of overstating housing delivery by conflating consented schemes with contingent, policy-dependent capacity. The final Plan should include a clear phase-by-phase deliverability table identifying which homes are deliverable in the near term and which are contingent on airport availability, major infrastructure and other prerequisites	201181 (Save Honey Hill Group), 203619 (Horningsea PC)
Whilst CE is not reliant on the relocation of the CWWTP like NEC is, it is essential that the Local Plan does not rely disproportionately on CE to meet housing delivery requirements within the early and middle stages of the plan period. Medium-scale, well located sites such as Fen Ditton are capable of coming forward without reliance on strategic infrastructure and can therefore play a critical role in supporting the housing trajectory and ensuring delivery against the plan's timescales.	210233 (Vistry Group)
Land at South West Cambridge (Site Ref. 52643) Promotion of additional site on the edge of Cambridge at land at South West Cambridge (Site Ref. 52643)	205161 (Carter Jonas on behalf of North Barton Road Landowners Group)
Land East of Gazelle Way, Cherry Hinton Endurance Estates strongly objects to the proposed policy map for Cambridge on the basis that it fails to inset Land East of Gazelle Way, Cherry Hinton, from the Green Belt and does not propose allocation of the site for development.	209756 (Endurance Estates)
I think some development on Lakes, like in the Netherlands, such as close to the proposed Cambridge East Station, should be considered.	208723 (Cambridgeshire County Council (Cllr M Morgan))

Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd, Pemberton Family and Pemberton Family Trusts, Cambridgeshire County Council and Prologis and Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust all referenced the importance of the campus for UK life science sector, and the global significance of the site. They offered general support for the local plan approach, but also areas where they sought change. There was a general support for the need for a site wide masterplan. Flexibility was a theme in the comments, in terms of use classes and phasing, to ensure the area could be adaptable to future needs of the sectors present.

Opportunities within the Strategic Enhancement Area and the Landscape Improvement Area, but a desire for the policy not to be too prescriptive. Housing delivered on the Campus should primarily serve Cambridge University Hospital / NHS campus workers including medical students, but acknowledgement was also sought that market and build to rent maty be needed to make delivery viable, and the policy should also allow dwellings a spart of the expansion land. The goals of the transport requirements were supported, but plan should be flexible on how they are achieved. The ambition for an east-west street was supported, however, it is essential that the policy recognises that its delivery is likely to occur at a later stage in the overall development programme. CUH focused on the importance of their being an infrastructure delivery plan.

The University of Cambridge also highlighted the need for a more coordinated approach to infrastructure for the site.

Cambridge Growth Company supported the policy and the allocation for expansion through release of land from the Green Belt for future phases to support the future development of the Biomedical Campus.

Great Shelford PC, Great Shelford Village Charity, and Stapleford & Gt Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group expressed concern about the scale of development, and there needed to be consideration of the cumulative impacts on landscape and ecology.

A number of comments reference the need for a site wide masterplan. There was also support for additional health provision, including a new acute hospital.

Some developers promoting other developments highlighted that their sites could complement the CBC proposals.

Comments objected the green belt release in principle, questioning whether the need had been properly demonstrated, or the impacts properly understood, including on the green belt. A number of these comments included conditions that should be required if land is released, such as firm requirement for a new acute hospital, a focus on uses that need to be located there, and enforcement of transport issues.

Impacts on ecology and wildlife were raised, by Bedfordshire Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust, and Cambridge Past Present and Future, and John Meed who has presented extensive information on farm land birds. Hobsons Conduit Trust

refence the importance of nine wells. They highlight the need for extensive mitigation. Historic England require consideration of heritage and landscape when considering building height and form, and the need for development to be linked with mitigation.

A number of comments focused on the impact of CBC on adjoining communities. Many reports were included of issues arising from parking and antisocial behaviour impacting adjoining areas. Proposals must include mitigating for the failures of previous growth.

A lot of comments highlighted transport concerns and suggested interventions. Personal experiences of accessing the site were highlighted. Cambridge South East Transport Scheme received a number of specific objections, siting alternative transport measures which could be applied.

Comments objected to a new vehicle access into CBC from Granham's Road, saying that there were better ways bus access could be achieved. There were concerns that it would simply move or worsen traffic problems

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Support from a range of stakeholders for the policy approach is, noted, but also local concern on a range of environmental issues.

The Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) identified that the area adjoining Babraham Road and north of Granham's Road would have 'high' harm to Cambridge Green Belt Purposes, and the area beyond would have 'very high harm'. However, there are exceptional circumstances to justify release of land from the Green Belt. This site is only one of a number of life science sites in the Cambridge cluster, it offers the unique benefit of siting commercial research directly with the hospital. The Greater Cambridge Growth Sectors Study identifies that some businesses need to be in close proximity to clinical research. Submissions by the

Campus on ‘the Power of Proximity’ and the ‘CBC Economic Impact Study’ also provide evidence regarding those benefits. The expansion provides the opportunity to provide new facilities to enhance the site, but also support enhancement of the existing campus. The Written Ministerial Statement of 8 May 2024 emphasised the importance of the site.

A wide range of stakeholders emphasised the importance of a site wide masterplan, and infrastructure and amenity planning, to ensure the full benefits of the site are achieved and the impacts are mitigated. The local plan policy includes this requirement. This will also be of key interest to those living near to the campus who sited many concerns about impacts of living near to the site. Mitigation must include improvements to the surrounding area, and the approach to public realm and landscape has now been refined. Given the scale and long term construction of the Campus, placemaking is fundamental to achieving high quality and comments from local and neighbouring communities regarding community safety, and poor design is noted. A Place Book approach has been introduced to mitigate the impact of new development, and require policy to prepare design codes to respond positively to placemaking requirements. Policy reflects that a Masterplan is fundamental to delivering phases 3 and 4 of the Campus.

The Strategic Enhancement Area and Landscape Improvement Area wording has been amended to respond to request for clarity of what these areas may provide, including reference to habitats, farmland birds and other sensitive ecology. The policy has also been amended to clarify the importance of the key strategic views at Nine Wells LNR and the heritage asset at White Hill Farm, and other important green spaces such as the Magog Down and the Pocket Park. The importance of natural and ecological features is noted, and the policy includes reference to the Hobson Conduit Trust legal agreement for the chalk stream.

The spatial framework has been amended to make clearer the green edge and Local Nature Reserve colours. The landscape buffer to the south has been amended to show clearer boundary treatment. Other changes have been made to reflect comments on the key.

Many comments from the Campus owners and stakeholders sought flexibility in the policy, but is also important that the plan sets clear policy in terms of mitigation and infrastructure expectations, in order that a world class campus is achieved, and impacts on the wider area are addressed.

Transport infrastructure is going to be key to addressing future needs of the site. The opening of the Cambridge South Station is a huge step forward, but other infrastructure will be needed to support future growth, including enhanced South East Cambridge Transport. The realigned Granham's Road entrance is also considered necessary to serve the expanded campus. Concerns raised about the modal filter of Dame Mary Archer Way, have been noted and reference is now made to measures that need to be implemented to manage traffic across the Campus.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd • CBC Ltd works with landowners and local government / organisations to drive and inform how the Campus should evolve so that it both maintains and further builds upon its success. The UK	203327, 211012, 211013, 211014, 211626, 211627, 211628, 211629, 211630,

life science sector has grown significantly in recent years, with Cambridge playing a fundamental role in this. • Overall, CBC Ltd agrees with much that has been included in the draft Local Plan concerning the Campus. CBC Ltd's primary concern for the draft Local Plan is to ensure that the leading international importance of the Campus as a location for life science excellence is protected, enhanced and, importantly, not diluted. For the Campus to retain its leading reputation, it must be vibrant, desirable and offer best in class facilities to attract talent and key life science businesses. • CBC Ltd seeks a masterplan led policy approach that will provide clarity concerning the timing / trigger for its production, as well as a properly defined context and framework. The policy approach proposes clear triggers and parameters which would require a whole Campus masterplan include. The need for an IDP is also linked to the proposed Campus masterplan triggers. • Given the proximity of the Strategic Enhancement Area to the Campus and significant opportunity for place shaping and contribution to the Campus it offers, works on this land should take place before any works on the land within the Landscape Improvement Area take place. • Any housing delivered on the Campus should primarily serve Cambridge University Hospital / NHS campus workers including medical students. • Applications for other uses should need to provide an amenity strategy. • Need to secure developer funding to improve public space. • Other detailed amendments are proposed.	211631, 211632, 211633, 211634, 211635, 211636, 211637, 211638, 211639, 211640, 211641, 211642, 211643, 211644 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus)
Pemberton Family and Pemberton Family Trusts Support the overall approach to the policy but object to two parts (Part 7 and Part 17d) where the Pemberton Family requires a detailed amendment to the policy to ensure the effective use of land and to ensure a sound allocation that involves the release of Green Belt land. • Strong support to the overall policy and the continued recognition by the emerging Local Plan of the important role of CBC and its future growth	205286, 210481,210482, 211294, 211295, 211296, 211297,211298, 211299, 211300, 211301, 211302, 211303, 211304, 211305,

• object to the policy requirements for the LIA. policy should allow for flexibility in design and not limit the use of the entire area for linear or drainage features. • SEA should specific requirements for landscape buffers, green infrastructure protection, flood risk mitigation, and the use of Green Belt land to enhance biodiversity. • Policy, Spatial Framework and the Proposals Map all need to align and be consistent and accurate in how they represent the land and allocation. Important that all Local Plan plans or diagrams that present the site graphically show and designate these two areas (LIA and SEA) separately. • The term “future phase” should be replaced with “expansion” to avoid the potential inference that the development of the expansion land should only occur after the existing Campus has been regenerated. • Including an explicit reference to “life sciences” to ensure the full scope of work undertaken at the Campus is accurately reflected. This proposed amendment aligns with the uses outlined in paragraph 2 of the draft policy. Additionally, the suggested references to “an innovation hub” and “visitor accommodation” are important to highlight, given the significant benefits these elements will bring to the Campus and its wider community. • Describing CBC as ‘globally significant’ is an accurate reflection of its international standing. The unique mix of uses at the Campus make it a world-leading centre of research, development, and medical application. • Support the identification of land to the south of the Campus for green infrastructure enhancements, including open space and biodiversity. It may be difficult to achieve the necessary net gain in biodiversity and all amenity provision within the Campus’ expanded boundary. This may change, however, and if it does become possible, then the clear direction in legislation and policy is for those benefits to be provided onsite so far as possible. • Provision of higher education uses within the Campus is a key component of its offer and success.	211306, 211307, 211308, 211309, 211310, 211313, 211315, 211317, 211319, 211321, 211323 211325, 211327, 211329, 211331, 211333, 211335, 211337, 211338, 211340, 211341, 211343, 211345, 211347, 211349, 211351, 211353, 211355, 211357, 211359, 211361, 211363, 211365, 211367, 211369, 211371, 211373, 211375, 211377, 211379, 211381, 211383, 211385, 211387, 211389, 211391, 211393, 211395, (Pemberton Family and Pemberton Family Trusts)

• Paragraph 8(e), which states a floorspace figure for research and development and healthcare uses only (excluding higher education, leisure, hotels, and other supporting uses), be deleted and additional text be included at paragraph 8(b). • A reference to use classes is not necessary and may unduly limit the scope of potential uses. Flexibility is particularly important given the evolving nature of life sciences research, which is increasingly associated with AI and data-driven methodologies. As a result, there may be a shift from traditional wet lab facilities to dry lab environments. • Requirement for a Framework Amenity Strategy for the Campus is supported. However, we do not agree with describing the Campus as a “24-hour” community. • A well-designed masterplan for the Campus should intentionally promote interaction between people who live, work, and visit there. • The majority of housing delivered on the Campus will be located within the existing boundaries and will be provided by CUH to meet the needs of CUH and wider NHS campus staff. However, there is also an aspiration to enable the delivery of build-to-rent homes for Campus workers within the expansion land. • The policy wording should recognise that the proposals will bring about a substantial amount of change, and that some of these changes may adversely affect views or heritage assets. It is essential that the policy recognises that land optimisation will sometimes require development forms, scales, or configurations that do not enable the enhancement of all existing views into or across the site. • Recognise that in certain circumstances, proposals for demolition may deliver benefits that outweigh the carbon savings associated with retaining the existing building. • Support the ambition for an east-west street; however, it is essential that the policy recognises that its delivery is likely to occur at a later stage in the overall development programme • Policy should be flexible regarding for Transport strategy and trip budget, it should be sufficient for the policy to set out the ambition not exactly how it will be achieved at this stage. • Healthcare uses may not be suitable and viable for all water use, energy etc aspirations.	

• The benefit that a campus-wide masterplan can play in ensuring the best possible outcomes is understood and appreciated. The LCG has prepared a draft Spatial Framework supported by robust assessment and evidence. We support the requirement to be the output of a planning application rather than something that should necessarily precede one. • Acknowledge GCSP's desire to include a spatial framework (figure 63) but we are concerned that may appear more prescriptive/precise than the stage of the process we are at • Future strategies should apply to the area covered by the application. While coordination across the wider campus is encouraged where possible, it is unlikely that existing management strategies can be revised. • The policy is not contingent on identifying a single delivery body, nor should it be interpreted as such. • Proposals may need to come forward on an expedited timeframe. The draft policy should not prejudice this happening but be flexible enough to accommodate them in an appropriate way that does not prejudice the rest of the masterplan being built out in accordance with its terms. • A number of other detailed points are made and changes proposed. .	
Cambridgeshire County Council and Prologis Pleased to submit representations in support of the draft Local Plan, and in particular Policy S/CBC. Detailed wording changes are suggested. • Describing CBC as 'globally significant' is an accurate reflection of its international standing. The unique mix of uses at the Campus make it a world-leading centre of research, development, and medical application. The policy rightly recognises this position and sets an appropriately defined context for expansion of the Campus. • We recommend including an explicit reference to "life sciences" to ensure the full scope of work undertaken at the Campus is accurately reflected.	209136 209137, 209138, 209139, 209140, 209141, 209142, 209143, 209144, 209145, 209146, 209147, 209148, 209149, 209150) 211314, 211316 211318, 211320, 211322, 211324, 211326, 211328, 211320,

• The term “future phase” should be replaced with “expansion” to avoid the potential inference that the development of the expansion land should only occur after the existing Campus has been regenerated. • support the identification of land to the south of the Campus for green infrastructure enhancements, including open space and biodiversity. • The provision of higher education uses within the Campus is a key component of its offer and success. • Provide clarity on what floorspace figures are referring to in terms of uses, and that they are indicative. Also need flexibility between use classes given the evolving nature of life sciences research • Do not agree with describing the Campus as a “24-hour” community. While the hospitals operate around the clock, these activities do not generate a night-time economy • The term “comprehensive” should be deleted from Para 10 as it could be misinterpreted as implying a level of detail that is not intended at this stage. • A well-designed masterplan for the Campus should intentionally promote interaction between people who live, work, and visit there. • The majority of housing delivered on the Campus will be located within the existing boundaries and will be provided by CUH to meet the needs of CUH and wider NHS campus staff. However, there is also an aspiration to enable the delivery of build-to-rent homes for Campus workers within the expansion land.	211332, 222334, 211336, 211339, 211342, 311344, 211346, 211348, 211350, 211352, 211354, 211356, 211358, 211360, 211362, 211364, 211366, 211368, 211370, 211372, 211374, 211376, 211378, 211380, 211382, 211384, 211386, 211388, 211390, 211392, 211394, 211396, 211398, 211400, 211402, 211404 (Cambridgeshire County Council and Prologis)
CUH strongly supports the overall vision for CBC. • We recommend including an explicit reference to “life sciences” to ensure the full scope of work undertaken at the Campus is accurately reflected. CBC as globally significant is an accurate reflection of its international standing. The unique mix of uses at the Campus make it a world-leading centre of research, development, and medical application. A reference to use classes is not necessary and may unduly limit the scope of potential uses.	208764, 209276, 209277, 209278, 209279, 209280, 209281, 209282, 209286, 209289, 209290, 209291, 209292. 211788, 211789,

• The term “future phase” should be replaced with “expansion” to avoid the potential inference that the development of the expansion land should only occur after the existing Campus has been regenerated. • CUH supports the identification of land to the south of the Campus for green infrastructure enhancements, including open space and biodiversity. Our primary objective would be to ensure that the expansion land and associated enhancement land, provides an opportunity for enhanced recreational access for our staff, patients and visitors. • The provision of higher education uses within the Campus is a key component of its offer and success • The scale of development at the Campus should be determined by physical and infrastructure constraints such as building heights, the trip budget, and land availability. These constraints require further assessment, and current work does not support a defined minimum or maximum. • It is essential that the scale of new healthcare buildings be determined by the specific operational requirements of the Trust, the model of care to be delivered, and the clinical and spatial standards that apply at the time of design. • We are making the case for significant renewal of our wider hospital estate, and a case is being put forward to Government for funding to develop the business case for a new Acute Hospital. • We enjoy excellent partnership working across healthcare, academic and commercial research partners on campus, which should be encouraged. • LCG’s evidence base submitted to GCSP identifies an opportunity to deliver approximately 1,000 additional homes on the Campus. The Expansion Landowners are therefore very supportive of this element of the draft policy. However, we propose an amendment to increase the indicative number of units to allow greater flexibility for additional homes to be delivered on the expansion land. • CUH support the objective that the majority of housing delivered on the Campus will be located within the existing boundaries and will be provided by CUH to meet the needs of CUH and wider	211790, 211791, 211792, 211793, 211794, 211795, 211796, 211797. 211798, 211799, 211800, 211801, 211802, 211803, 211804, 211805, 211806, 211807, 211808, 211809, 211810, 211811, 211812, 211813, 211814, 211815, 211816, 211817, 211818, 211819, 211820, 211821, 211822, 211823, 211824, 211825, 211826, 211827, 211828, 211829, 211830, 211831, 211832, 211833, 211834, 211835, 211836, 211837, 211838, 211839, 211840, 211841, 211842, 211843, (Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust)

NHS campus staff. In order for staff housing to be viable, an element of market housing or build to rent may be necessary. • Requirement for a Framework Amenity Strategy for the Campus is supported. However, we do not agree with describing the Campus as a “24-hour” community. • The policy wording should recognise that the proposals will bring about a substantial amount of change, and that some of these changes may adversely affect views or heritage assets. It is essential that the policy recognises that land optimisation will sometimes require development forms, scales, or configurations that do not enable the enhancement of all existing views into or across the site. • Consider giving greater clarity on the respective roles of the SEA and LIA such that the balance between such objectives as biodiversity enhancement, recreational access, access and movement corridors, landscape buffering/screening and impact on views can be assessed in the round. • Policy should be flexible regarding for Transport strategy and trip budget, it should be sufficient for the policy to set out the ambition not exactly how it will be achieved at this stage. Patient parking is a priority for CUH. • The LCG remain committed to the long term ambition to deliver the east-west link, or High Street, as a public transport and active travel corridor. It is essential that the policy recognises that its delivery is likely to occur at a later stage in the overall development. • Healthcare uses may not be suitable and viable for all water use, energy etc aspirations. • We support the need for a campus-wide Framework Masterplan. • CUH encourage a focus on establishing the approach to Infrastructure Delivery to ensure the ambitions for the campus, and the expectations of each landowner / area of the masterplan are clearly defined. • Othe detailed wording changes are suggested.	

The University of Cambridge supports the policy in the Local Plan that promotes the expansion and enhancement of the Biomedical Campus, recognising its national and international significance for education and research in life sciences. The Vision and Objectives of the policy are endorsed, aiming to establish the campus as a leading centre for medical research and health science in Europe. While generally supportive of the allocation and wording, the University has provided detailed comments in an attached document to clarify aspects of the policy in alignment with other landowners. Concerns are raised regarding the 'Lifespan' section of the policy, particularly about the lack of clarity on phasing and delivery of expansion proposals. The Development Strategy indicates that development is contingent on appropriate infrastructure being in place to support the campus's needs, which the University believes requires a more coordinated approach. The University advocates for a detailed masterplan that includes infrastructure and delivery timing to ensure all developments align with the broader vision of the plan. The University expresses willingness to collaborate with partners and the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service to address these concerns and contribute to the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.	204736 (University of Cambridge)
The Biomedical Campus is encroaching on the Green Belt south of Cambridge, and the proposed CSET busway will further impact this area. These must be considered together. Both the Biomedical Campus and the busway will have significant harmful effects on the Green Belt, with concerns about the cumulative impact on the surrounding countryside, regardless of landscaping efforts. While the proposal for a Landscape Improvement Area is welcomed, previous plans under Policy CSF/5 have not been implemented, raising doubts about future improvements. Clear plans and guaranteed funding for landscape improvements must be established before granting planning permission for any	204687 (Great Shelford PC)

development. Proposals for public access should align with the recommendations in the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan. There must be a firm and irrevocable commitment against any further development in the Green Belt should the construction of the busway proceed.	
• The respondent expresses broad support for Policy S/CBC clauses 14, 17, and 18, emphasising the need for new developments to integrate sensitively with surrounding areas and retain key views, particularly from strategic viewpoints like Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and Magog Down. • Concerned about the cumulative impact of building height and density on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, suggesting that it may create a 'concrete wall' that detracts from the landscape, particularly from high points on the Gog Magog Hills. This 'wall' could be broken up by fingers of vegetation penetrating into and through the southern fringe. • The respondent calls for greater specificity in Policy S/CBC 14a regarding transitions in height, scale, and landscaping, arguing that current guidelines may inadvertently support taller buildings that negatively impact long-distance views. • There is a concern that the lack of height restrictions in Policy S/CBC clause 16c may lead to increasingly taller buildings that overshadow City views, public spaces and the greenbelt, suggesting that medium-mature trees should be included in planting plans to mitigate the raw edge of the development. • Support is expressed for the vegetated landscape buffer proposed in Policy S/CBC clause 17d, with a recommendation to expand the Strategic Enhancement Area southwards to Magog Down to enhance nature and landscape character. • The respondent believes that improved landscaping policies from the 2008 Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan should be incorporated into the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan to ensure community and environmental benefits are preserved.	202085 (Great Shelford Village Charity)

• The respondent argues for limited private car access on the new road and supports alternative transport solutions that would improve connectivity within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, such as an on-road CSET route coupled with upgrades to existing roads.	
The respondent expresses broad support for Policy S/CBC clauses 14, 17, and 18, emphasising the need for new developments to integrate sensitively with surrounding areas and retain key views, particularly from strategic viewpoints like Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and Magog Down. Concerns are raised about the cumulative impact of building height and density on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, suggesting that it may create a 'concrete wall' that detracts from the landscape, particularly from high points on the Gog Magog Hills. This 'wall' could be broken up by fingers of vegetation penetrating into and through the southern fringe. The respondent calls for greater specificity in Policy S/CBC 14a regarding transitions in height, scale, and landscaping, arguing that current guidelines may inadvertently support taller buildings that negatively impact long-distance views. There is a concern that the lack of height restrictions in Policy S/CBC clause 16c may lead to increasingly taller buildings that overshadow City views, public spaces and the greenbelt, suggesting that medium-mature trees should be included in planting plans to mitigate the raw edge of the development. Support is expressed for the vegetated landscape buffer proposed in Policy S/CBC clause 17d, with a recommendation to expand the Strategic Enhancement Area southwards to Magog Down to enhance nature and landscape character.	201552 (J Flynn, Chair, Stapleford & Gt Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group)

Improved landscaping policies from the 2008 Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan should be incorporated into the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan to ensure community and environmental benefits are preserved. The respondent argues for limited private car access on the new road and supports alternative transport solutions that would improve connectivity within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, such as an on-road CSET route coupled with upgrades to existing roads.	
I am unable to find details of the Strategic Enhancement Area S/SEA/CBC which is referred to in 17d of Policy S/CBC.	201829 (F Goodwille)
We are disappointed that Site 40509 remains unallocated, which we consider unreasonable and inconsistent with the Local Plan's aims. HELAA review highlights clear discrepancies in site assessments. Compared to Site OS276, an allocated Green Belt site, Site 40509 performs significantly better, receiving five Green ratings and no Red ratings, whereas OS276 receives two Reds and only two Greens. Excluding Site 40509 on Green Belt grounds while allocating a less sustainable site is unjustified and demonstrates inconsistency in assessment and site selection, undermining the equitable application of the Local Plan's criteria.	204428 (Waterbeach Instruments Ltd)
Strong support is given to this policy. Cambridge Biomedical Campus is a globally significant hub of research and innovation that has led to tangible improvements to human health and wellbeing. Its expansion and regeneration deserves full support. The potential for Cambridge South to complement and support the expansion of CBC has long been evident, with housing delivered on Cambridge South intended to support the evolution of the Campus and to meet the needs of its diverse workforce. Whilst the two sites are now being promoted separately, that intrinsic relationship between the two sites remains obvious.	208216 (Pigeon Land and LIH)

CGC supports this policy and the allocation for expansion through release of land from the Green Belt for future phases to support the future development of the Biomedical Campus. The strategic importance of CBC has been stated in the Written Ministerial Statement 8th May 2024, including support for the accelerated delivery of any associated housing development and the provision of appropriate levels of affordable housing to meet the housing needs of those working at the campus. CGC recommends that further consideration is given to the boundary of this allocation in relation to the proposed access. The access as shown on the Spatial Framework plan figure 63 appears not to be deliverable due to the consented scheme to the north of Babraham Road. Therefore, an alternative redline for the proposal allocation should be considered to allow for alternative access arrangements.	203914, 208940 (Cambridge Growth Company)
This section needs to give priority to measures that will improve the mental as well as physical health of people. See the research in Neuroarchitecture and note how the existing building style ***increases levels of mental stress in the brain*** - achieving the opposite of what hospitals and health facilities are meant to do. The Frank Lee Centre should be made public and *massively expanded* to become a leisure centre. Provision for a new lifelong learning centre is essential.	203762 (A Carpen)
Provision for keyworker housing near the Cambridge Biomedical Campus should be made given the additional hospital construction happening. The distances staff have to travel involves crossing county boundaries for too many. This could be a requirement for developments at any existing or proposed railway stations, and possibly light rail stops should such a system get built.	203828 (A Carpen)
Urgent need for a masterplan prior to further development Need for a direct link in this policy between jobs and housing availability to ensure they come forward together.	202847 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)

EWR Co supports the principle of the development and expansion of the Campus, as it aligns with EWR Co's objective to facilitate economic growth within the Oxford–Cambridge Growth Corridor. EWR will contribute to the Councils' vision for the Campus.	211898 (East West Rail Company)
Support the expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, recognising its importance to healthcare and science. Concerns are raised about the safety and wellbeing of staff commuting to the site, highlighting current commuting experiences as lengthy and potentially dangerous. Many staff cannot work from home and must travel to campus, necessitating improvements in convenience and safety. Many staff cannot afford to live in Cambridge, limiting their commuting options to car. Improvements in parking and bus services are essential to accommodate the growth of the campus. The frequency of the guided bus service should be increased, particularly during peak times. A shuttle bus from Cambridge Train Station to the hospital is suggested to alleviate capacity issues on the guided bus for those travelling to St Ives.	201173 (A-J Denman)
The biomedical campus is a good location for as much development as possible. I has a new station, a number of bus routes and jobs and amenities. As much development as possible, as dense as possible should take place. If anything, it should go further than what the plan currently proposes.	203616 (H Thomas)
My 14-year ecological study shows that the fields adjoining the Biomedical Campus hold remarkable populations of farmland wildlife. Encroachment of CBC has already had an impact on threatened species and S/CBC will further increase the pressures. While the proposed mitigation is an improvement over the first proposals in 2021 there will be tensions in the way the mitigation fields may be managed. To help conserve threatened farmland species I recommend a combination of enhanced arable land with some grassland and wildflower plots secured under long-term agreements, with	202585 (J Meed) (206306, 206307, 206308 206309, 206310, 206311, 210870, 210871, 210872 210873, 210874, 210875, 210876, 210877, 210878,

species-specific conditions for farmland birds including appropriate management and annual monitoring.	210879, 210880, 210881, 210882, 210883, 210884, 210885)
Object, CPPF acknowledges the importance of the site and supports the release of Green Belt land for clinical and research investment but opposes further boundary expansion in future Local Plan reviews. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD, adopted in April 2025, should be referenced in supporting documents. An updated master plan is necessary to identify redevelopment opportunities and strategic landscaping to mitigate impacts on the landscape. Policy needs to require the masterplan to be updated. Consider restricting development to those uses where it is essential to be onsite. Amend policy to direct housing development to sites not needed for biomedical purposes. Heavily scrutinise and sensitivity-test forecasts for modal shares for transport to/from the CBC. Test all routes onto and through the Campus for adequate capacity for all modes, recognising that there will be large cohorts of people walking and cycling to and from Cambridge South station. Revisit the options for providing bus priority between the Babraham P&R and the Biomedical Campus to also accommodate buses arriving on the A1307 from Haverhill via the Babraham Research Park.	202862 (Cambridge Past Present and Future)
CPPF is concerned that residential development may encroach on land needed for biomedical purposes, advocating for housing only on unsuitable land. High-rise residential developments should be located in areas appropriate for such buildings, and housing should be limited to key worker accommodation. Policy needs to require the masterplan to be updated. Consider restricting development to those uses where it is essential to be onsite.	209295 (Cambridge Past Present and Future)

CPPF suggests a different approach to development and green space on the south-east boundary to enhance outcomes for nature and people, referencing the Wildlife Trust BCN. Mitigation strategies for new habitats should consider the needs of red-listed farmland birds and may require off-site nature-friendly farming.	209296 (Cambridge Past Present and Future)
The Wildlife Trust supports point 14(b) of the policy and the principles in bullet 17(c). The Wildlife Trust fully supports effective buffering of both LNRs at Nine Wells and Beechwoods. The fields immediately to the east of Nine Wells are also essential to buffer this site and protect the chalk springs. The Biomedical Campus is known as a hotspot for farmland birds. The proposed landscape enhancement and accessible greenspace provision will not provide suitable compensation for the loss of farmland bird population. These will need off-site areas of nature friendly arable farming with a secure long-term future and not typical greenspaces. The policy doesn't adequately provide for this. We are extremely concerned overall that the proposed landscape buffer is the wrong solution in the wrong place in terms of delivering nature recovery and ecological enhancement in line with the Cambridge Nature Network and the Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Opportunity Mapping. It fails to deliver the strategic natural greenspace that the City requires and demonstrates a lack of long-term vision to deliver the Cambridge Nature Network. A corridor from Beechwoods LNR to Nine Wells LNR around the edge of the Babraham Park & Ride site is not the right solution.	202995 Bedfordshire Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust)
Wildlife Trust believes that now is the time for a comprehensive approach to long-term planning for development on the south-east edge of Cambridge to create a one-off targeted Green Belt release in appropriate locations and to deliver a regionally significant sub regional greenspace of 500 Ha in size", comprising a large accessible area of chalk downland and associated habitats from Cherry Hinton to	202998 Bedfordshire Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust)

Beechwoods and Wandlebury, and on towards Magog Down. Targeted release of green belt land in more than one location will facilitate the land assembly required to deliver the strategic green infrastructure in the best location	
Nine Wells remains the principal source of spring water feeding into our chalk stream system, and so it is axiomatic that the Trust is directly concerned with the health of the springs and the curation of Nine Wells LNR. The Trust have legal agreements with developers at CBC to cover surface water arriving into the Brook. Parameters have been established for flow rates of run off and many interventions have been successfully including at Clay Farm and CBC. We believe that these legal agreements should be recognised in S/CBC. It should be explicit the importance of water quality and natural habitats.	209014 (Hobsons Conduit Trust)

Other comments from stakeholders

There are no designated heritage assets however there is a scheduled monument known site revealed by aerial photography west of White Hill Farm. There is also a grade II listed monument at Nine Wells with inscriptions including Thomas Hobson, of Hobsons Conduit. There are also important views of the edge of the city from the higher land to the south and in particular from heritage assets including the scheduled monuments of Little Trees Hill (on Magog Down) and Wandlebury. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome 14c, 16c.and 16d and 28. 14c should also specifically mention the scheduled monument west of White Hill Farm as well as the listed monument at Nine Wells. The policy should include the need for a Conservation Management Plan of the heritage assets in the Landscape Enhancement Area including their ongoing maintenance. Criterion 16 should be amended to reference	210129 (Historic England)

the need to scale down heights towards the edge of the development as recommended in the HIA. However, we have some serious on-going concerns about heights and the softening of the edge of the City as well as landscape enhancements in the wider area. Landscape Enhancement Areas have been part of the previous Local Plan and yet there has been little change to the wider setting of the city in this broad area. It is imperative that future development of the Addenbrookes site is linked to positive offside mitigation to help enhance the setting of the City and indeed views from heritage assets along the southern hills. This aspect of the Plan, and the link between development and mitigation must be strengthened to ensure that it is implement. This issue applies not only in relation to Addenbrookes but to other Landscape Enhancement Areas in the Plan.	
Unless the Strategic Enhancement Areas start to deliver a softening of the landscape e.g. around Addenbrookes, we will have ongoing concerns about heights of development in the proposed CBC extension to the south of Addenbrookes.	208930 (Historic England)
A new purpose-built ambulance hub is required for Cambridge and the surrounding areas, ideally in the area of green belt south of the Cambridge Biomedical campus. The right infrastructure would include 1 ha of land to build the ambulance hub with close access to nearby main roads. The new ambulance hub would be designed to enable expansion to allow for population growth for the next 30 years. A new Ambulance Hub would cost around £20-£22m (including land purchase, EV charging infrastructure requirements).	210320 (East England Ambulance Service NHS Trust)
Site area includes a safeguarded Waste Management Area for the partially implemented EIC as shown on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) Policies Map. Developers should be made aware that the partial implementation of this EIC involved the construction	210604, 210611 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

of underground tunnels; and this should be considered in any design. It is requested that supporting text to this effect is included in the Plan for this allocation. we welcome that nature is included within the policy for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital), particularly the need to 'improving ecological links between Nine Wells LNR and GoG Magog Hills' and the allocation of 'Non-development areas adjacent to Cambridge Biomedical Campus Strategic Enhancement Area' (S/SEA/CBC)	
Anglian Water welcomes the policy requirements set out within the Resources section of these policies, which sets out important measures including innovative approaches to water management on site, including SuDS, water reuse and solutions to address flood risk, and sewage disposal.	210192 (Anglian Water)

Comments Related to Garnham's Road Access

Object to proposed new vehicle access into CBC from Granham's Road • Not be needed if the suggested alternative for a busway spur off the A1307 Hinton Way roundabout was adopted, because this would connect all the CBC with Cambridge South Station (CSET fails to achieve this) and it would significantly reduce traffic volumes near Addenbrooke's / Babraham Road /Hills Road and provide emergency vehicles a direct blue light route into Addenbrooke's. • A link from Granham's road into CBC would exacerbate congestion at junction with the A1301 High Green (at the Coop) and the queuing at the level crossing. • The Better Ways for Busways' alternative for a busway, as cheaper, faster to achieve and far, far less damaging to our environment and respectful of the Wandlebury landscape	202085 (Great Shelford Village Charity) 201552 (J Flynn, Chair, Stapleford & Gt Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) 202664 (A Gannon) 202639 (S Newman) 204955 (O Arthurs) 207657 (K Foreman)

• Proposed route doesn't seem to take into account the destinations which travellers wish to access, i.e. Cambridge South Station, all part of CBC, proximity to Babraham P&R Previous plan committed not to build south of Granhams road • To facilitate the alternative CSET route, we support upgrades to Francis Crick Avenue and Dame Mary Archer Way, as per clause 20b • Granham's Road. This is across farmland, from a notoriously poorly maintained and difficult road • Proposed entrance to the expanded Cambridge Biomedical Campus from Granhams Road may worsen traffic and should restrict private vehicle access • It may shift traffic congestion to A1301/Granhams Rd junction and Graham's Rd level crossing rather than alleviate it, and questioning the necessity of the road given that CSET is intended to reduce traffic volumes.	208406 (M Cooper) 209023 (Hobsons Conduit Trust) 202664 (A Gannon) 202626 (I Smith) 203156 (J Jasiewicz) 204979 (C Arthurs) 203081 (T Lane) 205650 (A Sykes) 203189 (V Morgan) 204457 (N Pond) 208557 (J Robinson) 203100 (C Schofield) 204979 (C Arthurs) 203102 (N Campbell) 204107 (A Baker)
PC would like to raise concerns about the extra traffic that will be using Granhams Road as the relief road joins with it because his is a fast signal track road. Would also like to highlight the importance of Nine Wells as an environmental site for rare chalk streams. Figure 64 shows the area being both sides of Granhams Road (this is land being released from Greenbelt) but maybe some of this is to retain a green area.	202535: 205585: 205586 205587, 205588,205589 (Little Shelford Parish Council)

Object, why continue to pursue an access into CBC from Babraham Road at Granhams. This will increase congestion. It is too close to Addenbrookes and will require a roundabout or lights. The access should be near the Babraham Road roundabout where there is more space to allow a better flow of traffic into the CBC. The policy rightly emphasises the importance of the Gog Magog Hills, yet it has deemed approval of an ill-considered busway which will visually dominate the most attractive landscape close to Cambridge and seriously harm the Green Belt throughout its route. It is a tragic situation. The busway route is hugely flawed. Seven thousand residents have objected and how can the County deem approval at the same time as stating that it harms the Green Belt and is inappropriate development. Although the GCP have spent ten years considering CSET, the approved busway route should be abandoned. For years those who use the 1307 know that forming a good access into the CBC near to the Babraham Road roundabout would be the most effective solution allowing both bus and car access.	204119 (B Reeve)
The Transport Strategy needs thorough scrutiny, particularly regarding the realism of mode-shares for train and bus transport. The technical note on Granham's Road realignment lacks clarity on tested options, and some claims about integration benefits require further examination. Consideration should be given to bus services from the A1307, with potential advantages from a continuous inbound bus lane or separate busway.	209297 (Cambridge Past Present and Future)
Granhams Road	208744 (Trumpington residents Association)

Unless the CBC Landowners devise and implement a robust contemporary solution to ensure that the CBC's private roads are only used by authorized users – and no-one else – the proposal to realign Granham's must be a non-starter.	

Comments raising transport issues

Connectivity between the Biomedical Campus and West Cambridge is required. The Plan must identify and secure key off-site active travel improvements. On-site walking and cycling improvements should not be delayed further.	205245 (K Brightwell) 204600 (D Potts) 202516 (H Brown) 205163 (J Grantham) 205410 (A Williams) 207542 (R De Beauz) 202306 (R Macdonald)
Expansion of the Biomedical Campus is understandable given its regional and national importance. However, the Local Plan does not yet set out a sufficiently robust spatial strategy to accompany this growth. While Cambridge South station will significantly improve access, it primarily resolves an existing deficiency rather than enabling the scale of growth now proposed. Transport cannot be treated as a single intervention. Large-scale employment growth without corresponding housing or genuinely mixed-use development risks intensifying peak travel demand and increasing pressure on already constrained corridors. At present, the level of mixed-use development proposed around the campus is token. If the objective is to support healthcare, research and education, the Plan must enable	209066, 211771 (Camcycle)

people to live close to where they work. The policy should: ● Require genuinely mixed-use development at a meaningful scale within and adjacent to the Biomedical Campus, including high-density housing with low car ownership, to reduce the need for long-distance commuting ● Avoid token residential provision and explicitly link employment growth to housing delivery in a walking or cycling distance to the campus If land is released around the Biomedical Campus, the Plan should not embed physical and spatial constraints that prevent homes being built close to the campus. The Plan identifies cycle connections over the railway but does not acknowledge that these are already major failure points as well as a fragmented on-site network. The busway bridge requires significant intervention, either through cantilevered widening or a parallel structure, if it is to support the level of cycling demand associated with further Campus expansion. Connectivity between the Biomedical Campus and West Cambridge is critical if growth in these two areas is to be successful. This is discussed further in the following section. The policy should: ● Ensure that boundary treatments associated with Green Belt release do not create long-term physical or spatial barriers to movement, future connections or neighbouring communities ● Identify the active travel connections over the railway line as critical infrastructure and explicitly acknowledge the need for improvement ● Secure firm commitments to upgrade the key walking and cycling corridors serving the campus,	

including Trumpington Road, Long Road and the busway path with delivery tied to development phasing.	
With such a significant expansion proposed, including green space provision, I question whether it is wise to try and fit everything on this one site. It will be the size of a town, but it lacks the transport infrastructure to cope properly. For staff, visitors and patients (for some of whom this hospital is not local) it would make more sense to consider another location outside Cambridge. There is only such much that can be built here.	201197 (B Nicolson)
Priority access by bus from the Park&Ride/South Cambs along a new road would be very welcome. It would be great if the Plan and accompanying Transport Strategy brought about 20 minute journeys by any mode between Eddington/West Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus.	203213, 205600 (S Hughes)
The Biomedical Campus has a policy of preferring public transport over private car use. But Stagecoach can't match this, leaving people often waiting 30 minutes or more for a bus to the station and centre from 17:00 to 17:30. I leave my desk at 17:01, arrive at the bus terminus at 17:10, and then wait. And wait. Buses to the station and centre should be every 5 minutes. The RTPI needs to be reliable (currently broken again!) If I miss 18:00 connecting bus, I have a 30 minute wait for the next to Bar Hill.	201041 (P Spowart)
I work at Cambridge Research Park, can see it from the edge of the village but inaccessible by bike. How did they get permission for a site with no safe cycle accessibility.	202641 (C Amos)
Growth of the biomedical campus can only be sustainably achieved if: More housing is planned along it, with <1 parking space per housing provision; boundary treatments associated with the green belt does not hamper active travel movement in the future - more emphasis is put on active travel connections over the railway, in particular a widening of the busway bridge or new path parallel to it clear	203732 (T Preud'homme)

commitments made to upgrade the key walking and cycling corridors serving the campus, including Trumpington Road, Long Road and the busway path with delivery tied to development phasing.	
(1) The Babraham Road Park and Ride is placed too close to the city centre. Regardless of whether the new busway gets built, the P&R should be further out with dedicated bus lanes between the P&R and Addenbrookes. That way cars have an incentive to use the P&R (skip the traffic) rather than driving all the way in. (2) I would urge the council to consider adding a bus stop on the busway bridge across South Station, making the transfer between buses and trains seamless	203826 (A Chan)
Support plans to improve bus access to Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) and links between the Babraham Park&Ride and CBC.	203239 Cambridge Area Bus Users)

Comments focused on the Cambridge South East Transport Scheme

I wish to comment against the proposed CSET bus route across green belt bordering the Gog Magog Hills which is due to cost 160 million pounds at current estimates. There is no need to pursue this route and destroy the landscape at such an astronomic cost when a perfectly good alternative has been proposed by Better Ways for Busways along the A1307 corridor from the A11 to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. This could be done in sections to avoid disruption, much of the route already has bus lanes in place and the cost is a fraction of that proposed by the route across green belt which would ruin good agricultural land. The Gog Magog Hills have been included as a priority for enhancing green infrastructure and will be negatively impacted by CSET and therefore I strongly oppose this ill thought through strategy.	207646 (J Coppendale)

Object, CSET plan encroaches onto Green Belt land and does is not proposed to lie within the public transport corridor. The proposed Busway will urbanise the rural countryside of south east Cambridgeshire. The Gog Magog Hills will be negatively impacted, when this was a priority for enhanced strategic green infrastructure. The Gog Magog Hills have not been afforded the value and protection required when considering the environmental impacts of the proposed route of the CSET Busway. Construction of the proposed Busway is expensive, when a cheaper alternative is available.	205468 (J Macpherson)
Don't like the CSET plan to concrete over the fields to produce a busway to take commuters from Abington to Addenbrookes (bypassing the local villages). I believe buses should run down the existing roads and bus lanes should be added to existing roads. Nine Wells should be protected, along with the DNA path. Buses should run into the town centre not terminating at Addenbrookes. Train station, car parks at Foxton and Whittlesford need to be enhanced to run commuters to Cambridge stations such as Cambridge South. The CSET's destruction of Cambridge greenbelt is simply wrong, expensive and shameful.	207522 (C Ayling)
BC is continuing to expand along the A1307 and the alternative in road bus lane would include a new spur road that emergency vehicles could use to access A&E more quickly, potentially saving lives. CBC already has a new transport access for travellers coming from the South on the West side of the site with Cambridge South Station. So why build CSET that enters in the same location? Accessing the Eastern end of the site via the bus road provides a different alternative for anyone travelling from the Southeast, such as Linton and Haverhill where housing is less expensive and many of CBC's key employees live. Please do not approve the scheme as proposed by GCP.	208139 (M Harper)

Comments opposed to Green Belt Release

GSPC is opposed to any further expansion of CBC. CBC needs to focus on healthcare and R&D first and foremost, not commercial activities. • CBC should have a mix of uses ‘ together clinical care, clinical education and clinical research including medical research institutes which meet local, regional, and national health care needs – together with directly related biomedical and biotechnology research and development activities’. The Policy does not reflect the unique nature of the site. Policy should restrict uses to those that need the relevant proximity. • The need for the new acute hospital is not recognised either in the draft Plan or in this policy. Without the new acute hospital, we would suggest that the Local Plan is not viable. Policy also does not respond to various health care needs identified in the CBC demand report. Sufficient land is available within existing campus to meet healthcare needs. • The case for expansion has not been established because the underlying data used overestimate potential demand, by failing to identify and focus on those businesses which need to be co-located with anchor institutions, such as Addenbrooke’s and the LMB. • The case for the removal of further land from the Green Belt for expansion has not been made. The underlying data and plans for CBC submitted by landowners and Vision 2050 itself have not been subject to public consultation. Estimates of demand on which the draft Local Plan relies are fundamentally flawed. • Green Belt assessment misinterpreted, the site will cause very high harm to the green belt. • Gas main and landscape impact may limit granhams road realignment potential. Could realign and still leave land undeveloped around it or swap for phase 3 land near nine wells. Realignment may also simply shift pressure to A1301. Private car access should be limited. Question whether this multi-modal access road is needed at all if the Better Ways for Busways’ alternative for a	210897, 210898, 210899, 210900, 210901, 210902, 210903, 211934, 211935, 211936, 211937, 211938, 211939, 211940, 211941, 211942, 211943, 211944, 211945, 211946, 211947, 211948, 211949, 211950, 211951, 211952, 211953, 211954, 211955, 211956, 211957, 211958, 211959, 211960, 211961, 211962, 211963, 211964, 211965, 211966, 211967, 211968, 211969, 211970, 211971, 211972, 211973, 211974 (Great Shelford Parish Council)

busway spur off the A1307 Hinton Way roundabout was adopted. Proper enforcement of driving prohibition should be precondition. • We support the proposals for a single integrated campus-wide masterplan for CBC and for the use of a single delivery body capable of managing the delivery of infrastructure and securing the long-term stewardship of shared facilities and public spaces. Should also be an energy masterplan. • There has been no programme of landowner engagement with the community. • We are concerned that the cumulative breadth, density and height of building on CBC will increasingly present a 'concrete wall' on the southern approach into Cambridge. Greater specificity should be given to the phrase "appropriate transitions in height, scale and landscaping". We are concerned that a lack of building height restriction. • Policy needs to reference protection of nine wells. Affordable housing should be ahead of other development. • we would like to see the Strategic Enhancement Area expanded: additional benefits to nature and landscape character would accrue if the Strategic Enhancement Area extended further south, along the SW side of Babraham Rd (i.e. that part of Babraham Rd which falls between Hinton Way and Haverhill Rd) all the way to Magog Down. Local Landscape policies have not been sufficiently responded to. If, despite our opposition, the proposed release is included in the final Local Plan: • It must be conditional on funds for the building of the new acute hospital being secured and building of the Cancer Research and Children's hospitals; • It must be conditional on a solution to the continuing failure to enforce the prohibitions in The City of Cambridge Area G (Consolidation) Order 1993 (as amended) as they apply to the roads within CBC. The proposed southern access road from Granhams Road should not be multi-modal. Private cars should not be permitted to use it.	

• Recognise CBC's unique and limited purpose - consideration should be given to including occupation use restrictions. Amenities should also be limited to those which need to be there. • Insufficient regard is paid in to the impact of CBC on the shrinking Green Belt that separates Cambridge from its necklace villages and on the neighbouring fragile Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. Tall buildings are a particular issue, and we oppose a prominent entrance from Granhams Road.	
1. Object, I am opposed to any further expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus ("CBC"). CBC needs to focus on healthcare and R&D first and foremost, not commercial activities. 2. The rebuilding of the acute hospital is crucial not only to the achievement of CBC's unique purpose, but also to the viability of the draft Local Plan. The healthcare needs of the current and growing population cannot be met without it, especially as the average age of that population is increasing. The need for the new acute hospital is not recognised either in the draft Plan or in this policy. 3. The case for expansion has not been established because the underlying data used overestimate potential demand, by failing to identify and focus on those businesses which need to be co-located with anchor institutions, such as Addenbrooke's and the LMB. This is a fundamental flaw. "Cambridge Biomedical Campus Vision 2050: Creating a life sciences quarter for Cambridge" ("Vision 2050") is not fit for purpose. Despite this, it underpins the supporting evidence submitted by landowners, which has been relied on by GCPS. In particular, the current plans propose disproportionately to expand the commercial activities at CBC. 4. As a result, the case for the removal of further land from the Green Belt for expansion has not been made out. This is compounded by a failure to recognise accurately the level of harm this removal will cause.	203820 (A Sykes)

5. The underlying data and plans for CBC submitted by landowners and Vision 2050 itself have not been subject to public consultation, yet the proposals in this policy (such as for 687,000 net additional sq m (GIA) of research and development floorspace (use class E(g)(ii)) specifically related to biomedical and biotechnology uses and clinical healthcare and hospital facilities) are derived from the relevant documents. 6. If, despite our opposition, the proposed release is included in the final Local Plan: (a) it must be conditional on funds for the building of the new acute hospital being secured and consideration should also be given to making it conditional on the building of the Cancer Research and Children's hospitals, each of which also appears important to the continuing success of CBC. (b) it must also be conditional on a solution to the continuing failure to enforce the prohibitions in The City of Cambridge Area G (Consolidation) Order 1993 (as amended) as they apply to the roads within CBC. Further, the proposed southern access road from Granhams Road should not be multi-modal. Private cars should not be permitted to use it. (c) the draft policy must properly recognise CBC's unique and limited purpose and consideration should be given to including occupation use restrictions. Amenities should also be limited to those which need to be there. (d) I support the proposals for a single integrated campus-wide masterplan for CBC and for the use of a single delivery body capable of managing the delivery of infrastructure and securing the long-term stewardship of shared facilities and public spaces.	
Object, the fields south of the CBC are a flood risk. Careful consideration needed: BIG collection ponds need to be in place close to Ninewells if this is to go ahead. Where are the workers for the new research	203790 (S Marelli)

institutes going to live? The housing market in Cambridge is saturated. More buildings will only mean more heat. Protect trees. There is currently no availability of shops at walking distance, a car is needed for everything.	
The loss of this green space for the community is psychological as well as physical - the sense of space when walking in these fields, when viewing the landscape from Addenbrookes bridge, Hobsons park, Nine Wells Nature Reserve and the DNA path. The proposed new buildings will close these spaces in, disconnecting us from the wider landscape of which we are currently part. The proposal is damaging and poorly considered, for both local people and nature.	203643 (H Donoghue)
Object to the loss of Green Belt for the proposed construction of 1,000 new homes at CBC, on the following grounds: i) The Employment & Housing Topic Paper Table 5.7 shows no need for additional office/R & D floorspace, above committed development, including 4 new schemes of 229,000 sq.m. Therefore, the loss of 22 hectares of Green Belt at CBC is not justified for office/R & D floorspace. ii) The need to redevelop Addenbrookes Hospital can be carried out on the existing site. proposed 1,000 homes is not justified under existing Green Belt policy as there is no need for homes for new employees at CBC. Legal Obligation/Planning Condition should restrict development to Specialised Housing for NHS/ Research workers on short contracts. The proposed 1,000 homes is not justified under existing Green Belt policy as there is no need for homes for new employees at CBC. The redevelopment of Addenbrookes will not result is major jobs increases requiring new homes. The Needs/Supply assessment Table 5.7 shows there is a surplus of supply.	204722 (R Turnbull) 210487 (R Turnbull)

If housing is considered necessary for CBC workers, a Legal Obligation/Planning Condition should restrict development to Specialised Housing for NHS/ Research workers on short contracts, for up to a one year tenancy, & the number of units reduced to 250 units of Specialised Housing, See Vale of White Horse Inspector's Report, pages 15-18, paragraph 56 onwards, on Issue 3: Exceptional Circumstances for housing at Harwell Campus not justified in AONB. This was due to loss of employment land & no need to housing next to employment land.	
Our opposition to the CBC's yet further expansion into our Green Belt does not result from purblind attachment to preservation of the Green Belt no matter what. It is the result of a rational and concerned view that neither the CBC in its submissions nor the two councils in this Draft Local Plan establish the "exceptional circumstances" which are the only grounds for further release – for the only incursion into the Cambridge edge of the Green Belt proposed in this Plan.	208743 (Trumpington residents Association)

Comments raising impact on adjoining communities

Red Cross Lane needs mitigation for the unintended consequences of the CBC/CUH growth to take off excessive no's never intended for a residential area. • CBC creates an environment conducive to innovation and knowledge creation, as evidenced by Cambridge's high number of patent applications per capita. The CBC serves as a hub for cutting-edge research and development, showcasing the positive economic impact of research funding in driving progress within the biomedical sector. Yet alongside rapid growth there can be unintended negative consequences, these can be felt by the neighbourhoods that the CBC site sits beside and on the established smaller residential areas. • A Neighbourhood Impact Report would be a valuable addition to the understanding of this effect locally, taking forward the" CBC commitment from its Vison 2050 to be a good neighbour.	207052 (207053, 207054, 207055, 207056, 207057, 207058, 207059. 207060, 207061, 207062, 207063, 207064, 207065, 210851, 210852, 210853, 210854, 210855, 210856210857, 210858,

• The disproportionate number of people travelling through the surrounding residential neighbourhood creates negative impacts. Active, continuing involvement with local governance bodies particularly the Greater Cambridge Partnership and Cambridgeshire County Council is needed to mitigate the impacts. Every effort including financial incentives, should be made to facilitate the maximum use of public transport and active travel. • Cambridge Biomedical Campus Vision 2050 rightly praises some of the public transport infrastructure, but has enough consideration been given to increases movement acres campus? Has the increased use of public transport by the surrounding neighbourhood been factored in? • Misuse of residential streets for Cambridge Biomedical Campus parking can be tackled. Misuse of residential streets by Private Hire Vehicle drivers can be tackled. CBC/CUH could support residents parking and double yellow lines so that the local streets are not used as an overspill car park for the campus. • Staffing targets are not being met, CUH have said 40 staff are lost a month due to not being able to offer accommodation. When new staff are recruited and then cannot find appropriate accommodation. Private accommodation is mistaken as being on the CBC/CUH site causing stresses for the area. Government guidelines recommend no more than 10% HMOs is any street/estate to maintain balanced neighbourhoods where there is a mixed tenure and no one need dominates and removes family housing. • Develop the Queen Edith's Employment and Skills Scheme. • Need toilets, taxi ranks, parking for private hire, patient drop off, blue badge spaces, better active travel routes, support for carers. • Recognise need for antisocial behaviour enforcement. Remove smoking sheeter near Red Cross Lane. Supporting residents prior to problems.	210859, 210860, 210861, 210862, 210863, 210864, 210866, 210867, 210868, (Red Cross Area Residents Association)
Red Cross Lane needs mitigation for the unintended consequences of the CBC/CUH growth to take off excessive no's never intended for a residential area. Red Cross Lane access needs closing as does the smoking shelter for safety of the residential area that CBC sits beside. Clearly demarcating boundaries	203294 203295 203296 203297, 210869 203298 (S Blackburn)

to CBC/hospitals site is required – to reduce crime, Anti-Social Behaviours, parking dangers/stress, illegal speeding motorbikes, crashes of emergency vehicles and other issues overspilling onto residential streets 24/7. Transition" on the basis that for a decade all reports have not had any positive impact on reducing the unintended negative impacts of growth. The policy requires development to 14 (a) "Integrate sensitively with adjoining residential neighbourhoods. Replace with new Route 3 to Nightingale Park via bus station path and Hills Road, avoiding Red Cross Lane. Remove existing Route 3 to avoid residential areas Babraham Park & Ride has established cycle routes away from Red Cross Areas built to high spec through Ninewells directly to CBC and Hospitals. This needs utilising to take away unintended negative consequences of CBC growth and over use of small residential areas bringing in crime, anti-social behaviours, traffic, parking stress, noise & pollution. benefits of campus growth for the local Red Cross Areas must include mitigating for the failures of previous growth that led to anti-social behaviour, littering and pavement parking.	
• Para 4 on page 212 says: The campus will grow to form a vibrant and sustainable neighbourhood, capitalising on its highly accessible location. It will be a high quality place to live... It isn't that now. The Nine Wells estate has almost nothing in the way of communal facilities, and Dame Mary Archer Way is a significant movement barrier between the Ninewells estate and the existing CBC facilities. • Capacity for approximately 1000 additional homes on the campus. The existing Ninewells population, plus 1000 new homes, is a lot of residents, yet their needs don't even get a mention. • There needs to be a transition down from 6 storeys at the west end of the phase 2 land to 4 storeys at the east end, and a transition from commercial to residential buildings. • Regarding Para 14b: This works both ways. The views of Nine Wells Wood and Magog Down from the main hospital ward tower and the children's hospital need to be preserved too	208143 (C Claxton) (208144, 208145, 208146, 208147, 208148, 208149, 208150, 208151)

• Regarding Para 17 on page 215: Figure 63 on page 219 shows something like this, extending northwards from Granhams Road to the eastern end of Nine Wells Wood. It needs to extend further north, to the "elbow" of Dame Mary Archer Way, to establish a green avenue through the ex-Green Belt land, visible from the hospitals, and creating a green boundary between the commercial and residential parts • Para 19 on page 215 says: Provide a network of world class, coherent, well designed and high quality public and communal spaces, taking a holistic campus wide approach, But again the needs of residents are not addressed at all. • Para 20 on page 216: this is entirely from the perspective of employees and visitors, the travel needs of residents are ignored. The residents don't just go to and from the CBC, they have lots of other journeys to make too. • Active travel needs more than the proposed east-west High Street, it also needs a safe and direct active travel route from/to Babraham Road, the 1000 new houses on the phase 4 land, and the existing Nine Wells estate. • Residents of the 1000 new houses on the phase 4 land are also going to need a bus route, unless they are expected to walk to Babraham Road or Dame Mary Archer Way to access public transport.	

Policy S/ED: Eddington, Cambridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The University of Cambridge supported the general direction of the policy but suggested some amendments.

Natural England points out the proximity of the site to Eversden and Wimpole woods, and the need to consider mitigation. Historic England highlights nearby heritage assets, and that a range of views should be referenced. The HIA is clear than the site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. Therefore criterion 6 b should be deleted. The HIA references the need for reduced scale of development as well as landscape buffers and screening in the south-eastern area of the site. This should be included in the policy. The heights referred to in the policy and supporting text do not reflect the HIA. The Environment Agency request adding a requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. National Highways provided the comments they made on the planning application for this site. Cambridgeshire Constabulary requested reference to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities funding.

Cambridge Past Present and Future ask for recognition of other views, including from Red Meadow Hill, and the additional cost of maintaining green infrastructure.

Other comments raise points including impact on car parking, rights of way, Huntingdon Road acting as a barrier, and the need for more variation in design and height of buildings. Better bus connections were requested. The Spatial framework should show the

Ascension Burial Ground City Nature Reserve, ands should include an East-West green corridor. The plan should make it clear that there should be no vehicular access at all from Storeys Way.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Broad landowner support for the policy is noted. The policy has been amended to make it clearer the quantum of development for each phase and it is clear that future development should be well integrated with existing development. The policy does not provide a feasibility caveat to the provision of affordable housing as these matters are addressed through the housing policies of the Plan. The Local Plan, as set out in the Development Strategy and Homes Topic Papers, is clear that there is a housing need for specialist accommodation and that the Local Plan approach is, in part, to address these needs through the strategic sites of the plan. The employment wording in the allocation is now more flexible compared with the adopted Local Plan, and enables university related development to come forward at any time subject to policy requires of the plan.

The policy sets out the necessary supporting infrastructure required to deliver the site. Where this can not be secured and delivered onsite, the councils will seek to secure financial contributions for off-site provision.

The policy has been amended to note that future applications will need to consider the Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC Impact Risk Zone and already notes that development proposals will need to take account of and safeguard nearby wildlife sites. The policy does not require the completion of Phase 1 of the development before Phase 2 can commence. This would need to be carefully considered through any future masterplan and phasing plan for the site, which would form part of the planning application process.

The Spatial Framework has been updated to reflect the previously missing wildlife sites and heritage assets. It would be for the planning application process to respond to the adjacent landscape and townscape features within and adjacent to the site and whilst these are broadly identified in the Context section of the policy, it now also makes reference to the east-west green corridor. The policy also includes additional reference heritage assets that would need to be considered through further heritage assessments as well as reference to strategic viewpoints. This list is not exhaustive and would need to be considered through these additional studies. The NPPF is clear that Local Plans should not prescribe specific building styles. Therefore the policy approach for high quality new buildings, as supplemented by the policies in the Great Places Chapter, as well as evidence such as the Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, is considered to be proportionate for plan making and provides a suitable policy framework to inform and assess future planning applications.

The indicative spatial framework has been updated to include Academic Led Development.

Wording has been added to the policy to address possible flooding concerns, which would also be addressed in more detail in the flooding and water management policies in the Local Plan.

The policy does not require existing footpaths to be removed, and these would be protected through other Local Plan policies and Rights of Way legislation. Whilst the ‘Girton Gap’ is still considered to be an important feature to avoid the coalescence of settlements and for them to maintain their own identities.

The policy, alongside the infrastructure related policies in the Local Plan, requires a comprehensive and detailed approach to be undertaken to address transport impacts of the development. This would include car park provision. However, it should be noted that the existing site is well serviced by active and public transport and future development should not undermine the existing

approach to sustainable travel that has already been achieved on the site. Given the M11 is a motorway on the Strategic Road Network, the Motorway Traffic (England and Wales) Regulations 1982(SI 1982 No. 1163) do not allow for buses to stop and pick up passengers on such roads. The policy wording has been amended in relation to private vehicle access as suggested by the representation. Subject to the approval and delivery of the Cambourne to Cambridge high quality public transport corridor, the site would be well connected with the proposed railway station at Cambourne. The site should provide new or connect to the active travel network to ensure people have access to other services, facilities and areas and therefore the policy maintains this requirement.

The policy notes the requirement for long-term management, maintenance and stewardship of infrastructure including landscape and open spaces. The requirement for financial contributions towards emergency services would be addressed through the infrastructure policy of the Local Plan and so is not repeated here.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The University supports the general direction of the policy to densify the site and make the best use of the available land. There are several detailed comments in relation to the policy wording which are attached in a table with comments set against the relevant policy/paragraph numbers. There is inconsistency across the plan of naming the site. Eddington should be used for all references to the site.	202528 (University of Cambridge)
Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC should be included in the HRA (AA), particularly in relation to 'Physical Damage and Loss of Habitat – Natural England's Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for this SAC is about	207603 (Natural England)

to be updated to a 6km core sustenance zone (CSZ) and a 10.2km landscape connectivity zone (LCZ) for barbastelle bats.	
No consideration is given to the Ascension Burial Ground as a prestigious cemetery or a City Nature Site. The site plan does not include an East-West green corridor and does not seem have sufficient green area at the east of the site to support existing wildlife in adjacent woodland, hedgerows and mature gardens. Figure 66 does not show the Ascension Burial Ground City Nature Reserve or mature hedgerows along field boundaries' noted in Context section v. It does not show the Grade II* listed property and Grade II listed garden at 48 Storey's Way almost adjacent the site and the further Grade II listed buildings at 29, 30, 54, 56, 63 and 76 Storey's Way.	202395 (K Wiemer)
Whilst the site does not include any designated heritage assets the site lies adjacent to Conduit Head Road and Storey's Way Conservation Areas and their associated listed buildings. Girton College listed at Grade II* and lodge (grade II lie to the north of the site. The American Military Cemetery, a grade I Registered Park and Garden lies at an elevated position of the west of the site, commanding long ranging views across the site. This contains the grade II* listed memorial and is also adjacent to the grade II * Madingley Mill. There are several designated heritage assets in the village of Madingley, including Madingley Conservation Area, Madingley Hall (grade I), and its grade II Registered Park and Garden, the grade II* church of Mary Magdalene as well as numerous grade II listed buildings. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. 5a What about views from Madingley Cemetery and Madingley Hall/RPG?	210130 (Historic England)

We recommend that you add these views to criterion 5a. We welcome criterion 5b although in criterion iii 'Farrow' should read 'Furrow'. Criterion 6b: The HIA is clear than the site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. Therefore criterion 6 b should be deleted. The HIA references the need for reduced scale of development as well as landscape buffers and screening in the south-eastern area of the site. This should be included in the policy. We welcome criterion 6c. Paragraph 3.2.27 - The heights in this paragraph are not supported by the evidence in the HIA. The HIA says nothing about 5 storeys at the edge of the site, nor does it allow for testing for taller buildings elsewhere in the site. Indeed, it specifies lower heights in the south-eastern part of the site. Amend paragraph to more accurately reflect the HIA. See our recent response to 25/03746/OUT in which we set out our detailed concerns regarding height.	
North West Cambridge has an allocation within the current local plan but has been recognised that there is the ability to increase the capacity for new homes. National Highways are currently consulted on the planning application for the increased quantum of development on site. National Highways offered no objection subject to the inclusion of suggested conditions, including the requirement for a Travel Plan with a sufficient monitoring regime to ensure the development does not result in additional trips on the SRN, namely M11 junction 10.	209009 (National Highways)
This policy should refer to the requirement for a site-specific FRA to include hydraulic modelling of the ordinary watercourses within the site to define the flood extents at the site. The policy should also clarify that a sequential approach should be taken with more vulnerable development located outside of areas of fluvial and surface water flood risk.	211182 (Environment Agency)
Concern around the increase of population at the site and the reduction in car parking.	201237 (S Williams)

The proposed expansion of Eddington/North West Cambridge. It’s unclear to me from the documents whether the pathway from just north of Howe's farm, across the fields to Madingley American cemetery will be maintained. As a regular user of this path for walking/mental health, I hope that this walking route is to be kept.	201489 (K Bright)
Sustainable infrastructure (carried over from initial development) vital. New connections are made at marginal cost. Homes kept simple. Open gap with Girton village not necessary. Growing affinity. Huntingdon Road a barrier that needs to be diminished. Concerning appearances from the West, Eddington looks understated and variations in both colour and height would bring create more interesting perspectives and lend the distinctiveness that Eddington deserves. Given the distance from Eddington to Cambridge the access to a railway station is still an issue. U bus provides this capability. Rapid transit to both Cambridge and the future Cambourne station need to be options.	202113 (R Stobert)
The policies overlook two key issues. First, they fail to consider the strategic viewpoint from Red Meadow Hill, which offers panoramic views over Cambridge, the University of Cambridge West Cambridge Campus, and the historic city’s setting, ensuring building heights do not disrupt this view. Secondly The growing population from development will place a financial burden on the charity managing the nature reserve, highlighting the need for funding to maintain visitor facilities and manage the area effectively. The respondent requests that the development of West Cambridge includes mechanisms to support the creation of the nature reserve, aligning with the overall vision for the Local Plan.	202982 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
Need to be clear on *how* the site's taller buildings will improve the city's skyline given the mediocre and controversial designs that polarise opinions. Will there be an alternative design that makes	203779 (A Carpen)

provision for the 'teeming towers and dreaming spires' the tourist literature contains about Cambridge? The current style is bulky, bland, minimalist and repetitive. Can this local plan make provision for a building style where ornate and architecturally interesting (and aesthetically pleasing/inspiring) spires can be incorporated into a design style given their complete absence in the existing development?	
If we are serious about public transport, we need to think about how to connect West Cambridge and Eddington with the rest of the bus network. Being close to the M11 would strongly incentivise people to drive to South Cambridge or London if this is not well thought out. I suggest adding bus stops on the M11 (request permission for the DoT) either south (for off-road busway connections) or north (for on-road busway connections) of Madingley Road. This allows the operation of express buses to places like South Cambridge or London, preventing cars from overburdening the M11.	203833 (A Chan)
Policy S/NWC: Eddington (5,550 dwellings/14,850 population) (p.225) Under the subheading ‘Uses’ Section 4 – add a new criterion i. as follows; “i. Provision of a fire & rescue service drop down point & contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities funding”.	207476 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207509 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue)
The Context does not include the need to respect the Ascension Burial Ground as a City Wildlife Site and a cemetery. The Context does not include the woodland at the southeastern edge where the site borders Archaeology/Astronomy nor the mature gardens that surround the eastern boundary of the site. Public Space includes no provision for amenity to the east of the site.	208625 (Madingley Road Area Residents Association)
The provision for Nature does not include an east-west green corridor for wildlife between the Green Belt on the west of the site and the city wildlife site, the large mature gardens of Castle ward, college playing fields and Archaeology/Astronomy grounds to the east and southeast of the site.	208626 (Madingley Road Area Residents Association)

There are several errors and omissions in Supporting Information Figure 66. Most notable are the absence of the Ascension Burial Ground City Wildlife Site and a Grade II* listed property on the eastern boundary of the site. The location of the primary school is incorrect. The location of mature hedgerows is not shown.	208627 (Madingley Road Area Residents Association)
The plan should make it clear that Phase one of the development should be completed before any Phase two is commenced. The phases defined as in S/NWC: Eddington. The plan should make it clear that there should be no vehicular access at all from Storeys Way, and the adjective 'private' removed from section 14, so to ensure there is no conflict with section 11(c). 'The Ridgeway' runs NW from the cul de sac of Storeys Way towards Eddington eventually reaching Huntingdon Road. The Planning document should reflect this and not be misled by the developer's labelling.	210832, 210833, 210834, 210835 (Storeys Way Residents Association)

Policy S/WC: West Cambridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The University supports the general direction of the policy which aligns with the approved Outline Planning Approval and offers flexibility for change across the plan period. Detailed comments are provided in relation to the policy wording.
Natural England points out the proximity of the site to Eversden and Wimpole woods, and the need to consider mitigation.

Historic England highlights nearby heritage assets. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Criterion 9b should be extended to include the setting of the listed buildings. Cambridge Past Present and Future ask for recognition of other views, including from Red Meadow Hill, and the additional cost of maintaining green infrastructure.

Cambridgeshire County council requested that the policy required facilitating the Cambourne to Cambridge Busway.

Other comments asked for better bus connections, and measures to make cyclists feel safe. Better connections to other destinations in Cambridge. Measures are needed to control light pollution. Several comments reference the West Fields should be protected from development.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Policies in the Local Plan require new development to be well served by active travel and public transport. At West Cambridge, whilst the site is reasonably well served by public transport, it is expected to improve with the proposed Cambourne to Cambridge High Quality Public Transport Corridor, which is now referenced further within the Movement section of the policy. As part of future applications on the site, the proximity to all public transport stops would need to be considered and outlined in a Transport Strategy and the enhancement of existing footways/cycle paths would be identified where required. Wider cross city bus movements and active travel connections are to be considered through the CPCA Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy, as they are the responsible body.

An additional policy criterion has been added to reflect that the site is now located within the Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC Impact Risk Zone. Additionally, sensitive lighting strategies will be required for new developments across Greater Cambridge and therefore this is addressed through other plan policies.

The policy has been amended to reflect existing heritage assets and strategic viewpoints in this area, including assets within the site.

The policy notes the requirement for long-term management, maintenance and stewardship of infrastructure including landscape and open spaces. The requirement for financial contributions towards emergency services would be addressed through the infrastructure policy of the Local Plan and so is not repeated here.

Objections to other specific site proposals are noted and addressed through the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Would suggest placing buildings near bus stops and improving existing pedestrian access to these stops. Worth mentioning that the footpath/cycle path along Madingley Road is in dire condition and needs improvement for safety. As a cyclist I do not feel safe cycling on it. Also attached a draft proposal for an interchange between east-west running buses (4/905/X3/proposed busway) and orbital/north-south running buses that may utilise the M11 for consideration. They would allow buses to serve trips between West Cambridge and the M11 corridor, which is currently ridiculously slow by public transport.	203835 (A Chan)
We strongly object to the development of the land named "Land off the Lawns" with ID 115526. The key reason: this landlocked lawn is a biodiversity hotspot, one of the few remaining ones within Cambridge. Its difficult access is a feature. While the land is much enjoyed by the neighbours, who thankfully don't abuse it, this land is a key resource as habitat for wildlife. Please consult the sample of the large diversity (140 species) in invertebrate wildlife housed within the land in the iNaturalist citizen science project area for the land, as can be seen at the inaturalist.org website.	204114 (Professor A Cardona)
The University supports the general direction of the policy which aligns with the approved Outline Planning Approval and offers flexibility for change across the plan period. There are several detailed comments in relation to the policy wording which are attached in a table with comments set against the	202530 (University of Cambridge)

relevant policy/paragraph numbers. There is inconsistency across the plan of naming the site. Cambridge West should be used for all references to the site rather than 'West Cambridge'.	
Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC should be included in the HRA (AA), particularly in relation to 'Physical Damage and Loss of Habitat – Natural England's Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for this SAC is about to be updated to a 6km core sustenance zone (CSZ) and a 10.2km landscape connectivity zone (LCZ) for barbastelle bats.	207607 (Natural England)
Considering the planned growth of the biomedical campus, many trips between West Cambridge and the biomedical campus are likely. It is essential that these are done via active travel and public transport. This will require an emphasis in improving bus priority to make it more reliable in the face of traffic jams. Two other improvements to the cycling and walking provisions are also needed: - recognize Sheep's Green Bridge limitations and plan a replacement or additional river crossings - require additional walking and cycling connections between West Cambridge and the Sidgwick Site to relieve pressure on Burrell's Walk	203741 (T Preud'homme)
Given the large number of buildings planned for the site each potentially contributing additional light pollution to what is a relatively dark area of Cambridge, the lighting requirement should be in the policy. The University has assured me that for recently developed and future buildings, lighting will comply with category E2 (Village or relatively dark outer suburban locations). Despite this, it is unclear whether the most recently opened building (photo attached) complies with that standard. It would help for the requirement to be clear to architects from the earliest design stage to avoid unnecessary lighting from the outset.	203205 (K Weimar)

I am against development of the West Fields site off Barton Road, and I support the city council, which I believe has rejected this site. It is part of the Green Belt, which is an important part of what makes Cambridge attractive and liveable for residents, visitors, and scientific / business companies. The site is also prone to flooding.	201343 (C Humphrey)
Development on West Fields (Site ID 115681) should remain protected from development until at least 2045 to save the green belt and prioritise and maintain open green spaces.	205701 (Newnham Labour)
I support the position taken in the proposed Local Plan to exclude from the favoured development sites the West Fields south of the West Cambridge site. This open area currently breaks up the ring of new development that is gradually encircling the city, allowing city residents to walk or cycle out into the countryside avoiding urban areas. It also allows wildlife a route from the river and parks within the city to open countryside.	201473 (V Yates)
The policies should consider the impact on the strategic viewpoint of Red Meadow Hill, which offers a panoramic view over Cambridge and is significant for the historic city's setting. There is a need to acknowledge the transformation of land on the western edge of Cambridge into a nature reserve, which will enhance access to green space for West Cambridge Campus users. The respondent highlights the financial burden on their charity to maintain paths and manage visitors to the nature reserve, indicating a lack of funding for necessary facilities and management. The respondent requests that the policy includes mechanisms for the development of West Cambridge to support the creation of the nature reserve, aligning with the vision for the Local Plan.	202988 (Cambridge Past Present and Future)

Clear and explicit statements on the long-delayed West Cambridge Swimming Pool that the University of Cambridge still has not built must be incorporated into this section. Don't let the University get this struck out.	203827 (A Carpen)
Outline planning permission was approved under planning reference 16/1134/OUT. Sport England commented on the planning application on November 2nd 2017 raising no objection to the proposal. The provision of on-site sports facilities should be informed by an up to date evidence base, and any subsequent updates. Sport England are aware that the Council are in the process of undertaking a PPS and BFS, and that a FPM for swimming pools has been completed.	209222 (Sport England)
The grade II* listed Schlumberger Gould research Centre is located within the West Cambridge site. There are two Conservation Areas, West Cambridge and Conduit Head Road adjacent to the site (and their associated listed buildings). Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We broadly welcome criterion 9 Criterion 9b should be extended to include the setting of the listed buildings. 3.2.48 The Schlumberger Building is grade II*. The text needs to be amended (currently says grade II). Reference should also be made to the listed buildings in the adjoining conservation areas	210131 (Historic England)
Movement – there should be a statement referring to facilitating the Cambourne to Cambridge busway and associated active travel route.21	210586 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
It is entirely possible to deliver a safe, high quality cycling route between West Cambridge and the Biomedical Campus that would support 20-minute journeys. Delivering a 20-minute public transport journey would require significant reductions in general traffic in the city core particularly around Lensfield Road and the approaches to the city centre. Connectivity between West Cambridge and the Sidgwick	211772, 211773 (Camcycle)

Site must also be improved. These interventions involve decisions that could be explicitly acknowledged and supported through the Local Plan. Without this, bus-based solutions will remain constrained by congestion. Identify active travel and public transport connectivity between West Cambridge, the city centre and the Biomedical Campus as a strategic priority.	

Policy S/HHR: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments from the landowner broadly support the continued allocation of Darwin Green and welcomes a single comprehensive policy for the site, given its advanced planning and construction status. However, they propose several detailed wording changes to the policy.

Additionally, other comments request amendments focusing on ensuring appropriate noise mitigation (prioritising earth bunds over reflective barriers), maintaining watercourse base flows, securing good active-travel permeability without vehicular links to Girton, future-proofing the internal road network for buses, and establishing clear governance for the Country Park.

Historic England highlight heritage considerations (including potential assets and the Conservation Area). There are also comments requesting financial contributions to emergency services be explicitly included.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy has been amended to reflect the recent planning consents for the various phases of the development. However, the policy retains the requirement for two primary schools, which is based on the latest understanding of education requirements generated by the development. If this were to change for later phases of the development, this would need to be justified and agreed with the Education Authority.

The policy provides additional criteria relating to noise mitigation measures and the requirement for the delivery and long term stewardship of the Country Park to be secured through a legal (S106) agreement. It also now identifies the adjacent Conservation Area and has also been updated in the Heritage Impact Assessment for the site. At this stage, there are no known other potential heritage assets in this location, but there is a formal process to designate new Statutory and Non-Statutory Heritage Assets where applicable.

The policy does not address the base flow of existing watercourses as this is addressed through Policy CC/IW: Integrated water management, sustainable drainage and water quality and therefore does not seek to repeat other policies set out in the Local Plan.

Financial contributions towards essential infrastructure, including emergency services, is addressed by Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery and is therefore not repeated in this policy.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The respondent supports the continued allocation of Darwin Green under Policy S/HHR but requests minor changes to the policy wording. Darwin Green has historically been divided into two allocations, one under the Cambridge City Local Plan (Policy 20) and one under the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (Policy SS/2), due to its location across two local authority boundaries. Both allocations have outline planning permission, with Phase 1 partly occupied and under construction, while Phases 2 and 3 are at Reserved Matters stage. The respondent supports a comprehensive policy approach for Darwin	203032 (Barratt David Wilson Homes and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Landowners)

Green in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, acknowledging the advanced construction and technical work already completed. The respondent has provided specific wording changes for Policy S/HHR, indicating proposed deletions and additions, with justifications for these changes outlined.	
It is important that earth bunds should be prioritised and if not, any noise barriers must be absorbent and not reflective. Reflective barriers along Orchard Park have increased noise issues.	203954 (Histon and Impington PC)
The policy should require a suitable compensation flow should be provided so the pre-development base flow of existing watercourses is achieved at all times	201663 (J Pavey)
Given the proximity to Girton and neighbouring areas, permeability will need to be addressed: • for active travel, to ensure good and safe access to new services and facilities and to existing bus services • agrees that the development should not provide direct vehicular access to/from Girton • the internal road network needs to be future proofed for buses	202140 (R Stobart), 203837 (A Chan)
Clear governance arrangements will be required for the Country Park	202140 (R Stobart)
Are Woodhouse and Impington Farms potential heritage assets	202140 (R Stobart)
Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding should be added to the policy wording	207477 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207510 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service)
The Conservation Area has not been considered in the Heritage Impact Assessment or the policy wording	210132 (Historic England)

Summaries of Representations: Sites Other Site Allocations on the edge of Cambridge

Policy S/EOC: Other Site Allocations on the edge of Cambridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Historic England requested that criteria 1 of the policy be clarified to list the sites.

Other comments on this introduction were related to site allocation proposals. Green belt releases were proposed for a variety of reasons, including additional development needs, that grey belt should have been included, and due to the specific opportunities the proposals provide, including for housing, employment and a travel hub.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

In response to Historic England's comment the policy structure has been clarified.

Proposals for alternative site shave been considered though an update to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment where they fit within the broad emerging strategy of the local plan. New evidence submitted has been considered, and where

considered appropriate scoring has been amended. Comments related to strategy choices have also been considered, particularly under the development strategy policies. It is not proposed to add additional village sites to the proposed submission local plan. An update to the Green Belt Study has been carried out to consider which areas would meet he governments definition of being grey belt. Whilst some site may meet the definition, exceptional circumstances is still required for green belt release, and the Councils do not consider that exists in light of alternatives available.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Criterion 1 is unclear as to which sites it is referring to. We recommend that Criterion 1 should list the four sites.	210133 (Historic England)
Land North of Madingley Road, Cambridge (HELAA Reference 40491 / Site ID 115543) Site is very suitable for an allocation for B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) uses, including but not limited to high technology industries such as digital infrastructure data centres and gigafactories. Draft plan not currently meeting employment needs.	211514 (Trinity College Cambridge)
Land East of Gazelle Way site (HELAA Reference 40250) The Development Strategy should include additional allocations on the Edge of Cambridge to balance housing supply and mitigate risks of delays from New Settlements. Further growth on the edge of Cambridge is seen as sustainable due to existing infrastructure and proximity to jobs and services. The Council has not conducted a comprehensive Green Belt assessment, which is necessary to identify suitable Grey Belt land for development. Endurance Estates objects to the omission of the Land East of	205103 (Endurance Estates)

Gazelle Way site (HELAA Reference 40250), proposing it for a mixed-use development of in the region of 1,500 dwellings and employment space. Site is grey belt.	
Land adjacent to A1303 and M11, Rectory Farm, Cambridge (HELAA Reference 208800) Representation in relation to a site submission to be tested through the HELAA. A range of issues raised on plan strategy including that plan should address higher development needs, grey belt land should be located. Land adjacent to A1303 and M11 is suitable for residential or commercial development due to its sustainable location and access to transport. The site could also serve as a Travel Hub to alleviate pressure on Madingley Park and Ride, potentially freeing it up for housing or employment growth at Eddington or West Cambridge.	211091, 202044 (Wimpole Associates Ltd)

Policy S/EOC/NWO: Land north of Worts' Causeway

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The policy requires further consideration of landscape and heritage impacts, specifically noting on-site and adjacent heritage assets that could be affected by the proposed development. Additionally, concerns were also raised regarding active travel site access and shared facilities.

One organisation identified that the site should be considered as part of a wider Green Infrastructure opportunity that aligns with the southern part of the city.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy has been amended to account for the on-site and adjacent heritage assets that could be affected by the development. Additionally, the policy also reflects that landscape mitigation measures for the site should be linked to the green infrastructure provision on-site and how it forms part of a wider network. However, the proposal in the representation to re-consider the Development Strategy and Green Infrastructure network across the southern part of the City has not been taken forward in this specific allocation as it for the Development Strategy to consider this matter.

The policy already requires good access by active travel into the site but additional measures as well as new facilities are not currently deliverable having been considered as part of the planning application process for application 20/01972/OUT.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
We believe there could be a different approach taken to development and green space on the south-east boundary of Cambridge, which could deliver even better outcomes for nature and people. We refer you to the response made by the Wildlife Trust BCN and the potential for an enabling development which could better deliver the ambitions of the Cambridge Nature Network by extending new green space and habitat creation from Nine Wells, north-eastwards to Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits.	202993 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
More needs to be included on multiple entrances and exits - especially by footpath/cycle paths. Must avoid building another housing estate with only a single point of access. What contributions will be made to what shared facilities either on site or on neighbouring sites will be made so the area doesn't end up as a dormitory neighbourhood requiring long journeys to get essentials?	203782 (A Carpen)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site. The grade II listed Milestone lies just to the east of the site. The milestone will need to be protected during the construction works. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion 1a. The policy should also refer to the Building of Local Interest, Netherhall Farm (though we appreciate it is	210134 (Historic England)

mentioned in the supporting text at paragraph 3.2.70). The policy/supporting text should also refer to the need to protect the milestone.	

Policy S/EOC/SWO: Land south of Worts' Causeway

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The policy requires further consideration of landscape and heritage impacts, specifically noting adjacent heritage assets that could be affected by the proposed development. Additionally, concerns were also raised regarding active travel site access and shared facilities.

One organisation identified that the site should be considered as part of a wider Green Infrastructure opportunity that aligns with the southern part of the city.

There is broad landowner support for the allocation.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy has been amended to account for the on-site and adjacent heritage assets that could be affected by the development. Additionally, the policy also reflects that landscape mitigation measures for the site should be linked to the green infrastructure provision on-site and how it forms part of a wider network. However, the proposal in the representation to re-consider the Development Strategy and Green Infrastructure network across the southern part of the City has not been taken forward in this specific allocation as it for the Development Strategy to consider this matter.

The policy already requires good access by active travel into the site but additional measures as well as new facilities are not currently deliverable having been considered as part of the planning application process for application 19/1168/OUT.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
We believe there could be a different approach taken to development and green space on the south-east boundary of Cambridge, which could deliver even better outcomes for nature and people. We refer you to the response made by the Wildlife Trust BCN and the potential for an enabling development which could better deliver the ambitions of the Cambridge Nature Network by extending new green space and habitat creation from Nine Wells, north-eastwards to Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits.	202999 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
More needs to be included on multiple entrances and exits - especially by footpath/cycle paths. Must avoid building another housing estate with only a single point of access. What contributions will be made to what shared facilities either on site or on neighbouring sites will be made so the area doesn't end up as a dormitory neighbourhood requiring long journeys to get essentials?	203781 (A Carpen)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site but the Grade II listed Milestone is close to the site. These needs to be protected during construction of the development and should be referred to in the policy/supporting text. Welcome the preparation of the HIA and criterion 1a of the policy wording.	210135 (Historic England)
The Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) support draft allocation S/EOC/SWO for land at Newbury Farm. As the Council is aware, CIP controls part of the draft allocation (Phase 3 - land on the western side)	204222 (Cambridge Investment Partnership)

and has already secured reserved matters approval, reference 24/01531/REM. The draft allocation accords with the details already approved.	
We strongly support the policy to reduce the urbanising impact on this edge of the Green Belt, to facilitate access to the countryside, and to manage car use.	210904 (Great Shelford Parish Council)

Policy S/EOC/BS: Bell School, Babraham Road

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Whilst the landowner is broadly supportive of the allocation, representations have been made that the policy should be more flexible in its approach to land uses and should provide the opportunity for residential or healthcare related development.

There are no designated heritage assets within or adjacent to the site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

There are no amendments made to the policy. Whilst comments suggested that the policy should be more flexible in its approach to appropriate land uses, the site is in very close proximity to the existing educational facility and therefore provides an excellent opportunity to place purpose-built student accommodation adjacent to the school. In addition, the existing or future accommodation needs the school are not known. By allocating the site for student accommodation, the policy is taking a longer term approach to meeting existing or future occupier needs throughout the plan period.

The site is within close proximity to Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Policy S/CBC) which is identified in the Local Plan for approximately 1000 campus related homes. Therefore, this policy does not propose to allocate the site for keyworker NHS housing.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The Bell Language School has closed. Can this site be turned into keyworker housing for the NHS hospitals?	203765 (A Carpen)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site and none nearby. No comments	210136 (Historic England)
The Bell Educational Trust is broadly supportive of the allocation of the Site at Babraham Road for residential uses. This is a highly sustainable site which is ideally suited for a range of uses that could make a valuable contribution to the NPPF requirement for 10% of the overall housing from sites under 1 hectare.	208389 (The Bell Education Trust)
The proposed allocation is for the remaining part of the Site which benefits from an extant planning permission for student accommodation. The site can only accommodate students associated with the Bell Educational Trust which historically meant the Bell School. Up until last year, this had been the intention of the Trust, but due to Bell going into administration, it is no longer an option.	208390 (The Bell Education Trust)
In line with Paragraph 127 of the NPPF, The Bell Educational Trust asks the Council to consider amending the policy to allow for greater flexibility regarding future occupiers and uses. Moreover, the requirements for student accommodation if any are unknown. The policy as worded would hinder the site being developed for other appropriate uses whether this be for student accommodation, other residential uses or even healthcare uses to contribute to housing need set out in Policy S/JH.	208391 (The Bell Education Trust)
It is therefore suggested that the wording of the policy be amended as follows: - Site area of 0.38 hectares	208392 (The Bell Education Trust)

- Capacity for approximately 100 student bedrooms or other residential uses or healthcare related uses in the alternative 1. Development proposals must demonstrate how they will meet the following requirements: a. With regard to new student bedrooms the need to contribute towards meeting the needs of the adjacent educational site or other existing educational institutions in line with Policy H/SA: Student accommodation whilst being carefully integrated; or b. Residential development and/or healthcare uses which sensitively respond in height, mass, density and landscaping to its immediate residential context.	

Policy S/EOC/FRE: Fulbourn Road East

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments raised concerns about the impacts of development on the adjacent properties and local townscape character. There were also comments regarding the site's accessibility by active and public transport, in particular the provision of a new railway station in Fulbourn.

One organisation identified that the site should be considered as part of a wider Green Infrastructure opportunity that aligns with the southern part of the city whilst another highlighted that the site should provide training opportunities for young people.

The landowner raised concerns about the lack of flexibility in the policy wording and noted that the site benefits from a planning permission. They also requested greater clarify on the proposed landscape buffer whilst Historic England noted that the site could impact nearby heritage assets and their setting and that the policy required clarification.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy has been amended to provide greater flexibility in relation to the quantum of development. This is consistent with the approach taken for all site allocations in the Local Plan. The policy is also clearer that development should be informed by careful consideration of the local context, including townscape and landscape character and has removed the required to not build in the

previously undefined eastern part of the site. The supporting text also notes that the eastern part of the site is more sensitive in relation to the historic environment and so a design led approach is required for future applications.

The existing planning permission for the site is now referenced in the supporting text.

Responding to the comments on transport, the policy now emphasises the need to increase sustainable travel modes which will need to be addressed through a Transport Assessment, Travel Plan and Parking Strategy. There are no current proposals for a Fulbourn railway station from either East West Rail, Network Rail or the Department for Transport. New infrastructure of this scale would require significant investment which is beyond what can reasonably be expected from this one development.

The proposal in the representation to re-consider the Development Strategy and Green Infrastructure network across the southern part of the City has not been taken forward in this specific allocation as it for the Development Strategy to consider this matter.

Other Local Plan policies address issues relating to skills and training and so are not repeated in this policy.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Why have you decided the maximum height here should be so much less than that permitted at Mission Street (Land South of Coldham's Lane)? I would be delighted if you would put the same limit (no taller than three commercial storeys) also at Mission Street.	201238 (S Williams)

The respondent strongly supports policies 1a-f. They suggest a different approach to development and green space on the south-east boundary of Cambridge for improved outcomes for nature and people. The respondent references the Wildlife Trust BCN's response regarding enabling development to enhance the Cambridge Nature Network. They propose extending new green space and habitat creation from Nine Wells to Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits.	203003 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
There is already considerable traffic on Cherry Hinton Road & Fulbourn Road that extend beyond rush hours. Provision *must* be made towards having a new transport link from a new Fulbourn Railway Station on an upgraded railway line - which developers must contribute towards. Developers should be required to contribute towards public transport provision and *not* towards private commuter buses which provide local residents with no benefit and only costs - potholed roads and pollution.	203758 (A Carpen)
Provision should also be made for supporting new facilities for lifelong learning and for children and especially teenagers.	207471 (A Carpen)
BioMed Realty support the continued allocation of Fulbourn Road East under Policy S/EOC/FRE. However, to ensure the policy remains flexible and effective, several amendments are required. In particular, the policy should allow greater flexibility in the floorspace quantum and building height parameters, avoiding overly prescriptive limits that could constrain delivery. In addition, clarity is needed regarding the approach to any landscape buffer to the east of the site to ensure this is appropriately defined and controlled. Please refer to the covering letter for further detail on the recommended amendments to the policy wording.	201661 (BioMed Realty)

The policy should allow greater flexibility in the floorspace quantum and building height parameters, avoiding overly prescriptive limits that could constrain delivery	201661 (BioMed Realty)
Planning permission for development has been granted and implemented on site (ref. 21/00772/OUT, as amended by 23/03182/S73), demonstrating the deliverability of development within the proposed allocation. This is a fact that must be noted in the supporting text of the policy.	210427 (BioMed Realty)
The policy cites 56,000 sqm of development (the sub-text states 'approximately' 56,000 sqm). While the policy does not impose a fixed cap on development, the reference to a specific floorspace figure is unhelpful in its current form and risks being misinterpreted as a limit on the quantum of development. An amendment is needed to either remove the floorspace reference or replaced with a reference to an approximate figure of development	210428 (BioMed Realty)
Policy in its current form does not define what constitutes the 'eastern part' which introduces ambiguity.	210429 (BioMed Realty)
The inclusion of a fixed height restriction within the policy wording is unnecessary and overly prescriptive	210430 (BioMed Realty)
Section 1.f; this policy should require increasing sustainable travel modes, not merely consider it.	203597 (P Tribble)
Safe, direct cycling and walking and wheeling access is needed between Cherry Hinton and the Beechwoods/Roman Road/Babraham P&R. It would also connect to the Nature reserves and give safe pedestrian access avoiding Lime Kiln Hill which is simply unsafe on foot or cycle.	203836 (Mr Wookey)
Development has the potential to affect the Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area and its setting. Criterion b is too vague. The policy should set out how much of the site can be developed. Criterion c – does not properly reflect the HIA. The HIA refers to the prevailing building height to the	210137 (Historic England)

north and west. To the north, development is 2 storey residential. Amend the policy to be clearer on heights. We welcome criterion e which reflects the recommendations of the HIAS.	

Summaries of Representations: Sites Existing Settlements

Policy S/NST: Northstowe New Town

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments focused on green separation, heritage, and community infrastructure. Several respondents emphasise that land forming part of the Longstanton and Oakington green separation — including Longstanton Meadows, ridge-and-furrow fields, and areas within the Longstanton Conservation Area — should be removed from the allocation or more clearly protected from development. This also included comments about the clarity of mapping, that recent permissions were granted within areas marked as green separation, and the need for a stronger policy statement preventing any built development in these gaps.

Historic England and other groups highlight the significance of Longstanton Paddocks, medieval remains, pillboxes, and nearby Conservation Areas, requesting explicit reference to these assets, with appropriate mitigation, and potentially a Conservation Management Plan noted in the policy. Other comments highlighted the need to protect ancient woodland and existing countryside, and to ensure heritage considerations shape land-use designations.

There were several comments regarding community facilities, services and social cohesion. Comments call for stronger provision for community spaces, emergency services contributions, improved healthcare delivery, faith and cultural facilities, and a clearer strategy for traveller pitch delivery. Northstowe Town Council also raises issues around employment space, self-build targets, education wording, and the need for a distinctive facilities and employment opportunities to help avoid the town becoming a dormitory settlement. Longstanton PC highlight the infrastructure burden on their village, which cannot support further development.

Homes England have broadly noted that matters that have been addressed through the consented developments should not be required in this policy to avoid conflicts with these consents and/or delays to implementation. They also note that the policy should not seek to introduce new requirements such as the provision of specialist and Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Homes England also request clarification on ancillary uses within open spaces and note that some mitigation measures may fall beyond the red line boundary of the allocation.

Transport and connectivity concerns were also raised, with comments relating to for better public transport, fairer bus fares, and direct links to Cambridge North and the city centre. Respondents also support additional tree planting, clearer flood-mitigation requirements, and improvements to policy wording on recreation, including water-based activities and appropriate sports provision.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

- The Northstowe New Town policy is now supported by the Northstowe Strategic Enhancement Area (S/SEA/NST) Policy Area. This policy area specifically identifies that this land is designated to ensure that there is sufficient physical and visual separation between Northstowe and neighbouring settlements and maintains a soft, green landscape to enhance the wider rural setting and relevant Conservation Areas. This has also been reflected on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Policies Map;

- The policy also identifies local heritage assets and that development will need to protect and, where possible, enhance their setting and how this will be managed through the preparation of a Conservation Management Plan. As this site was allocated in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), has a site specific Area Action Plan (2007) and has been considered in further detail through subsequent planning applications, a Heritage Impact Assessment has not been undertaken;
- Additional flexibility has been set out in the Policy to support town centre uses coming forward within the new town that serves both local residents but also those in the wider surrounding area. This also includes greater flexibility in relation to specific forms of sports provision as this would need to be considered through a Sports Strategy; Additionally, the policy requires the provision of employment floorspace as part of a mixed and well balanced community;
- The policy outlines that the development of the new town must be well served by new services, facilities and open space and that these should be phased to the delivery of new homes so that residents, workers and visitors have easy access to them to meet their day to day needs. This also includes temporary provision until such time that permanent facilities are delivered. It has also been updated to reflect the latest education requirements;
- The policy identifies requirements relating to flooding and sustainable surface water drainage measures. Subsequent planning applications will therefore be required to address this policy requirement and for it to be secured through a legal (s106) agreement;
- Financial contributions towards essential infrastructure, including emergency services, is addressed by Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery and is therefore not repeated in this policy;
- The Councils have identified a clear housing need for Gypsy and Travellers accommodation and the Council's preferred approach is to address this through a number of ways, including provision at the strategic sites. This is consistent with the previous approach of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and is reflected in the relevant conditions of the planning

permission for the site. Policy H/GT sets out the specific requirements for the implementation of this particular policy requirement. This approach also applies to specialist older persons accommodation.

- The policy requires the new town to deliver a range of homes including self and custom build. This would need to be considered for each phase of the development, in accordance with existing planning conditions attached to the outline permissions.
- Planning applications would have been considered on its own merits and in accordance with the adopted development plan.
- Adequate bus provision will need to be considered through future phases for development, specifically through subsequent versions of the Transport Assessment. This will inform whether additional funding is required to support additional services and/or a subsidy of fares for new residents.
- There are several ways in which new facilities can be secured and delivered. This will vary depending on site specific circumstances and it is not the role of the Local Plan to pre-determine a suitable approach to delivery.
- Whilst the council and the supporting text to the policy notes the existing planning permissions for the site, a number of policy requirements have been retained within the policy as they have yet to be implemented, for example, the Town Centre Strategy. This has been retained in the policy to ensure that any changes to the consented schemes can be considered against these policy requirements if required.
- The provision of ancillary uses to support sports and open space facilities is addressed through Policy WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities as it is not a specific matter related to this allocation.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**

Area bounded by Rampton Road, Long Lane, Mills Lane and Woodside (Longstanton Meadows) overlaps the Longstanton Conservation Area and forms part of the green separation between Longstanton and Northstowe. It provides substantial amenity value for the inhabitants of Longstanton and future inhabitants of Northstowe. It should be removed from the Northstowe Site allocation to make it clear that land to the west of Long Lane is not available for development.	201164 (A Helliwell), 211746 (Homes England)
The green separation between Northstowe, Oakington and Longstanton is part of the area's green infrastructure. The land between these settlements provides ecological connectivity, landscape character and access to countryside for nearby communities and should be recognised in the Plan.	204421 (Cllr Thomas Bygott)
The other problem with Northstowe and other new towns is lack of community, lack of community spaces, worse engagement, poorer mental health, and more anti-social behaviour. How do you plan to make these new towns have a realistic sense of community. This is not just about schools. Where can people join the bridge club, knitting circle, etc, etc, all these make a community and enhance individual's mental health? When Stevenage was developed, it quickly became the drug centre of England, in the 1970-80s. How can you learn from this example and others?	201503 (C Meads)
Group supports approach to heritage in Policies S/NS and S/NST, acknowledging the importance of heritage assets. Concerns regarding Longstanton Paddocks, where visible remains of the mediaeval village exist, which is subject to a management plan. Paragraph 11 of Policy S/NST restricts land uses between Northstowe and Longstanton to open land, which is deemed inappropriate for Longstanton Paddocks due to potential harm to heritage significance.	202945 (Northstowe and Longstanton Heritage Steering Group)

Recommend specifically mentioning Longstanton Paddocks in paragraph 54 of the Policy to ensure its significance as a key landscape feature is maintained and enhanced.	
Protected ridge and furrow field which forms part of the designated green separation between Longstanton & Northstowe needs to be recognised and made clear that field is protected and only used as green separation.	203780 (B Ball)
What is the one significant new leisure facility that this site could host, that has easy, frequent, and accessible public transport access, that could otherwise not be located in Cambridge City due to land prices and lack of land availability? Please make provision for this - co-ordinated with the other New Towns so that each place has at least one different facility that the others lack, thus encouraging people from within Cambridge to visit, and ensure that the New Towns are not dormitory towns. Ensure children & teenagers are involved at design stage.	203783 (A Carpen)
Under the subheading 'Uses' Section 7– add a new criterion n. as follows; "n. Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding"	207483 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207514 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service)
Whilst the open land uses such as playing fields, allotments and cemeteries precludes housing, destroying ancient woodlands and existing countryside simply to provide a different sort of open space would be hugely detrimental. Proposals within the Longstanton Conservation Area should be reconsidered to provide a strong legal protection for existing countryside within it.	201154 (S Roberts)

The respondent supports the policy of providing a green separation on the northern side of Oakington, including tree planting to enhance the pastoral parkland character. The Oakington Inset Map is unclear regarding the green separation, particularly the brown areas and their designation, which the respondent finds confusing. The respondent presumes that the areas marked S/NS indicate site allocations but requests clarification on the map's key. The respondent raises concerns about recent planning permission granted for housing on land designated as S/NS, questioning how this aligns with the Northstowe policy area. The respondent objects to the use of any green separation land for housing, stating it contradicts the stated policy.	203557 (L Lawrence)
We note the inclusion of two Traveller sites in Northstowe of 12 pitches in each. We would like the Local Plan to clarify and confirm that these sites are to be located within the Northstowe Defined Development Extent and not on land bought outside these boundaries by Northstowe's developers, Homes England.	208077 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
We note and support the clear policies to maintain a green separation between Northstowe and Oakington and Westwick. It is important that there is no development from the Oakington and Westwick boundaries nor a further expansion of Northstowe. We note and support the commitment to plant additional trees and the need to maintain the green separation. We strongly object to any development being allowed in the green separation or that the green separation should take the form of playing fields, allotments, cemetery or for any other form of planned use.	208078 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
We suggest that GCSP submit an appeal against development for eight houses on the field between Manor Farm Close and the Northstowe boundary in order to maintain this green separation.	208079 (Oakington & Westwick PC)

We welcome the statement regarding flood mitigation, but there is a complete lack of detail and specifics in terms of location and form of flood mitigation. The Plan must include a statement regarding these issues.	208080 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
We note that the inset map provided is contradictory, suggesting that the area marked is both a green separation and also an area where certain forms of development could be permitted within the green separation. The map therefore needs to be redrawn to make absolutely clear that no development will be allowed between Northstowe and Oakington and Westwick and a policy statement should be included in the document to this effect.	208081 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
The Parish of Longstanton has provided the backbone for a significant amount of new housing in this area, notably the 'Home Farm' development within the village and now the development of Northstowe. The village's infrastructure cannot support further development. Councillors continued to raise concerns that this would not be the limit of land which is reclassified and that this process would be repeated as the need for housing arises.	208465 (Longstanton PC)
Residents have aired concern that some or all of the proposed 24 Traveller Pitches at Northstowe that would be located on any of the previously mentioned Green Separation Areas. While the council respects the need to provide facilities for all parts of the community, the historic significance and existing infrastructure within the village must be considered when locating these new facilities. These areas are not suitable for pitches. Confirmation is provided that the proposed Traveller Sites will be located within the Northstowe Defined Development Extent and not on adjacent land outside of the NDDE.	208466 (Longstanton PC)

Dedicated, direct, frequent, reliable and affordable connections should be provided connecting Northstowe with Cambridge North, and Northstowe with Cambridge City Centre. For the avoidance of doubt the current Guided Bus provision is unacceptable.	208058 (Northstowe TC)
We would like to underline the timescale for delivery of traveller pitches and add the requirement that such pitches may come only when a comprehensive set of facilities, strong community cohesion, and adequate provision of local services (policing, fire, healthcare, leisure, employment, etc.) are fully in place.	208059 (Northstowe TC)
A typo here predicts 1,018,000 homes; this should read 10,180	208060 (Northstowe TC)
The ratio of employment capacity to dwellings falls below other comparable settlements like Graven Hill and NW Cambridge. Without additional employment space Northstowe will be a permanent dormitory town and with more people commuting this may put more strain on the roads and public transport.	208061 (Northstowe TC)
While these uses are described using planning Use Classes, in addition it would be desirable to use plain language to describe what this means in practice. We would like Lab space to be specifically noted here, as it is in short supply locally.	208062 (Northstowe TC)
We note that Northstowe Phase 1 was delivered with zero self/custom build homes. There are three plots coming forward presently in the first parcel of Phase 3B, but we would welcome an additional target being recorded here so progress toward it can be tested against future planning applications.	208063 (Northstowe TC)

We are now far beyond "early occupation", and all involved parties have failed to deliver "Temporary (...) healthcare facilities" and indeed are in default on the Phase 2 S106 planning obligation requiring permanent healthcare facilities.	208064 (Northstowe TC)
It is unfortunate that the existing established S106 obligations provide for land for faith and cultural use but failed to provide for any monetary or in-kind contributions to realising facilities on that land. It is regrettable that providing facilities in a new and master-planned development has fallen solely on the shoulders of religious and community groups. This contrasts with Cambourne, where a S106 agreement provided for monetary contributions toward delivery of a church.	208065 (Northstowe TC)
We welcome and support this clear re-statement that Northstowe will be separated from adjacent settlements. This separation must be retained and neither Northstowe *nor the adjacent settlements* should be developed into the gap.	208066 (Northstowe TC)
Please strike "which will not undermine the vitality and viability of other nearby towns or compete with Cambridge;" It is essential that Northstowe Town centre is allowed to compete with others in the area. It would be highly inappropriate and unacceptable for the LPA to neuter development of the Town Centre because it could compete with other areas. Please also adjust "immediate surrounding area" to "wider surrounding area" for similar reasons.	208067 (Northstowe TC)
We support the principle of outdoor sports provision, but a bowling green is already provided in Northstowe with no further pressing need given the town's demographics. Would suggest padel or bocce is more appropriate for casual sports provision associated with a town park. It would be appropriate here to reference the close proximity of the secured swimming pool provision to the Town Centre.	208068, 208069 (Northstowe TC)

"Continue to offer recreational opportunities" please reword to "must offer water-based recreation opportunities in the future" as this is currently not happening	208070 (Northstowe TC)
We note that while the relevant S106 payments have been made during the development of Northstowe, for example to fund the capital costs of the Guided Busway, the current level of service provided to Northstowe residents in return is deeply unacceptable. In addition, the charging model adopted by the operator and approved by CCC sees bus journeys commencing in Northstowe attract higher fares than the same bus being boarded in adjacent settlements. The AAP demanded 12 months subsidised/free bus travel, so this text is a significant weakening of that. In any case, this was not made available to later residents. We believe that no such subsidy exists currently.	208071, 208072 (Northstowe TC)
Sport England supports criterion (d) requiring indoor and outdoor sports facilities and strongly supports paragraph 34 requiring maintenance plans for such facilities.	209226 (Sport England)
Parts of the Longstanton Conservation Area lie within the site. There are also 8 grade II listed pillboxes within the site. There are a number of other designated heritage assets nearby including Oakington and Westwick Conservation Areas and their associated listed buildings including the grade I All Saints Church, St Andrews Church and St Michaels Church, both listed at grade II* and several grade II listed buildings. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. There does not appear to be an HIA for this allocation. It is important that the policy identifies on-site, and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. Amend policy accordingly. Is there a	210141 (Historic England)

Conservation Management Plan for the site? If so, this should be referenced. If not, we recommend that this should be included as a policy requirement.	
Suggested wording amendment: “A nursery, secondary school, primary school and special school have now been built but further education facilities will be required to meet the needs of the new town, including additional primary schools”.	210590 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Draft Policy S/NST includes detailed requirements relating to movement, connectivity and transport mitigation. However, for Northstowe these matters have already been comprehensively assessed and secured through the existing outline planning permissions, Environmental Statements, Transport Assessments and associated conditions and legal agreements. Any policy wording that could be interpreted as adding new requirements, constraining approved development parameters, or re-opening matters already resolved through the outline permissions would risk undermining the effectiveness of the policy and slowing delivery. As a result, this would be inconsistent with national policy and guidance on positive plan-making and deliverability.	211735 (Homes England)
The draft Local Plan seeks to include additional specialist accommodation of 1,050 units (Part 7a ii) and 24 permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches (Part 7a iii). These are additional policy layers that are introduced to the Northstowe site that are not consistent, nor committed to in the outline development descriptions. Homes England has no additional land available at Northstowe and so these references should be removed from the draft policy.	211736 (Homes England)
The draft Local Plan and Policy S/NST should clarify how strategic sports hubs are intended to function within areas that are designated as protected open space. While the protection of open space is supported, sports hubs require ancillary development such as car parks and sports	211737 (Homes England)

pavilion. Policy should explicitly allow sports hubs to deliver necessary supporting infrastructure and ancillary development. Alternatively, sports hubs could be given a distinct policy designation that recognises both open space and community infrastructure, ensuring that built forms are not constrained by restrictive open space policies.	
The Lifespan section of the draft policy is particularly overprescribed as it requires comprehensive masterplanning, adherence to phasing plans and design codes and stewardship strategies. These details are already adhered via reserved matters applications, discharge of conditions application or planning obligations. The wording should be updated to reflect what matters have already approved and agreed for Northstowe.	211738 (Homes England)
The draft policy makes reference to required capacity improvements associated with the A14. Highways improvements delivered as part of the Northstowe development, including works affecting the A14 corridor, are intended to mitigate the impacts of the Northstowe development alone. Other site allocations / planning applications in the vicinity should not rely on this increased capacity and must demonstrate, through their own transport assessment, how any capacity constraints on the A14 would be mitigated as part of their proposals.	211741 (Homes England)
Part 7b of the proposed policy refers to a variety of uses proposed in the Town Centre (Phase 2) and includes incorrect floorspaces. The draft Policy should refer to the figures set out in the approved Town Centre Strategy (for Phase 2 (ref. S/2011/14/COND14). Part 7c states that retail and other town centre and local centre uses to be provided in accordance with an up-to-date Retail Needs Assessment and Town Centre Strategy.	211743, 211743 (Homes England)

There is an approved Town Centre Strategy for Northstowe under the Phase 2 outline (ref. S/2011/14/COND14). A retail needs assessment is not required by any of the outline consents and should not be introduced at this stage.	
The proposed policy requirements for education healthcare, community, cultural and leisure facilities are broadly consistent with the four outline permissions as it the requirement for temporary facilities. The policy refers to youth facilities which can form part of wider community facilities and the open space strategy. This approach is supported, provided it does not create additional triggers or obligations beyond those already secured through existing legal agreements and planning conditions.	211744 (Homes England)
The policy places a stronger emphasis on biodiversity networks and long-term landscape management than the outline summaries alone; however, this is consistent with the Environmental Statements accompanying Phases 3A and 3B and does not represent a departure from the approved development strategy.	211745 (Homes England)
Homes England are also landowners for land that is located outside of red line boundaries for the outline planning permissions. This is an acknowledgement that supporting infrastructure is to be delivered outside of the settlement boundary, such as the Southern Access Road East (if required) and flood mitigation measures.	211747 (Homes England)
I am very concerned about the addition of permanent traveller sites in the Northstowe town. Relocate these sites from Northstowe to the outskirts of villages. I appreciate the need for these sites, but I do not think in the main part of Northstowe is the correct location for them.	201732 (R Beaumont)

This plan is extraordinarily difficult to get to grips with. There has been no public meeting in Longstanton at which we could have found out what is proposed. Local residents have not been notified of this consultation. When I entered that I live in [REDACTED] (the westernmost part of Longstanton) it came up with nothing of significance, but I hear that there are plans for Traveller sites potentially just South of where I live. This process needs to be restarted in a way that actually involves local residents.	202590 (A Riley)
Longstanton & District Heritage Society believes that this local plan should emphasise the vital contribution Northstowe's rich heritage can make to the building of a strong community and providing the "unique identity and sense of place" promised in the town's original planning documents. LDHS asks for four particular aspects to be considered: 1. Clarification and confirmation of the conservation and protection status of the heritage asset known as "Northstowe Longstanton Paddocks". 2. Acknowledgement in the Local Plan of the new Heritage Strategy for Northstowe being commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council Natural and Historic Environment Team. 3. Greater emphasis of the need to protect, conserve and present Northstowe's rich heritage as part of a connected Fen-Edge landscape and for the facilitation of heritage learning by all members of the Northstowe community alongside members of other local, connected communities. 4. Clear designation of the Green Separation between Northstowe and the villages of Longstanton and Oakington as "Protected Space". Specific areas are proposed for designation.	204189 (R Hetherington)

There appears to be an error in paragraph 3.3.67 which states 10,18000 homes	204383 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Ltd)

Policy S/WNT: Land north of Waterbeach

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The comments raise concerns about the overall vision for Waterbeach, particularly the continued allocation of greenfield land which is seen as eroding the area's historic low-lying landscape and local identity. While there is support for some elements, such as the Strategic Enhancement Area, respondents argue that the policy lacks sufficient clarity and ambition in delivering meaningful green infrastructure. There are worries that the proposed level of on-site green space will not meet recreational demand, potentially increasing pressure on nearby protected nature sites. Contributors also stress the need for clearer protection of heritage assets, stronger alignment with existing plans, and greater certainty that Waterbeach Village's distinct character will not be undermined.

A significant theme is the adequacy of infrastructure, services, and connectivity. Respondents highlight the need for clearer commitments to emergency services provision and education (including SEN and secondary school capacity), alongside better phasing to ensure infrastructure keeps pace with housing delivery. Transport concerns also highlight the proposed closure of the existing railway station, ongoing pressure on key routes such as the A10/A14, and calls for improved public transport, cycling links, and alternative solutions such as bus corridors and a new station at Milton. More broadly, there are doubts about the deliverability and sustainability of proposals, including unresolved issues around water infrastructure and the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Concerns are also raised about inconsistencies with existing planning permissions and the Spatial Framework, as well as the risk that the scale and pace of development could outstrip both infrastructure provision and realistic delivery, ultimately

affecting community cohesion and long-term stewardship. There is also a comment requesting that the Waterbeach New Town SPD is carried forward to support the delivery of the site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy wording has been amended to provide greater clarity on the role and function of the Strategic Enhancement Area, whilst also requiring its delivery to be coordinated by the two landowners bringing forward the new town. There is also further reference to the role the SEA has in terms of filtering views from Denny Abbey and other heritage assets in that area. The exact location of specific uses within the SEA will need to be considered and determined through the planning application process, as it would not be reasonable to determine this through the Local Plan, especially given there are existing planning consents for the site and live reserved matters applications being considered. The recreational pressures generated by the development have been considered in Local Plan terms through the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment, with any identified mitigation measures required added to the policy. At the delivery stage, this will then be considered in further detail, ensuring the phasing of mitigation (including the delivery of accessible open space) is aligned to the delivery of new homes. The policy wording now reflects the important multifunctional nature of the SEA and how it will need to address the recreation, wellbeing and other needs of those living, working and visiting the new town.

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan Development Strategy sets out the councils identified strategy for growth and how the councils have arrived at this position, noting a range of evidence studies and how the plan is in general conformity with the national planning policy framework. Additionally, the plan and policies within it, are subject to consideration through the Sustainability Appraisal which consider environmental, social and economic indicators. The principle of residential led development at Waterbeach New Town as already been established through the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and subsequent planning permissions. Therefore,

the proposed allocation remains for a residential led mixed-use development and supports the continued delivery of the site, including the necessary mitigation and supporting infrastructure.

The Councils have identified a clear housing need for Gypsy and Travellers accommodation and the Council's preferred approach is to address this through a number of ways, including provision at the strategic sites. This is consistent with the previous approach of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and is reflected in the relevant conditions of the planning permission for the site. Policy H/GT sets out the specific requirements for the implementation of this particular policy requirement.
The Housing policies of the Local Plan identify different housing types and tenures and how these should be delivered throughout Greater Cambridge. This allocation for Waterbeach New Town outlines the broad quantum of development, acceptable land uses and policy requirements, which must be read alongside the other relevant policies of the Local Plan. There are clear national definitions for the different types of affordable/subsidised housing products and the Local Plan, in combination with the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy, will inform the housing types and tenures that come forward at the new town across each phase.

The policy has been clarified to confirm the education provision required to support the development and the phasing of this will need to be agreed with the education authority. Financial contributions towards essential infrastructure, including emergency services, is addressed by Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery and is therefore not repeated in this policy.

The policy wording has been developed further to ensure there is an appropriate, context led, approach at the interface between the new town and the existing village to maintain its townscape character. The policy also supports higher density development around the relocated railway station, as suggested by the representation.

The transport impacts of the development are noted, and the Movement section of the policy sets out clear requirements for future development to address impacts generated by the new town. This will need to be phased in line with the delivery of the town and will require a multi-modal approach including high quality active travel connections, enhanced public transport provision (including the relocated Waterbeach railway station and public transport corridor) as well as highways improvements. The policy is clear that development should not have an adverse highways impact on existing settlements and that financial contributions will be required for measures identified in the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study as well as a monitor and manage approach for each phase of the development to ensure that the mitigation measures are adequate as the new town builds out. The Interim Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy notes that in the medium term (2030-2035), there will need to be a north corridor package of measures delivered, which includes targeted A10 improvements, with possible larger highway interventions delivered in the long term.

Whilst the principle of relocating the railway station was established through the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the Greater Cambridge Partnership will be responsible for its delivery. The proposal to also retain the existing station in combination with the relocated station will be subject to further consultation undertaken by the Department for Transport. There may be an opportunity during this consultation for respondents to put forward other options including other new stations along this route. At this stage, the Interim Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy does not identify either of these proposals.

The policy as well as other policies in the Local Plan note the timely provision of infrastructure, services and facilities are needed to support developments of this scale. This will need to be kept under review through subsequent phases of the development to ensure the needs of new residents, workers and visitors are meet as the town comes forward. The policy has been amended to provide some flexibility on this basis. The policy also requires temporary and meanwhile uses to be delivered to provide initial facilities where needed, as not all amenities will be commercially viable at an early stage of the town’s development before a critical mass of people has been achieved.

The comment regarding sustainable connections to the Wicken Vision area and Wicken Fen has been added to the policy whilst the request for further engagement is noted.

The provision of water and wastewater infrastructure is a clear requirement for any new development and is addressed through Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments and is therefore not repeated in this policy. Additionally, any detailed proposals for the delivery of such infrastructure are subject to planning consent.

The policy has been amended to confirm the number of new homes that will be delivered during the plan period. The long-term stewardship, governance and community identity are addressed in the policy as this will be an important part of how the town is delivered and maintains its long-term success.

It is not uncommon for completed homes to be advertised for sale whilst future phases of development are under construction. There is a build out period both for the properties as well as the supporting infrastructure like streets and local open spaces and it is unlikely to be economically viable for the house builder(s) to only commence latter phases of development once all earlier phases are sold. Additionally, this is a planning condition that cannot be reasonably applied to developments through the planning system.

Amendments to the indicative spatial framework have been made to reflect the consented development and factual updates to the policy have also been applied. However, some requirements, such as addressing potential areas of flood risk are still relevant until such time that the consented development in this area, and any necessary mitigation measures, have been implemented.

The supporting text to the policy now highlights that the Waterbeach New Town SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications. However, under the changes to national planning policy, existing SPDs cannot be 'rolled over' or readopted by local planning authorities.

The policy wording and the indicative spatial framework provide a clear and consistent approach to ensuring that development is contained within the allocation area, and the role and function of the adjacent SEA. Any development proposals outside of the developable area or elsewhere in the parish, will need to comply with other policies in the Local Plan. Notably, the Defined Development Extents ensure that isolated development in the countryside is not generally supported whilst land to the south of the parish falls within the Cambridge Green Belt, which has national and local protections.

Made Neighbourhood Plans and adopted Local Plans have the same weight in decision making, however, if there is any conflict between the policies in the two plans, the most recently adopted/made plan takes precedence in decision making. Nevertheless, the Councils do not believe that the proposed allocation conflicts with the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan, as it is an update to an existing adopted allocation.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Vision and Identity • Object to allocation of further greenfield sites in Waterbeach which erodes low-lying historic fields that form part of the local landscape identity.	201331 (J Bell)

Uses • Under the subheading 'Uses' Section 4– add a new criterion m. as follows; "m. Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding" • Be clearer on the permission for a SEN School and that no more than two secondary schools are required. • I am concerned that housing proposed within Waterbeach New Town will not be genuinely affordable for people with existing local connections, including younger residents and families. The Draft Plan does not clearly explain: - How affordability will be secured over time - What proportion will be social or genuinely affordable rent - How local need will be prioritised. This undermines confidence that the development will support a balanced community.	207484 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207515 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service), 210529 & 210591 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 208980 (J Williams)
Context • Strategic Enhancement Area welcomed but policy needs to be more explicit in identifying area for provision of strategic natural greenspace to serve the new development. • Current extent of on-site green infrastructure will not be sufficient or attractive enough to support the recreational needs of the new population and will therefore likely result in displacement of recreational pressure to nearby designated nature sites. • Policy should be amended to incorporate delivery of strategic green infrastructure within the strategic enhancement area in accordance with the masterplan SPD document. • The plan does not give sufficient assurance that Waterbeach Village's distinct character will be protected, risking increased traffic and loss of landscape and breaching the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan. • It is important that the policy identifies on-site, and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. • The new town at Waterbeach should include high-density development focused around its new station.	202983 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 208975, 208981 (J Williams), 210142 (Historic England), 208035 (Railfuture East Anglia)

Travel • Transport impacts on the A10/A14 and surrounding villages remain significant. • Object to closure of existing Waterbeach railway station. • No objection to new station but existing one should be retained. • Forcing residents to travel further to reach rail services contradicts Policy I/ST's aim to prioritise walking, cycling, and public transport. • Retaining both stations would enhance access to rail, reduce car dependency, support social inclusion, and provide network resilience. • Milton should receive a new railway station and a metro-style service, to improve connectivity and support the plan's sustainability objectives. • Support moving railway station to better serve the town, but for many destinations (west Cambridge, science park, retail park, city centre), it is not convenient for residents to do a feeder>train>feeder journey as it is slow, expensive, or infrequent. • Suggests bus lanes along southbound A10 to create a bus corridor to relieve the pressure on road. • Propose blocking through traffic in Milton and building a bus/cycling-only bridge across the A14. • Support the provision of high quality pedestrian and cycle links to nearby existing facilities such as Cambridge Research Park (CRP) • Policy wording used must be sufficiently robust to ensure any transport infrastructure which is critical to accommodating sustainable growth in this location is secured and adequately planned for.	201332, 201333, 201334 (J Bell), 201366 (D Malik), 201402 (R Swift), 201404 (P Johnson), 201405 (I Williams), 203844 (A Chan), 204476 (Royal London Mutual Insurance Society), 204670 (East Cambridgeshire DC)
Infrastructure • Delivery heavily dependent on timely and costly infrastructure, some of which has already been delayed.	201180, 202602, 202603, 203305, 203314 (Save Honey Hill Group), 208977

• Risk that housing delivery will outpace infrastructure provision. Plan should include stronger triggers to ensure infrastructure comes forward at the right time and mitigates potential for substandard living conditions. • Temporary facilities / meanwhile uses may not guarantee the same quality of service as a fully developed town. • Water supply, wastewater treatment and environmental capacity present unresolved risks. • Proposed pipeline solution has not been robustly reassessed against more sustainable alternatives, despite earlier studies identifying a local Waterbeach WRC as the preferred option. • The Plan is unjustified under NPPF 36b because the Waterbeach strategy depends on a pipeline founded on a misleading account of regulatory advice. • Plan unsound as it treats the Waterbeach pipeline as a necessity despite the CWWTPR DCO ExA Report confirming there is no operational need and no presumption of need under Section 105. • 2014 Water Cycle Study previously identified a local Water Recycling Centre would provide "betterment" for the River Cam and the local community. By promoting a pipeline justified solely by "facilitating" a relocation that is now unfunded and uncertain, the Councils are endorsing a strategy that fails to meet the "Exceptional Circumstances" established by the Secretary of State's Decision Letter and contrary to NPPF paragraph 11, as more sustainable alternatives (local treatment) exist. • DCO confirms that Pipeline South will become redundant once a new works is built. Proposing high-cost, high-carbon infrastructure that is designed to be decommissioned shortly after completion is inconsistent with the sustainability objectives of the Minerals and Waste Plan 2021 and the NPPF. • Insert binding policy wording to ensure that wastewater treatment and potable water supply are delivered prior to or alongside housing occupation, with clear triggers and monitoring.	(J Williams), 208035 (Railfuture East Anglia) 203593 (Horningsea PC)

• The access strategy relies heavily on the A10. Traffic impacts on the A10/A14 network require robust and timely mitigation, prevent rat-running through neighbouring villages. • Long-term stewardship arrangements for open space, community assets and unadopted infrastructure are essential but challenging at this scale. • The ongoing proposals for Waterbeach are problematic, being a dominant satellite attached to the side of an existing settlement and relying predominately on the existing village and overburdened road and facilities. The facilities and road improvements should have been in place prior to the impact and occupation of the new housing to avoid harm to the existing. The current Plan for the satellite New Towns is not sufficiently robust in phasing.	
Other • Stated capacity of up to ~11,000 homes may overstate realistic delivery by 2045 • Long-term stewardship, governance and community identity require stronger safeguards. • No further development should be approved until the new-town properties are sold. • New town has been infilled contrary to the original understanding and that no new schools have been provided • The Draft GC Plan does not assess cumulative development pressure across Waterbeach Parish as a whole, focusing almost exclusively on the New Town site. I am concerned that this leaves other sensitive parcels of land vulnerable to Incremental or speculative development, the loss of agricultural land and open countryside and harm to heritage assets and their setting • The Draft GC Plan does not provide sufficient reassurance that the separate identity, character, and quality of life of Waterbeach Village will be protected in the long term. I am concerned that: - Increased traffic, pressure on services, and loss of landscape setting will cumulatively erode village character. The Draft Plan does not clearly explain how it will remain in general conformity with the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan, as required by planning law.	201180 (Save Honey Hill Group), 201333 (J Bell), 208975, 208976 (J Williams)

Alignment with existing policy and planning application context: • It is noted that the policy and supporting text seeks to reflect key elements established through the outline planning permissions at Waterbeach New Town. However, there are a number of deviations from that framework which WDC wishes to highlight • Conflicting statements on heritage value, drainage and the use of design codes at phase level are included in the draft. • The requirement for 24 Gypsy and Traveller pitches in Policy S/WNT was not included in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Plan or the Waterbeach SPD and it is unrealistic that these could be delivered under the existing outline planning permissions. • The draft policy's wording that development east of Bannold Drove should be avoided because of flood-risk is inaccurate and fails to recognise relevance of provision within the outline planning permission for Waterbeach and should therefore be deleted. • The Spatial Framework Diagram in the draft plan deviates from the parameter plans in the outline permission and the SPD. • The draft policy makes no mention of any on-going role for the SPD • Omits any reference to the adopted Spatial Development Plan and northern buffer area and fails to capture the transport phasing linked to the A10 corridor. • Land-use allocations are presented as fixed quantities rather than "potential for" values and the policy attempts to protect a private museum, which exceeds the authority's remit.	209202, 209198, 209199, 209200, 209201, 211749, 211750, 211751, 211752 (Urban & Civic), 205116, 206847, 206848, 206849 (Waterbeach Development Company) 210989 (C Newell)
The National Trust considers that Waterbeach could be far better connected to the Wicken Vision Area and Wicken Fen via a foot/cycle bridge over the River Cam which would provide a more direct route via sustainable modes of transport. This development should look beyond its	211080 (National Trust)

boundaries to provide access to the wider landscape, particularly to the east. This should be included in the policy. The National Trust would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further. The National Trust are currently working with partners to deliver a new foot/cycle bridge over Burwell Lode to improve access to the south of Wicken Fen.	
What is the one significant new leisure facility that this site could host, that has easy, frequent, and accessible public transport access, that could otherwise not be located in Cambridge City due to land prices and lack of land availability? Please make provision for this - co-ordinated with the other New Towns so that each place has at least one different facility that the others lack, thus encouraging people from within Cambridge to visit, and ensure that the New Towns are not dormitory towns. Ensure children & teenagers are involved at design stage.	203784 (A Carpen)

Policy S/BA: Bourn Airfield New Village

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The comments are generally supportive, particularly from key stakeholders such as Juniper and Natural England. The overall ambitions of the draft plan, including the growth strategy and the allocation of Bourn Airfield for a new community, are endorsed. However, there is a strong emphasis on ensuring the policy remains fully aligned with the existing outline planning permission, allowing for flexibility as the scheme evolves over time. Respondents call for clearer wording on how the policy will apply alongside extant permissions, and raise concerns about inconsistencies with the spatial framework, including omissions such as access points and a primary school. There is also objection to elements of the policy seen as premature or unjustified, such as the removal of land from the allocation area within the Strategic Enhancement Area and the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller pitch requirements.

A range of site-specific and strategic issues are also highlighted. These include suggestions to strengthen transport provisions—particularly around public transport delivery—and to ensure comprehensive integration of all land parcels, including areas currently excluded from the allocation. Environmental and design considerations are raised, with support for enhanced biodiversity measures such as dark corridors, and calls for improved leisure, retail, and community facilities to avoid creating a dormitory settlement. East West Rail highlighted the relationship of the site with their proposals.

Heritage concerns are also noted, particularly the need to identify and protect nearby listed buildings and conservation areas, supported by appropriate assessment and policy references. More broadly, some respondents question whether the proposed land use mix is appropriate, suggesting alternative approaches such as a stronger focus on employment uses, while The National Trust emphasise opportunities for partnership working to improve sustainable connections to surrounding assets such as the Wimpole Estate.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy has been amended to provide some flexibility around the quantum of homes and commercial floorspace. This enables future development proposals to respond to future needs whilst also ensuring that the policy approach is consistent with the other Local Plan allocations. The policy is broadly consistent with the consented application for the new settlement but has been updated to reflect any recent material considerations. For example, the requirement to form green networks linking with Cambourne North and surveys and mitigation, where needed, to address local bat species in the wider area.

The red line boundary of the allocation does not affect the implementation of the existing planning permission. The 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan identified two boundaries for this site, a larger Strategic Site and the smaller Major Development Site in which the development would take place. The proposed allocation in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan applies a similar approach, with a site allocation for the developable area (previously known as the Major Development Site) and areas for mitigation and enhancement within the Strategic Enhancement Area Policy Area. The policy makes specific reference to the SEA for this site and identifies that it forms an important component of the new village. Therefore, which the role and function of the SEA has been clarified in the policy wording, the Councils have retained the proposed approach for the reasons set out above.

A significant proportion of Bourn Quarter has been built out whilst the remaining plots within the site have planning consent. The councils do not believe that the site needs to be kept within the allocation area, however reference is now made to the policy that the development of Bourn Airfield needs to integrate with this locally important employment site.

Amendments to the indicative spatial framework have been made to reflect the consented development and factual updates to the policy have also been applied.

The Councils have identified a clear housing need for Gypsy and Travellers accommodation and the Council's preferred approach is to address this through a number of ways, including provision at the strategic sites. This is consistent with the previous approach of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and is reflected in the relevant conditions of the planning permission for the site. Policy H/GT sets out the specific requirements for the implementation of this particular policy requirement.

The policy broadly sets out the necessary uses which are required to support this new community, including leisure provision, education facilities and community uses. This will need to be refined through any subsequent planning applications for the site and informed by the latest evidence and any other material considerations. These facilities should be informed by the views of local people, as set out in the NPPF and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, which requires community engagement ahead of the planning application stage. The Councils have a strong track record of encouraging and facilitating youth engagement during the design development stages of planning applications and this is supported by other policies within the Local Plan.

The principle of residential led development at Bourn Airfield as already been established through the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and subsequent planning permission. Additionally, the Councils evidence does not identify a current or future need for

further large-scale retail or employment uses in this location. Therefore, the proposed allocation remains for a residential led mixed use development.

Additional wording has been added to the policy to address the comments relating to ecology and the historic environment.

The comment regarding sustainable connections to The Wimpole Estate and the request for further engagement are noted.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
No comments to make on the policy, which reflects previously agreed policy.	202984 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust)
Juniper supports the overall ambitions of the draft plan including its growth strategy and the inclusion of Bourn Airfield as a site allocation. Policy S/BA should support the delivery of a new community at Bourn Airfield. Juniper supports the overall vision, identity and uses as expressed.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
Policy for this site must be entirely consistent with the outline permission and support its implementation so that new homes can be delivered as soon as possible. The policy must provide for some flexibility to enable the delivery of development on the site to evolve to respond to changes in circumstances that may be encountered over the lifetime of the development of the site, should new planning applications be required.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)

Greater clarity is required, particularly regarding the relationship between the development being implemented in accordance with an existing planning permission and policy which would apply to any new applications.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
The SEA around the developable area should be removed from the Local Plan as it is premature to de-allocate a part of the site that is integral to the whole scheme. These areas already benefit from a consented parameter plan.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
The Spatial Framework for the allocation is not consistent with the outline permission. It should also provide flexibility for future amendments to the layout of the settlement. If retained, it needs to include the correct eastern vehicle access and missing primary school.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
Amendment is needed to public transport section, either to a segregated bus link or equivalent scheduled rapid mass transit. Amendments also needed to reference related to Cambourne to Cambridge as it is not factually correct.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
Bourn Quarter should be reincorporated into the allocation boundary, along with the land outside the Major Development Site area, to ensure a comprehensive approach across all areas and effective integration and connectivity between different uses. It should not be unpicked at this juncture.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
Object to the Gypsy and Traveller approach in the draft plan, which is unsound and should be remedied by provision in forthcoming strategic sites, such as Cambourne North where it can be secured. The reference to Gypsy and Traveller pitches is unsound and should, therefore, be removed from Policy S/BA.	203427 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
What is the one significant new leisure facility that this site could host, that has easy, frequent, and accessible public transport access, that could otherwise not be located in Cambridge City due to land prices and lack of land availability? Please make provision for this - co-ordinated with the other New Towns so that each place has at least one different facility that the others lack, thus encouraging people from within Cambridge to visit, and ensure that the New Towns are not dormitory towns. Ensure children & teenagers are involved at design stage.	203786 (A Carpen)

Develop Bourn Airfield as a retail and Business Park rather than more houses. No provision for entertaining these extra people or providing services for them	207462 (A Parfitt)
Natural England welcomes the strategic priorities of the Local Plan and are pleased to note that the Vision for Greater Cambridge, includes the aspiration for a big decrease in climate and environmental impacts, and increase in the network of nature, wildlife and multi-functional green spaces. We would encourage your authority to add wording to the Nature section of this policy about sensitive lighting strategies and providing dark habitats/corridors where possible, particularly if these can link with those planned in Policy S/CBN, and around the outer edge of the settlement.	207616 (Natural England)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site but there are some grade II barns to the north of the Grange I the Strategic Enhancement Area to the south of the site allocation. Great Common Farmhouse (also grade II listed) lies to the west of the site. Bourn Village and Hall Conservation Area lies to the south of the site. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. There does not appear to be an HIA for this allocation. It is important that the policy identifies on-site and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. Amend policy accordingly. We welcome reference to the grade II listed barns at criterion 9. We recommend that Criterion 9 should also reference Great Common Farmhouse (also grade II listed). Figure 88 This should also identify nearby heritage assets (much as the other Spatial Frameworks do)	210143 (Historic England)
The Wimpole Estate, including Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC/SSSI is located approximately 6km to the south of Cambourne. It will inevitably draw visitors from the new developments at Cambourne and Bourne Airfield. However, it is currently poorly connected to these locations by sustainable transport. Policy S/CBN promotes better connections and sustainable modes of transport to surrounding villages, facilities and open spaces. The National Trust would welcome discussions with the LPA and developers about the opportunity to work in partnership to deliver sustainable transport options between Cambourne/Bourn and Wimpole.	211079 (The National Trust)

Barratt Northampton is currently progressing a Reserved Matters application forming Phase 1 of the Bourn Airfield new settlement. The representations focus solely on the Development Management policies, as they are of direct relevance to the delivery of the Bourn Airfield new settlement.	210501 (Barratt Homes Northampton)
EWR Co is proposing to route the new railway through a mined tunnel under the A428 and the Bourn Airfield site, much of the tunnel is within land that has planning permission. However, part of the tunnel may be located under land identified for mixed use/residential-led development in the land use parameter plan and Spatial Framework. It is important that proposals for any built development above or near to the tunnel are suitable for such a location and would not conflict with or prejudice the delivery of EWR. There may also be a requirement for EWR to utilise land within the site in order to construct the proposed tunnel, mitigate impacts on A428, and/or undertake utilities diversions. To avoid a conflict between the proposed allocation and the EWR Safeguarding Directions, EWR Co requests that draft Policy S/BA is amended in Para 15 and 3.3.110.	211895 (East West Rail)

Summaries of Representations: Sites New Settlements

New Settlements

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments on the new settlements introduction have been grouped to draw out the issues raised.

General comments

Essex County Council welcomed joint working on accessibility and connectivity on the cluster of sites south of Cambridge. National Highways highlighted the need for transport modelling to reflect anticipated development timing. Natural England suggested an alternative approach to the red-line mapping of sites. Historic England highlighted the need for Heritage Impact Assessment to also influence the detailed planning stage of sites. Other comments highlighted the need to consider the landscape impacts of new settlement sites, and it was questioned why site policies did not identify building heights. Comments expressed concern about the qualities of exiting new settlements. Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum raised the importance of building in active travel networks

and connectivity Cambridge Past, Present and Future said that garden town principles should be applied. Cambridge Acre said the development strategy risks drawing investment and services away from existing rural villages. Endurance estates considered they should be supplemented with additional village development sites. Thakeham Homes proposes sites which together would form a major new settlement.

Comments focused on Infrastructure

National Highways highlighted the need for transport modelling to reflect anticipated development timing. Anglian Water Services and NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board identified the need to plan for infrastructure to meet the needs of sites. Other comments were concerned with infrastructure delivery, and the impacts of planned infrastructure.

Comments focused on Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm

Comments expressed concern regarding the proposal, and considered that it should be removed from the local plan. Reasons include: Would create Isolated car reliant community, limited public transport, lack of infrastructure capacity, loss of agricultural land, Impact on water and chalk streams, landscape and visual harm. Site previously rejected, inadequate evidence base to demonstrate benefits. Focus on completing the existing new settlements.

Comments focused on Cambourne

Comments expressed concern about the development being used to help justify East West Rail. It was seen as acknowledgement that failures with the current Cambourne site needed to be rectified. Where Cambourne could attract jobs to go with the homes. Development should not take place until public transport measure are in place.

Comment on Northstowe

One comment requested that land providing green separation and public access should be identified for protection.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

On the general comments, we will continue to engage with adjoining authorities, building on the engagement captured in our statement on duty to cooperate activities. Heritage consideration will be a detailed matter to consider at the planning application stage of the site development process, as will detailed design issues including building heights. The emerging plan includes a comprehensive set of polices to ensure high design quality. Proposals for additional sites have been considered through consideration of the development strategy, and testing of individual site proposes in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.

The Proposed Submission Local Plan is accompanied by further evidence exploring transport infrastructure needs and delivery, which have informed the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Comments on Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm and North Cambourne echo those made against the site policies themselves. Response to issues raised have been provided on against those policies later in this document.

Table of representations

Comments raising general new settlement issues.

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**

ECC notes that the Local Plan states “We also have evidence that locating homes close to existing and proposed jobs at the cluster of research parks to the south of Cambridge would help reduce commuting and associated carbon emissions and congestion”. ECC welcome joint working to ensure consideration is given and actively planned to ensure accessibility and connectivity to key services and facilities that will benefit Cambridgeshire and Greater Essex residents, visitors and those investing in these localities.	210473 (Essex County Council)
We note that some of these allocations SEAs, particularly where SSSIs and other sensitive habitats are within or adjoining the sites. Whilst we welcome this, we also wish to make you aware of the case of Uttlesford District Council (UDC), who took a similar approach, but were directed by the PINS inspector to merge the development and non-development areas into one red line boundary for increased flexibility in masterplanning, in order to overcome constraints. Whilst this may not happen here, it would be prudent to be prepared, and we advise that a minimum buffer area adjacent to SSSIs should be decided upon in case the quantum of Green Infrastructure provision eventually becomes fragmented into smaller parcels across the wider red line boundary. We would be happy to provide more information and discuss this further with your authority in our ongoing meetings.	207608 (Natural England)
For some sites the policy wording states that a Heritage Impact Assessment will be required (e.g. North Cambourne/Grange Farm). This is a helpful requirement, but we suggest adding the words ‘more detailed HIA’, given that an HIA has already been prepared for these sites. The policy should also make clear that the HIA is needed to inform the masterplanning / proposals.	208920 (Historic England)

The policies should set parameters consistently and should respect the rural character of the open countryside. Storey heights do not appear to be controlled at Grange Farm and other new allocated development sites, which would have a significant and potentially detrimental effect on the open countryside. They have been partially set at Bourn Airfield New Village, however, it is unclear why the edge of the settlement is considered important at Bourn but not elsewhere, and why the Local Plan proposes no control over the height of the rest of the development on these very prominent sites in the open countryside.	210987 (C Newell)
The new settlements being proposed on former WW2 airfields are functionally prominent hilltop sites. The current Plan is not sufficiently robust to show this will be achievable sustainably within the environmental thread of sustainability.	210988 (C Newell)
It is unclear why the proposed Spatial Framework plans of these sites have excluded the perimeter buffers, as the Plan should retain control over these. These would be better controlled by inclusion within the site boundary and hatching as non-developable / open space / tree buffer areas as appropriate. The boundaries to these buffers should be reconsidered to be simple and clear to achieve the purposes of buffering and provide most efficient use of land (NPPF129). The development should maintain an area's prevailing character and setting (NPPF129). There are conflicts in the CBA Townscape reports, some of which are significant (such as Great & Little Abington villages having modest prevailing 1½ storey housing and being assessed as 4 storey prevailing heights).	211918 (C Newell)
Other recent large-scale developments, such as Waterbeach, have proved to be unattractive places to live. We are lucky to enjoy village life in a rural setting. A large scale, fairly high-	206600 (A Butchart)

density development so close to us would likely deliver a socioeconomic decline which may negatively affect South Cambridge's status as a sought-after place to live. It may not draw science and technology workers, who, like us, would choose to live elsewhere.	
For new development sites, particularly on the edge of Cambridge, in new settlements, and in the rural southern cluster, CLAF expects: •Early engagement with rights of way teams and access stakeholders during site master planning. •Provision of safe, convenient, coherent and attractive routes that connect new communities to existing path networks, services, public transport nodes and green spaces. •Routes designed to enable a range of non-motorised users, recognising that multi-user access benefits health, wellbeing and social inclusion	208167 (Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum)
Policies should require new settlement to conform with Garden Town Principles as defined by the tcpa (Town and Country Planning Association)	203007 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
The focus on creating well connected, self-sufficient new settlements is positive, but the strategy risks drawing investment and services away from existing rural villages. While strong public transport links to Cambridge are highlighted, there is little reference to how surrounding villages will connect to these new hubs or benefit from new facilities. The cumulative impact on rural roads, health services and schools is not addressed. Stronger rural proofing would include explicit links between new settlements and nearby villages, shared service planning and safeguards to avoid weakening existing rural centres.	203160 (Cambridgeshire ACRE)

South Cambridgeshire is becoming increasingly urbanised and losing its rural character	202427 (P Deer)
My main concerns are as follows: Increased traffic on local roads from the new housing and railway; Destruction of countryside and ancient sites; Cambridgeshire's very poor record on new towns - both Cambourne and Northstowe are cultural deserts with insufficient services and what services they have lagging development; Pressure on local services.	205254 (T Meyer)
Endurance Estates endorses the proposed New Settlement Allocations, including Cambourne North, as these locations represent excellent opportunities to capitalise on recent growth in a way which materially enhances the existing settlements. The new settlements should continue to have a significant role in the delivery of the overall housing need, however, Endurance Estates are of the view that these new settlements should be supplemented by additional development on the edge of Cambridge and within the sustainable villages in the district.	209708 (Endurance Estates)
HELAA Reference 208915, HELAA Reference 208916 and HELAA Reference 208917. Thakeham controls circa 1,800 hectares of land in South Cambridgeshire, located between Shepreth to the east and Kneesworth to the west, that is intended to deliver a zero carbon new town of more than 25,000 new homes, alongside new employment, services, amenities and requisite infrastructure to support a thriving community, the details of which can be found in our accompanying Vision Document. Furthermore, we have the potential ability to increase this to circa. 40,000 homes with the inclusion of the adjacent Ministry of Defence land at Bassingbourn. The 40,000 homes proposed are therefore an upper limit on the	209757 (Thakeham Homes)

potential for Wetherbrook. Wetherbrook New Town will support the growth spirations of the region, providing much needed housing to support economic growth but also provide production and manufacturing facilities, incubator and flexible workspace supporting the life science, biotech and medical sectors.	

Comments on Infrastructure issues

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
It is National Highways understanding that new strategic sites, including North East Cambridge, Grange Farm, Cambridge East and Cambourne construction would be limited until 2032 therefore, National Highways recommend that traffic modelling reflects the expected delivery timescales.	209012 (National Highways)
Please note that specific comments regarding wastewater treatment at our WRCs has already been addressed under Policy S/DS. We support the requirements for a Foul Drainage Strategy to support the delivery of these settlements and consider that this requirement should be consistent across the new settlement policies (dependent of the stage of planning consent each site has progressed to).	210193 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Site allocations lacking explicit on-site health facility requirements should mention the need for financial contributions for health and infrastructure mitigation, aligning with the IDP approach. Engagement with Council Officers during early plan preparation and input into the	205091, 205093 (NHS Cambridgeshire and

Infrastructure Delivery Plan is Welcomed. An additional assessment by the ICB in Stage 2 of the IDP process will provide targeted evaluations of key site allocations and health infrastructure needs	Peterborough Integrated Care Board)
I am concerned about the number of trees and fields that have been used for the new A428 and now for the North west railway. If we keep building on farm land, there won't be enough fields for food and wildlife. As a resident of Papworth Everard, we don't want to be surrounded by roads railway's and housing it's not what we moved to a village for. We have had a lot of upheaval with the new A428 constantly changing and diverting traffic and then it will be the railway.	201170 (T Carter)
Strategic sites: test against lived reality Large allocations must be judged on: • real travel behaviour, • realistic public transport delivery, • and actual timelines — not optimistic assumptions. Development should not proceed where: • key infrastructure is speculative, • impacts are pushed onto existing communities, • or road access is constrained without alternatives. Sustainability that depends on "future fixes" is not sustainability.	208879 (D Smith)

Comments focused on Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The allocation of land at Grange Farm should not proceed. The site is greenfield with negligible connection to existing built up areas. As such any development would result in an	201296 (J McGill)

isolated community heavily reliant on outside resources; it would be strongly car-reliant; it would represent a "foot-in-the-door" for further unsustainable neighbouring development.	
Grange Farm needs to be taken out of the plan and existing new developments e.g. Cambourne, Waterbeach and Northstowe completed. The brownfield site at Cowley Road should be revisited. Grange farm site is on prime agricultural land within the green belt. The proposed urban development, situated on a rise, will dominate the landscape of surrounding local communities and significantly change the character of the area. Other approaches to SCDC's housing requirements can be met as set out in the consultation documents. Grange Farm was previously proposed for development and disregarded by GCSP on the grounds of being unsustainable; there have been no change in circumstances since that decision. No access is proposed between Grange Farm and the A11; additional traffic exiting onto the A1307 will cause increased congestion.	201860 (J Carter)
I find the plan to build 6-8000 new homes on productive farm land a disgrace, we have a population large enough For our fragile infrastructure Hospital at capacity, roads a bloody disgrace, schools at capacity, no appointments at health centres, The proposed development will dominate the landscape and will be visible from as far as Ely, Below the farm land is a chalk Aquifer feeding a chalk stream ,which would be destroyed.	201922 (G Johnson)
This draft Policy relies on a series of unsubstantiated assertions and claims about evidence. There is simply inadequate analysis and information to support what is claimed. This proposed Policy has all the hallmarks of having been added in at a late stage, which is exactly what has happened with the requirement to find additional homes to replace those	203569 (B Haydensmith)

originally in the Plan at the existing wastewater treatment works adjacent to Cowley Road. It is also highly opportunistic, with the unusual situation of one landowner providing an easy alternative for the location of homes the draft Plan seeks to identify	
These public transport-led developments from other new settlement sites all offer a marked contrast to the Grange Farm development, which despite claims that it will be sustainable and served by public transport, falls far short of the above examples. There is an attempt in the Draft Plan to deal with this when it says, “the new settlement will play a critical role extending the South-East Transport Scheme.” This is a highly speculative comment and even if some sort of extension to the main scheme can be provided, would fall far short of the public transport alternatives offered in Cambourne, Northstowe and Waterbeach.	208534 (B Haydensmith)
Grange Farm is severely constrained by major roads (A11 and A1307) and the protected Roman Road. Only one access is proposed—via a new roundabout on the A1307. The proposal lacks proper traffic modelling and data on existing network performance. Comparable settlements with similar or smaller populations have multiple access points. Highways England is unlikely to allow another junction on the A11. Even a link to the Worsted Lodge layby would increase pressure on FourWentways and risk queueing onto the A11. A1307 already carries heavy traffic, including many HGVs, and will face additional pressure from Haverhill’s growth. Queueing from the new roundabout is likely to extend into Little Abington. This will encourage rat running through the village to reach the A11/A505.	208535 (B Haydensmith)
Traffic is increasingly backing up due to congestion near Babraham Research Campus, Fourwentways and queues already extend to the A11/A505 slip roads at peak times. There	208536 (B Haydensmith)

are existing issues on the A505. A505 is highly congested and set to worsen with expansions at the Genome Campus and new housing nearby. Grange Farm traffic will add substantial pressure, with the A505 being the only viable westbound route. The respondent has doubts about the CSET extension. The extension requires crossing the A1307 and a new bridge over the A11—expensive and disruptive. Uncertainty whether this extension will ever be delivered. The respondent has concerns about walking / cycling routes. Only the southern end of the site has a realistically walkable route; northern areas would be too far. The respondent has concerns that the congestion and transport issues cannot be mitigated.	
Criticism that the allocation of this site was driven by the loss of the waste water plant site. This brownfield Cambridge site was ideal for new housing. The housing shortfall is marginal. Excluding the waste water site from future plans is inefficient, especially given likely lower long term costs compared to delivering infrastructure for alternatives like Grange Farm	208537 (B Haydensmith)
Policy S/GF is misaligned with strategic objectives, unsustainable, and transport problematic. The site should be removed and replaced with a better aligned alternative. There is a lack of evidence to allocate this site. There are no sufficient alternative site assessments and better alternatives have been ignored. The claim that proximity to research parks will reduce commuting is unsupported. Evidence shows limited job growth at nearby research parks, many of which already have associated housing allocations. No data is provided on expected travel behaviour or vehicle movement estimates, despite critical transport implications.	208538 (B Haydensmith)

The respondents have concerns about landscape and visual harm. Development would remove productive farmland and dominate gently rising landscape. Intrusive visual impact over a vast area (views as far as Ely Cathedral). High density flats needed due to constrained land area would worsen this impact. The development is too large for the available land, leading to overcrowding and inadequate green buffers. Boundary mitigation is inferior to that of other new settlements. The proposal threatens heritage assets including the Roman Road and Little Abington Conservation Area. Sewage infrastructure proposed on the village side of the A1307 would negatively affect existing residents	208539 (B Haydensmith)
Plan for sustainable travel is unrealistic. Most people working at the science parks already reside within Cambridge, These are unlikely to all relocate to grange farm. The plans for expansion within granta are less than the capacity at grange farm, therefore it is likely that at least some residents will be commuting elsewhere. It also ignores the fact that most families do not just go straight to work, they also need to drop off children. 6000 houses with an average of 1 car per household, commuting between 7-9 would be about 1 car per second being added to the a1307. Changes to plan: If this size project goes ahead, a junction needs to be added to a11 to protect the a1307 and the villages from excessive noise and air pollution from the inevitable congestion. This will also be more suitable for the Lorries for the storage facilities. I think grange farm rather than having a protected strip to the north of the area, should have it to the south along the a1307 so that little abington is not consumed by the new development	202599 (B Stapleton)

and the wastewater that runs off the hill that is planned for grange farm has got somewhere to be absorbed and stops abington being flooded. It will also help to shield grange farm from the noise of the a1307. The sewage works for the new town should not be in little Abington. There is a Bronze Age cemetery at the planned site, it is a danger to the protected chalk stream and destroys the pleasant rural charm of the properties along Bourn bridge road.	

Comments focused on Cambourne and Cambourne North

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The integration of Cambourne North with the existing town would seem not wholly unconnected with rectifying the failures of existing Cambourne (e.g. the lack of a town centre). Whether integration will be “supporting services and facilities“ in anything but the long term seems unlikely (see above). Regarding the “northern forest”, see remarks on Policy S/CBN.	201905 (C Deer)
Building on Currently farmed agricultural land is Wrong in ecological, sustainability, land utilisation and economic terms. The development North of Cambourne towards Elsworth is a prop to help justify the EWR rail line.	205368 (J Daffarn)

EWR has not produced a costed Feasibility forecast or Business plan, and to most local people it is an outrageously expensive white elephant that does not justify a station at Cambourne at all. Without that station there is NO reason for the development area almost linking Cambourne with Elsworth and Knapwell. National need for self-sufficiency means it is madness to lose this area.	
Cambourne North is a new settlement, separated from the existing town by a trunk road and a railway; it is anything but an organic outgrowth of existing Cambourne. The insistence on achieving integration between Cambourne North and the existing town would seem to acknowledge that things were not got quite right before (e.g. the lack of a town centre). Whether integration will be “supporting services and facilities“ in anything but the long term seems unlikely (see above). With regard to the “northern forest”, see remarks on Policy S/CBN.	202344 (P Deer)
The juxtaposition of commercial properties and housing is hoped to create jobs, but the success of attracting skilled jobs remains uncertain based on past experiences in Cambourne.	210451 (P Deer)
I support the expansion of house building in Northstowe, Waterbeach and Cambridge Airport, which are close enough to Cambridge for some people to cycle, which have adequate public transport provision and where it is possible to make further improvements to public transport. However, further expansion of Cambourne (too far from Cambridge and employment centres for most people to cycle, and currently lacking adequate public transport) is unwise until the rail link is in place and this will only create more motor trips into	203292 (J Palmer)

Cambridge, adding to existing congestion along all of the arterial routes into the city from the west – including Barton Rd/A603 where I live.	

Comment on Northstowe

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Northstowe Openspace The Northstowe Site allocation as delineated on the map includes area bounded by Rampton Road, Long Lane, Mills Lane and Woodside (Longstanton Meadows). This area overlaps the Longstanton Conservation Area and forms part of the green separation between Longstanton and Northstowe. It has recently been opened up for public access and provides substantial amenity value for the inhabitants of Longstanton and future inhabitants of Northstowe. It should be removed from the Northstowe Site allocation to make it clear that land to the west of Long Lane is not available for development	201164 (A Helliwell)
Homes England are fully supportive of the continued allocation of Northstowe as a sustainable new town and are committed to its ongoing delivery alongside Greater Cambridge Shared Planning and other key stakeholders. Key to this is ensuring that the existing planning permissions and local plan policy continues to support the delivery of housing and community facilities in the right way and in good time.	203984 (Homes England)

Northstowe is a New Homes Accelerator Site and policy should not introduce complexity or constraints which would slow delivery.	

Policy S/CBN: Cambourne North

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments focused on scale, landscape and transport impacts, and the relationship of the development with surrounding villages. Many respondents emphasise that development north of the A428 represents an excessive expansion into open countryside, eroding rural character and risks overwhelming existing settlements. Concerns highlighted the risk of coalescence with Elsworth, Knapwell, Boxworth and Papworth Everard, with calls for much stronger landscape buffers, early and substantial tree planting, and clearer guarantees that no built development will encroach toward the villages. Several comments also note previous Planning Inspectorate decisions have already identified the site's elevated topography and visibility as highly sensitive, and argue that these constraints have not been adequately addressed.

Environmental and ecological issues were also raised where respondents stress the importance of protecting ancient woodland, arable habitats, and species such as Barbastelle bats, with Wildlife Trust and RSPB highlighting that there should be explicit recognition of ecological constraints, stronger mitigation, and acceptance that off□site compensation is likely to be required. Comments also noted that the proposed "Cambourne Forest" is too narrow, insufficiently defined, or risks becoming tokenistic unless planted early, managed professionally, and expanded to provide meaningful separation and biodiversity gain.

Transport and traffic concerns form one of the largest themes. Respondents highlight the likelihood of significant increases in car journeys, pressure on rural lanes, and rat-running through Elsworth, Knapwell and Boxworth. Many argue that the road network is already inadequate, with narrow bends, congestion, and no capacity for additional flows. Comments call for clearer traffic modelling, early delivery of active travel routes, binding mode-share targets, as well as a bypass for Elsworth. Several comments also questioned whether East West Rail will meaningfully reduce car use, with some questioning the viability of the station itself, the route choice, and the environmental cost of construction.

Infrastructure capacity and phasing were also major concerns. Respondents question whether water supply, drainage, schools, healthcare, emergency services and community facilities can support a development of this scale. Many stress that services must be delivered upfront, not after housing occupation, and that surrounding villages should benefit from S106/CIL contributions. Flooding concerns are prominent, particularly in Elsworth, Conington and Swavesey, with calls for robust attenuation, long-duration storage, and improvements to existing drainage systems.

Comments relating specifically to Elsworth, Boxworth, Knapwell and Papworth Everard emphasise the close proximity of the new settlement, fears of becoming suburbs of an expanded Cambourne and the impact on their conservation areas, historic landscapes and rural lifestyles. Suggested amendments include widening buffers, improving routes around Papworth, restricting access and ensuring that development boundaries are fixed to prevent future creep.

A smaller number of comments address housing numbers, employment provision and overall justification. Some argue that too many homes are proposed, that demand is unproven, or that Cambourne already has unsold properties. Others note that without strong employment strategies the area risks becoming a dormitory settlement, increasing commuting pressures.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The councils have undertaken additional evidence since the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan consultation on a number of themes which were identified in the comments. These relate to landscape, ecology, heritage and transport and are addressed in more detail below and within the Site Allocations Topic Paper.

The Councils have worked in collaboration with the Highways and Transport Authorities as well as National Highways as it has developed additional transport evidence. Through a series of detailed transport modelling exercises, it has been possible to identify the transport implications generated by the development during the plan period and the necessary mitigation measures required to ensure there are no significant adverse impacts on both local roads and the strategic road network (SRN) (A428/A14). This includes active travel (walking and cycling), public transport and access measures both within the site but across the wider local area. At this stage, the transport evidence is not recommending that a by-pass for the northern villages is required. Through this work, the Trip Budget has also been revisited to provide a more accurate limit on the number of peak hour trips that the highways network can accommodate and has also taken into account other development proposals in the local area to understand the cumulative impacts.

The policy requires a number of additional transport assessments to be undertaken as a development proposal is being prepared as part of a planning application. It is at this stage that more detailed testing and transport interventions will be identified and secured. The transport evidence and Local Plan recognise that additional mitigation measures may be necessary beyond the plan period in order to facilitate the full build out of the site.

The comments regarding the East West Rail proposal are noted however this is a project that is not being delivered by the Councils. The Councils are statutory consultees to that project and are also not the determining authority as it is being brought forward as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and will be reviewed and determined by an independent government inspector. The merits of the overall project as well as key decisions relating to costs, route alignment and environmental considerations will be for EWR Co. to set out as part of their NSIP application. The Councils, through this allocation, are seeking to respond to the proposed new railway station at Cambourne in line with the requirements set out in national planning policy.

Through the additional evidence work undertaken, the Councils have revisited the boundaries of the allocation and the supporting Strategic Enhancement Area. The Landscape Visual Appraisal has identified the most visible and therefore sensitive parts of the developable area, and the allocation boundary has been amended by increasing the gap between Cambourne North and Elsworth. There have also been some minor amendments to the boundary near to Knapwell and on the eastern edge of the site. The Landscape Visual Appraisal also identified that the land to the west of the site is less sensitive in landscape terms and therefore this has been included within the development area. Additionally, the Heritage Impact Assessment has also been updated and identifies the necessary mitigation measures required to protect the setting of the adjacent conservation areas.

The matters relating to coalescence have sought to be addressed by the amendments to the allocation red line boundary. Additionally, the policy wording in relation to the role and function of the Strategic Enhancement Area (SEA) has been developed further to provide a clearer indication of the types of uses/activities and mitigation measures that are acceptable within it. The supporting text to the policy identifies that as new types of spaces are delivered within the SEA, these would gain planning status such as Protected Open Space or a Local Wildlife Site.

The phasing of mitigation measures, such as tree planting, will need to be coordinated and phased accordingly. The policy requires this to be set out through a Place Book approach in combination with other studies including a Phasing Strategy and Biodiversity Enhancement, Implementation and Management Plan. Based on the construction rates identified in the Housing Delivery Study, it is anticipated that Cambourne North will continue to be built over several decades, providing sufficient time for landscape mitigation measures to be implemented and for them to become established. Given the scale of the Cambourne North SEA and the opportunities it presents, there is significant potential for a forest to be provided in this location as part of a mosaic of landscape typologies. The allocation also recognises the RSBP Hope Farm and seeks to further their environmentally friendly approach to arable farming within the SEA.

Whilst the allocation will reduce the amount of arable farmland in this location, the policy seeks to minimise this through compact forms of development, focused around the proposed railway station and key areas of activity within the development. It also supports the continuation of farming within the SEA.

Whilst the site contains some Public Rights of Way, much of the land north of the A428 is not publicly accessible. The policy wording requires publicly accessible spaces and footpaths to be provided within the SEA.

Cambourne North contains and is adjacent to a number of ecologically sensitive and important sites, including Ancient Woodland and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). As part of the additional evidence undertaken, the councils have engaged with local and national bodies and organisations including the RSPB, Wildlife Trust and Natural England to develop an evidence led approach to protecting existing sites, habitats and species and identifying the necessary policy requirements which will inform future planning

applications within the site. This includes management and monitoring requirements, the provision of new woodland buffers around protected sites, dark corridors across the site to form part of a wider ecological network and minimum buffer zones around sites and existing vegetation which are in excess of national standards. The existing ecological assets and the necessary mitigation and enhancement measures form a key element of the updated Spatial Framework and policy wording.

The timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure will be required to support the development. This relates to all forms of infrastructure, including transport, water, sewage, community and cultural facilities and education. This is required in the policy to align with the phasing of development and agreement will need to be sought with the relevant bodies/authorities during the planning application process. Currently, no development is anticipated to come forward at Cambourne North until 2032 when there is sufficient water capacity to serve the development. The policy identifies the broad infrastructure areas that will need to be delivered through the development of the site, informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. However, this will need to be kept under review based on the emerging land uses, quantum and housing mix. The Councils will continue to keep under review the most appropriate way to secure financial contributions from development across Greater Cambridge.

Known areas of flood risk have been taken into account through the updated evidence, all of which fall outside of the developable area. The policy wording in relation to the SEA notes that this area would need to address flooding issues and the policy now addresses site specific flooding requirements. In addition, Policy CC/FM: Managing flood risk sets out clear requirements for new development proposals.

The Councils are required by national planning policy to meet their identified housing needs through the preparation of the Local Plan. Cambourne North contributes towards meeting the need during the plan period but the policy looks beyond 2045 to set out

the council's longer-term aspiration for the town. The introduction of new transport projects as well as a wide range of services and facilities as part of Cambourne North will continue to make this location a desirable location for people to live, work and visit.

The policy sets an ambitious but realistic amount of new commercial floorspace for the development but notes that the councils would broadly support more employment development subject to meeting policy tests. This also does not include wider employment opportunities generated by the development such as construction, retail and supporting services like education.

The Councils agree that new developments should be multi-generational and designed to accommodate the needs of everyone. This is supported by a range of policies across the Local Plan including the design of new homes and public spaces.

The councils, through the Cambourne Spatial Options Assessment (2025) and Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (2026) rejected the option to develop to the south of the existing town and subsequently the sites in this location due to their suitability. Additionally, other sites submitted to the councils as part of the Local Plan process have been considered through the HELAA.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support • Very positive step for my children and those growing up here. • Development feels proportionate and rational.	**Individuals:** 203676 (N Woods), 201414 (J Carey), 200987 (R Howard)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The site of Cambourne North is appropriate for new development provided EW Rail proceeds. If it does proceed there would be less need for the busway via Coton. • Site can be extended westwards, utilising the remaining land between the A428 and the East West Rail corridor up to the new junction between the A428 and the A1198. • Plans attached to representations show potential additional development areas to the west which Endurance consider to be suitable for development and potential additional access from the new A428 / A1198 Junction currently under construction and utilising land under Endurance Estates' control. • Provision of new development both to the north and south of Cambourne, would have substantial benefits in sustainability terms and boosting housing supply in the short term, and that it is clearly the most suitable option when considered against the alternatives. • Commend strategic vision for promoting balanced growth by increasing sustainable employment opportunities alongside residential development, reducing car reliance, and supporting sustainable transport. • Emphasis on low-carbon development and biodiversity net gain is seen as a positive reflection of national priorities.	**Other organisations:** 204152 (Endurance Estates), 204253 (Richborough), 205149 (Taylor Wimpey East Anglia), 205158 (Taylor Wimpey East Anglia), 207609 (Natural England), 209976 (Endurance Estates), 211892, 211887 (East West Rail Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Welcome positive approach taken to shaping and planning this new settlement so far, and we will continue to work with you as you develop and refine the policies around this allocation. • Endurance strongly support and welcome the identification of Cambourne North as a New Settlement proposal with scope to contribute significantly to Greater Cambridge's long term housing needs over the Plan period and beyond. Taken together with the existing Cambourne settlement, the combined new town will have sufficient critical mass to enable it to support a wide range of employment, retail, leisure, cultural and other services and facilities that will ensure it can become a desirable, vibrant and sustainable place to live and work. • EWR Co strongly supports the proposed allocation and spatial framework and the vision for Cambourne North which aligns with an EWR station at Cambourne and which will maximise the benefits of this highly sustainable location served by the new station and EWR services. EWR Co agrees that the EWR project will make the town one of the 'best-connected places in the region', providing an opportunity to grow and enhance the town and increase the critical mass of population, employment and services available to the existing and future communities in the area.	
General	**Individuals:**

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
General concerns raised about proposed new settlement: • Sprawl of development across A428 • Increase in crime • Doesn't fit in with plans for neighbouring settlements • How will developers be stopped from building poor quality homes • Build on brownfield sites rather than agricultural land • Prime agricultural land would be lost • Increased noise and light pollution • Development north of A428 previously been refused by Planning Inspectorate due to planning constraints and negative landscape impact • Focus on urban agglomerations and interests of rural South Cambridgeshire subservient • Policy should be strengthened to ensure Cambourne evolves into a cohesive town rather than a series of fragmented developments. • Comprehensive masterplan is essential. • Must prioritise seamless integration to prevent physical and social severance caused by the A428, • Integration with Cambourne impossible due to A428 barrier and EWR	201318 (M Meyer-Kelly), 201426 (E Chavida), 201496 (V Lebedeva), 201502 (C Meads), 201546 (L Payne), 201680 (C Davies), 201771 (I Claydon), 201807 (K Rhodes), 201877 (M Goldberg), 201891 (C Deer), 201953 (R Milns), 202000 (I Claydon),202027 (D Askew), 202161 (H Fordham), 202280 L Meyer), 202322 (P Deer), 202348 (C Farquharson-Robert), 203332 (R Jamieson), 203562 (D Pope), 203605 (R Askham), 203639 (J Tanner), 204236 (G Tanner), 204531 (I Chamberlain), 204656 (N Woods), 204710 (H Rhodes), 204776 (C Drummond), 204782 (I Maddison), 204964 (M Jordan), 205506 (D Brown), 205184 (J Cowdrey), 205189 (L Hanzi),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Reliance on higher density housing and specific requirements for the applicant to address integration issues is viewed as inadequate. • Environmental damage that may result from the development, is suggested to be justified by anticipated economic benefits. • Danger of failing the tests of “scale…appropriate to the location” “protect and enhance local features of green space”, “landscape” and “the necessary infrastructure capacity to support the development” • Plan lacks detail. • Houses aren’t being built close enough to the main part of Cambourne for it to be connected, • Houses will be of poor quality and with no or little gardens and what green space there is supposed to be won’t be looked after properly. • Essential that existing and future growth, and the implications on wider area, are taken into consideration, with any required mitigation identified and planned for from the outset. • Overly vague and the proposed Cambourne North development is excessively large. • Vital information is missing throughout draft plan, hindering consultees' ability to make informed decisions. The plan lacks transparency and has not provided meaningful information to local communities about the proposal's full impact.	205369 (S Keep), 205592 (E & J King), 205594 (I Chamberlain), 204656 (N Woods), 204765 (K Seifert), 205023 (J Cowdrey), 207404 (N Woods), 204795, 208652 (C Drummond), 208703 (J&C Collins), 211212 (C Askham), 211215 (C Askham) **Other organisations:** 202124 (Elsworth PC), 203016 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 204226 (Richborough), 204655 (Papworth Everard Parish Council), 204951 (Papworth Everard Parish Council), 204957 (Papworth Everard Parish Council), 205149 (Taylor Wimpey East Anglia), 206106 (Elsworth Parish Council), 207070 (Cambourne Town Council),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Based on scant research with dubious projections around, for example, expected employment figures in Cambridge and the requirement for more housing. • No consideration of development and impact of AI. • Building heights must be tightly controlled and not exceed reasonable heights for a rural setting • Development scope should meet local, not national needs • GCP has not complied with its duty to co-operate (SCI). Has been no engagement with Papworth Everard Parish Council despite being a statutory consultee for planning applications and an important stakeholder that is materially affected by what is proposed by GCP. • Should establish point of contact for local residents during large developments to help address concerns and keep community informed. • Not easy to accept such a significant impact this proposal will have on everyone. • Naming of Cambourne North and Cambourne Forest is seen as inappropriate; suggestions include New Elsworth or Elsworth South. • Should insist on solar panels on all utility buildings to help achieve net zero. • Expansion entering new territories of farmland and countryside which should be left alone. Cambourne getting too big for unnecessary reasons. This settlement needs to be stopped.	207074 (Cambourne Town Council), 208257 (Martin Grant Land Limited), 208500 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 208503 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 208504 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 208505 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 209332 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 209979 (Endurance Estates), 209980 (Endurance Estates), 209988 (Endurance Estates), 209989 (Endurance Estates), 209992 (Endurance Estates, 209999 (Endurance Estates), 210004 (Endurance Estates), 210005 (Endurance Estates), 210008 (Endurance Estates), 210020 (Endurance Estates),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Should include environmentally friendly houses with solar panels, heat pumps, and trees along roads, prioritising sustainability and nature. • If the space between the A428 and the railway is wide enough to allow playing fields, the distance between Cambourne South and Cambourne North makes it very difficult to envisage how the communities can be integrated. • Requires stronger policy wording, clearer evidence, and binding commitments on various issues before it can be supported. • Community led stewardship / strategy bodies must include the surrounding villages as equal partners with resources allocated to the village bodies to enable this democratic equality. The new development must be of benefit to all, not just the railway and builders. • For each section of the proposals, complete a 1 to 10 scoring system which summarises the real confidence of the writers of these plans that the promises they speculate on will be: 1 legally committed to by developers and other bodies responsible for this area without any future retraction/renegotiation 2. 100% funded long term after allowing for contingencies/inflation 3. Of genuine benefit to existing residents in the area 4. All will be sustainable and funded for at least 25 years ahead 5. The additional wealth created will be retained for the benefit of the local communities affected in the form of quality schools, doctors, emergency services,	210022 (Endurance Estates), 210025 (Endurance Estates), 210030 (Endurance Estates), 210044 (Endurance Estates), 210058 (Endurance Estates), 210063 (Endurance Estates), 210064 (Endurance Estates), 210066 (Endurance Estates), 210067 (Endurance Estates), 210068 (Endurance Estates), 210830 (Elsworth Parish Council), 210831 (Elsworth Parish Council), 211412 (CALA Group Ltd), 211594 (Places for People), 211721 Cambourne Town Council), 209331 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
care homes etc as well as the quality Forest. 6.Timescales .Any promise must be qualified with a score. • Rise in crime associated with more people and lack of activities. • Will have massive impacts on surrounding villages, with potential benefits like improved bus services, but also significant adverse effects and inadequate mitigation measures. • Plan addresses well-being and social inclusion, but Cambourne North may face social and behavioural challenges due to its scale and development pace. • Land north of A428 is in Elsworth not Cambourne. • Land to the South of Lower Cambourne presents a viable option for immediate development, requiring less infrastructure and allowing for short to medium-term growth. • Planned development is far too large for the locality and if it does go ahead should be reduced in scale. • Insufficient discussion about the very significant impact of a prolonged construction phase on existing residential communities. • Encourage LPA to provide clear guidance on phasing and infrastructure delivery to ensure timely provision of transport and community facilities.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Some of our residents, businesses and other bodies, benefits could flow from the location of a station for Cambourne and the creation of a new centre for the town north of the A428. • Concern how North Cambourne will operate as part of a single, coherent town, particularly given physical barrier created by the A428. • Architectural approach for North Cambourne must be sensitive to established character and identity of Cambourne and wider Cambridgeshire context and should inform scale, materials, proportions and public realm. • Overly distinctive or self-contained architectural theme risks creating an isolated development that feels disconnected from the existing town and would be inappropriate for new development. • Should adopt an architectural language that respects local history and townscape, demonstrated through a context-led, human-scale set of Design Codes. • MGL have provided a series of recommendations and suggestions in relation to the policy wording, supporting text and Spatial Framework diagram of Policy S/CBN. • Will contribute to food insecurity. • Endurance object to proposed site allocation boundary. It is too prescriptive at this stage and insufficient work / evidence has been undertaken/provided on key constraints such as landscape and heritage to support such a precise approach. This	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
is a long-term development that will take place over decades, and greater flexibility is therefore required to enable proposals to respond to more detailed assessment and masterplanning along with changes in circumstances over time. Consistent with policies in the Adopted Local Plans, we feel that the scheme should be design led and that the Concept Spatial Framework is too prescriptive at this early stage in process. • Considered that there is scope to extend development framework further west whilst still maintaining a suitable buffer to Papworth to the north west and without unduly impacting on known constraints or aspirations for Strategic Enhancement Area. This is illustrated through the additional areas shown in orange on the attached Masterplan Spatial Framework Strategy (Drawing Ref: 19-237-SGP-STE-XX-DR-A-011003-P03), which shows potential additional development areas to the west which Endurance consider to be suitable for development as part of the Cambourne North proposals. • Important that masterplanning approach learns lessons from original Cambourne settlement by not making neighbourhoods too separate from one another as this can reduce community cohesion and walkability. • Number or neighbourhood centres, their composition, mix of uses, scale, and timing of their delivery needs very careful consideration to ensure they are vibrant and integrated parts of the new community. This should be evidence driven and determined at the masterplanning stage and secured through appropriate	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
conditions/legal obligations. This detail should therefore be left to masterplan and planning application stage. • Getting right balance between homes and jobs is essential to creating a mixed and balanced community that its prosperous and has a high degree of self-containment. The town's accessibility by rail and strategic highway network provides an opportunity to be more ambitious in order to achieve the prosperous, thriving community set out within the overall vision. • Whilst there are a number of constraints as identified within the policy, these have been taken into account through the concept masterplanning work to date and it is considered that there is sufficient land within the site to allow for appropriate buffers to the relevant designations and protected features to be delivered. • It is important that flexibility is maintained on the precise boundaries of the development areas to ensure these can be adjusted to reflect more detailed assessment and design work as the design of the scheme progresses. • Endurance support need for various strategies to be developed based on robust evidence to inform overarching approach to land use and to ensure that a mixed, balanced, prosperous and sustainable new settlement is achieved. Accordingly, Endurance support in principle the need for a report covering an Intergenerational Housing Strategy to inform the level of housing typologies to meet the local need.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Endurance also support in principle the provision of a report covering a Place Activation, Culture and Events Strategy. • Endurance consider there is a degree of overlap between a number of requirements for supporting evidence and that some rationalisation of policy requirements would be beneficial to ensure a more streamlined and legible application submission. • Endurance support provision of mixture of densities within site, with highest focussed around proposed new station and Town Centre. Neighbourhood centres and employment locations whilst being higher in density than most of the site are likely to be at a lower density than the Station Quarter and Town Centre given their less fee central location and function. • Part 14c) Whilst Endurance understand the need to deliver higher density development to make best use of land, this should not compromise the objective of creating a high-quality new community with design that responds to its setting and constraints and a range of house sizes and house types to meet a variety of needs. It is considered that the density range proposed is ambitious, and with a narrow range that is too limited and risks being unduly prescriptive. This could inhibit the place-making aspirations, resulting in a homogeneous development, lacking character and variety, or worse, render development unviable before the development even gets underway.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Part 16) Endurance agree with general intent and consider that it is important that residential neighbourhoods provide a coherent built form that creates a distinct character for the different neighbourhoods. Whilst aspiration to incorporate complementary employment uses in each neighbourhood is generally supported, it is considered that some flexibility should be built into the policy through addition 'where possible'. This will allow a more flexible and evidence led approach, reflecting needs and the character of each area. • Part 33c) Endurance support and welcome a holistic approach to Cambourne's environmental, economic, social sustainability. Important that balanced approach is taken to prioritising these aspects of sustainability to ensure successful, vibrant economically viable, attractive and sustainable new settlement is created. • Part 45) Endurance are generally supportive of the principles set out and agree with the need to develop a sustainability focussed masterplan. Important that the aspirations are realistic. It should be noted that the policy context may no longer be applicable in light of proposed revisions to the NPPF. • Part 48) Whilst the ambition of achieving a highly sustainable new town is supported, further consideration of the feasibility and viability of the specific requirements is required, particularly as these go far beyond existing legislative and policy requirements. Endurance consider it important that the policy allows for flexibility, particularly in the earlier stages of the development recognising how requirements	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
and technologies will change over the 30-year implementation period. The requirement for rigid compliance to 'day 1' principles may otherwise impact viability and prevent delivery of the wider scheme. Also considered that there is unnecessary overlap and duplication with point (45) above. • Part 49) Endurance support this approach and consider that a clear phasing strategy that sets out the phased delivery of infrastructure and services alongside the delivery of new housing, commercial and other uses is essential to the successful delivery of the project. It should be recognised that this may need adapting and adjusting over time in response to changes of circumstances given the long-term nature of the development. • Part 51) Endurance support this approach in principle and consider it important to ensuring the long-term successful delivery and ongoing management of the new town, ensuring that its benefits are maximised and will endure for future residents over the long term. • Part 52) Endurance support the preparation of a Meanwhile Strategy in general terms subject to incorporating the proposed report into a more general Economic and Employment Strategy to also include inter alia measures to avoid empty or unused spaces and facilities, and to ensure early provision of amenities and facilities that foster a culture of inclusivity and encourage early community building.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Part 53) Endurance support this approach and consider that this is essential to the successful delivery of the project. • Will give rise to issues of local governance. While development will take place within the parishes of Elsworth and Knapwell, Cambourne North will presumably fall under the aegis of Cambourne Town Council. What this mean for the continued existence of the parishes thereafter and how will they benefit from, for example, s106 monies also needs to be clarified at the earliest opportunity. Do not only wish to have put in place measures to mitigate the impacts of development. We also want to realise benefits for our communities from them, particularly in relation to improvements in infrastructure such as flood management, bus services, digital connectivity, etc. • Continued engagement by SCDC with our community/ communities is vital. EWR and Cambourne's growth is part of the Oxford to Cambridge corridor national infrastructure project involving stakeholders other than the parishes and the District Council and also the DCO process. Our small community/communities we have no direct interaction and little influence in these and look to the SCDC to represent our interests and therefore we welcome and wish to continue to have dialogue with SCDC. • Whilst this Government is fully committed to the delivery of East West Rail, there are no guarantees that a future government would be as committed. Emerging Local Plan	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
should focus more growth in Rural/Minor Rural Centres, which are considered sustainable, such as Melbourn. • East West Rail will be complicated to deliver and it is not feasible for Cambourne North to be delivered until such time as the new rail line and station have been completed. Accounting for the substantial uncertainty and major infrastructure required, it is plausible that delivery of the site could slip into the 2040s and the number of dwellings to be delivered as part of this plan period will be very limited. In this regard, the proposed 2,550 dwellings to be delivered in Cambourne North within this plan period is considered to be optimistic. The lack of certainty regarding the delivery of Cambourne North further strengthens arguments for additional small-to medium site allocations. • Inclusivity must be designed into all aspects of development if North Cambourne is to achieve a genuine place-making outcome. Provision should be made for all life stages. Designing inclusivity into developments from the outset is more effective and significantly more cost efficient than attempting to retrospectively add or adapt features once homes and spaces are already built. LPAs must adopt M4(2) standards, and M4(3) for wheel-chair accessible homes and the Plan must clearly address these standards. • The policy must be strengthened to ensure that Cambourne evolves into a cohesive, successful town rather than a fragmented series of developments. The policy should	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
ensure that Cambourne North is not merely an add-on, but a vital component of a well-integrated, economically vibrant, and self-sustaining town, providing a balance of jobs, services and housing.	
Transport and traffic • Significant number of car journeys generated. • Increased traffic through villages to north to reach A14. • Village roads are inadequate and no proposals for increased capacity. • Impact of new housing at Cambourne North, Bourn and continued development of Northstowe on highway infrastructure around the Swavesey area. • Insufficient consideration of traffic impact on local roads, particularly affecting communities along the A1198, including villages like Longstowe, Arrington, and Kneesworth. • Lack of provision for safe and sustainable alternative transport options along the A1198 corridor. • Little appreciation that for many people use of a vehicle a necessity • There are no cycle paths in villages. • This is the way the village has always been. We do not want to be beside a huge town. This is not what we bought into moving here. The distance of greater	**Individuals:** 200992 (T Roberts), 201325 (M Lester), 201495 (J Brinkman), 203639 (J Tanner), 201411 (Cllr P Sandford), 201452 (C Barnard), 201453 (C. Barnard), 201454 (P Deer), 201486 (E & J King), 201749 (S Barnard), 201680 (C Davies), 201770 (G O'Connell), 201757 (P Safranek), 201759 (N Safranek), 201768 (R Crowther), 201775 (D Meyer), 201786 (J Bennison), 201797 (N Hall), 201807 (K Rhodes), 201911 (W Parker), 201914 (C Deer), 201953 (R Milns),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambourne is coming far too close and will impact the rural feel and traffic through the village • Development must unlock better walking, cycling and public transport for existing residents • Current road congestion is already severe, and claims of excellent connectivity are unrealistic. • Traffic calming measures is not a viable solution. • Need more details on traffic management. • Should be binding transport mode share targets. • Insufficient evidence that active travel and public transport will reduce car use. • Active travel and improved bus services welcomed, but do not meet all residents' travel needs. • Those requiring access to distant destinations or carrying goods. • Robust assessment of traffic flows through Elsworth and surrounding areas is lacking. • Need faster / easier connection to A14W. • Absence of traffic plan to handle extra traffic. • Need more station parking. • Need diversion road needed for local villages for railway traffic. • Unrealistic to expect new residents to not own cars.	202006 (D Langley), 202027 (D Askew), 202189 (M Stevenson), 202280 (L Meyer), 202901 (J Williams), 202348 (C Farquharson-Robert), 202441 (P Deer), 203208 (S Hughes), 203562 (D Pope), 203572 (A Pope), 203573 (G Pope), 203599 (J Fordham), 203602 (H Passan), 230674 (C Roberts), 203702 (S Wyer), 203834 (N Thornton), 203840 (A Chan), 203896 (R Chamberlain), 203981 (L Richards), 204095 (C Davies), 204100 (N Turton), 204141 (R McClure), 204526 (I Claydon), 204602 (A Watson), 204604 (R Hoadley), 204607 (D Potts), 204656 (N Woods), 204952 (C Gouldsbrough), 207403 (N Woods), 205165 (J Grantham), 205189 (L

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Already traffic delays in Elsworth at peak times. • Traffic volume on Brockley Road, Elsworth has increased significantly, causing difficulties for residents turning onto the road, especially during peak hours. • Cambourne crossing two major roads is illogical from an urban planning perspective and creates divided car bound communities further increasing traffic. • Limit car access between Cambourne and Cambourne North. • Should enable improved active and public transport links for current residents, with binding mode share targets, early delivery of the active travel network, and restrictions on car access between Cambourne and Cambourne North. • Cumulative impact of consented and proposed development required. • Public transport proposals are uncertain and unlikely to reduce car use. • Area's sustainable transport options and liveability must be improved. • Urge council to ensure that the "high quality public transport route" provides good coverage at reasonable times. • Local villages should have relief roads before development commences. • Sustainable transport infrastructure needs to be in place early. • Road network needs careful planning. • Reconsider the reliance on private transport for reducing CO2 emissions.	Hanzi), 205307 (C Smith), 205441 (A Williams), 205446 (R De Beaux), 205507 (D Brown), 207382 (C Deer), 207396 (L Skerritt), 207403 (N Woods), 207460 (L Payne), 207466 (A Mitchell), 208609 (Quod), 208642 (S Keep), 208643 (S Keep), 208644 (S Keep), 204264 (J Brown), 202158 (M Shrosbree), 202495 (G Stevenson), 204236 (G Tanner), 204782 (I Maddison), 204817 (J Harris), 202517 (H Brown), 202610 (J Rolfe), 202740 (L Turton), 207422 (N Thornton), 207767 (R McClure), 207768 (R McClure), 208018 (P Crisp), 208708 (J&C Collins), 209350 (D Pope), 209361 (B Skerritt), 209365 (C Roberts), 209456 (C Davies), 211214 (C Askham),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The proposed 'Landbridge' would need to be enormous to be effective and I can't locate it on the plan. • Requirement to 'consider connections to all parts of Cambourne and to surrounding villages' runs counter to the no-coalescence argument • We are concerned that these roads should not become greater rat-runs to the new station and development. Elsworth and Knapwell village roads cannot cope with current levels of traffic. • Policy currently focuses on travel between Cambourne and Cambourne North, neglecting traffic routes through Elsworth and the implications of relocating the rail station. • Lacks sufficient measures to mitigate traffic impacts through the villages, with reliance on traffic calming measures deemed inadequate without more effective solutions. • Connections between North Cambourne and existing areas of Cambourne require detailed review and careful design to prioritise permeability, legibility, and safety for all users • There is little detail on roads which will be used for traffic to and from the railway station and Cambourne centre as well as local traffic. A bypass or similar is necessary for Elsworth. Current roads are totally unsuitable.	**Organisations:** 203076 (Swavesey PC), 203438 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited), 203608 (British Horse Society), 206107 (Elsworth Parish Council), 206108 (Elsworth Parish Council), 206111 (Elsworth Parish Council), 208637 (Swavesey PC), 211078 (National Trust), 207070 (Cambourne Town Council), 207072 (Cambourne Town Council), 207078 (Cambourne Town Council), 207079 (Cambourne Town Council), 207080 (Cambourne Town Council), 208036 (Railfuture East Anglia), 208500 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 208503 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 208504 (Central

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Expansion must unlock better walking, cycling and public transport for existing residents • Limit car access between Cambourne and Cambourne North. Set binding mode share targets. • Require early delivery of the main active travel network and crossings • With 13,000 homes and an estimated 1.5–2 cars per household, this equates to around 19,500 additional cars. If just 5% pass through Elsworth, Boxworth or Knapwell, that is approximately 975 extra vehicles. • Assumed that budget of 2,500 trips in peak hours relies on significant investment in sustainable transport, which although proposed, cannot be guaranteed to be the preferred method of travel for future occupiers. • Reservations about assumption as it appears to suggest what the modelling says the network can accommodate, rather than the result any sustainable transport interventions might have. • Further work needed in relation to traffic impacts of combined proposals at Cambourne on local and strategic road network, both within and beyond the Greater Cambridge area. Given proximity of the proposals to Central Bedfordshire, essential that CBC are engaged in process as soon as possible, so we can help to identify the issues arising within our administrative area, understand the implications for our	Bedfordshire Council), 208505 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 209001 (National Highways), 209002 (National Highways), 209003 (National Highways), 209004 (National Highways), 209996 (Endurance Estates), 209997 (Endurance Estates), 209998 (Endurance Estates), 210028 (Endurance Estates), 210028 (Endurance Estates), 210029 (Endurance Estates), 210045 (Endurance Estates), 210046 (Endurance Estates), 210047 (Endurance Estates), 210048 (Endurance Estates), 210049 (Endurance Estates), 210050 (Endurance Estates), 210051 (Endurance Estates), 210052 (Endurance Estates),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
residents and communities, and help to identify where, and the extent to which, mitigation is required. • There is no clear consideration of the increased traffic through peripheral villages, particularly northern, that this will generate. This will come through its employment zone, cultural zone and as a dormitory town for any industrial sites, particularly those being developed along A14. • Policy S/CBN promotes better connections and sustainable modes of transport to surrounding villages, facilities and open spaces. The National Trust would welcome discussions with the LPA and developers about the opportunity to work in partnership to deliver sustainable transport options between Cambourne/Bourn and Wimpole. • Motorised quick access routes North/South for aged people/ambulances/police/fire etc across or into new development facilities not shown. • Clarification requested on vehicle trip budget referenced in policy in terms of whether this evidence base has already been prepared and is available to review or, if not, confirmation on when it will be produced. • New transport and active travel infrastructure linking Cambourne North with Cambourne, surrounding villages and the wider countryside should be required to function as inclusive, multi-user routes, accommodating pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian.	210053 (Endurance Estates), 210054 (Endurance Estates), 210055 (Endurance Estates), 210056 (Endurance Estates), 210517 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 210811 (Elsworth Parish Council), 210812 (Elsworth Parish Council), 210813 (Elsworth Parish Council), 210814 (Elsworth Parish Council), 211776 (Camcycle)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Concerned that existing and already-committed transport improvements—such as the Cambourne–Cambridge bus service and other measures intended to address current transport pressures—could be delayed or deprioritised as a result of the scale of new development. These commitments must be delivered as planned and not deferred. • Essential that parking strategy is fully future-proofed and grounded in realistic patterns of behaviour rather than idealised assumptions about modal shift. • Parking provision must reflect actual car ownership levels, household composition, servicing and delivery requirements, and transitional period before public transport and active travel networks are fully mature. • Any parking strategy must be supported by a clear, deliverable, and enforceable management framework, aligned with Cambridgeshire County Council parking guidance and regularly reviewed against observed demand rather than projected best-case scenarios. Failure to plan for realistic parking demand from the outset would create long-term pressures on the public realm and undermine the overall success of the development. • The Cambridge to Cambourne busway should be extended to directly serve Cambourne station enabling high quality bus services between Cambourne railway station and existing parts of Cambourne and the proposed Bourn Airfield housing allocation.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• As currently drafted, Cambourne appears likely to bring significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impacts on the safe and efficient operation of Cambourne Junction on the A428. The Transport Evidence Report identifies that there is still significant congestion on the highway network (with DS2 proposed improvements) around the site meaning that the model suggests high levels of trips will still remain within the sector. • National Highways are unable to agree to the proposed approach (managing SRN impacts through an indicative trip budget prior to an outline application) at this stage without the benefit of further modelling work for the proposed development. If a trip budget is to be proposed this needs testing within an operational model, with detailed timings/parameters identified and a monitoring approach agreed to enable NH to confirm whether proposals are deliverable in SRN terms. As identified in Circular 01/22, SRN capacity enhancements need to be identified as part of the plan making process, because this provides the best opportunity to consider the cumulative impacts of development and identify appropriate mechanisms for delivery. • National Highways endorse the Local Plan work on 'Transport Vision and Principles' for Cambourne. We support the report's identified next steps, highlighting that additional work is required to consider achievability of vision assumptions and to ensure a robust evidence base is established to support a site allocation of this	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
significance; we note that even with an ambitious shift to alternative modes demand still exceeded the trip budget. • The emerging Local Plan text and Figure 78 identify a number of additional active travel crossings over the A428, with mention of potential bus provision in associated documents. We recommend further discussion with National Highways regarding emerging crossing locations / existing bridge improvements to consider feasibility and to ensure suitable commitments and costings are included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It may be practical, demonstrated through further modelling work, to consider the need for additional A428 bridge crossing options for private cars, to remove local trips from Cambourne Junction. • Support proposed approach which seeks to integrate the two halves of settlement and consider this to key design challenge for the scheme. A key aspect to this will be maximising potential crossing points across the A428 and future East West Rail, both in terms of road and pedestrian & cycle routes to ensure effective integration. Character and usability of these links will also be important to promote integration. • Comprehensive Transport and Movement Strategy for town as a whole is required which will integrate both the existing and new community with one another and with the planned improvements to be delivered through East West Rail and the C2C Busway.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Benefits of addressing existing transport and movement challenges with existing Cambourne community are plentiful but particularly manifest in the consideration and setting of a trip budget where the shifting of existing trips is a lever which North Cambourne can use effectively. • The trip budget needs to be better evidenced through detailed and collaborative further working before specificity can be provided and agreed. Monitor and Manage can be employed effectively to ensure compliance through scheme delivery but this control mechanism should also be used to ensure the scheme's Vision is being met. It is considered that Monitor and Manage is the mechanism to ensure preferable outcomes. • Part 18) Endurance consider that wording and interpretation of policy is unclear and whether it is referring to the approach into the town from Elsworth to the north or into the existing part of the town from Cambourne North. It is also unclear why this route should be a focus over others. Further clarity in the wording of the Policy is requested. • Support need to ensure necessary mitigation from A428 and East West Rail and consider the appropriate location of employment uses of one means of securing this. • Part 34) Endurance broadly support proposed policy approach as currently set out and consider that it establishes appropriate principles for the movement strategy.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Policy wording should be adjusted to specifically reference a Vision-led approach for the transport and movement strategy for Cambourne North. • Part 36) Endurance consider that reference to delivery of landbridge being in the early phases of the development should be removed to provide more flexibility. Further consideration of this requirement is required in terms of how this might work and when it could reasonably be delivered having regard to both placemaking and viability considerations. In any event, it is considered that further flexibility is required as to the nature of this and the timescales for delivery. • Part 37) Endurance support the proposed approach in principle, and consider that it is important that the design encourages walking and cycling and makes appropriate provision for active travel throughout both within the settlement itself and through its connections with the existing community, surrounding villages and providing appropriate access to the countryside. • Part 38) Endurance consider proposed policy approach as currently set out is too prescriptive. Considered policy wording should provide flexibility and have regard to what is necessary and allow for alternative approaches where these would achieve similar outcomes. Final bullet point should include the words ‘endeavour to’, recognising that this requires cooperation from other parties.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Part 39) Whilst Endurance broadly support the approach the words "…minimise duplicated parking provision" should be deleted such that the focus is on reducing vehicular trips. • Part 40) Endurance consider amendments are required to the detailed wording and requirements to ensure that it is clearer and includes more flexibility. Our proposed wording is set out in the document entitled Cambourne North GCLP Reg 18 Reps Final. • Parts 41 & 42) A new vehicular access should be provided from the new junction between the A428 and the A1198 south west of the site currently under construction and as illustrated on the attached plan. Employment Development Access Off Proposed Northern Dumbbell Roundabout General Arrangement Plan (Drawing Ref 48168-P005-001) utilising land under Endurance Estates' control. New junction could serve employment uses between the A428 and East West Rail whilst also helping to separate and reduce heavy goods traffic from entering via existing Cambourne A428 dumbbell access junction, improving the design, character and amenity of these areas and ensuring they are more welcoming for pedestrians and cyclists on the key gateway into Cambourne and assisting with the integration of Cambourne north with the existing settlement. Provision of this secondary access would provide more flexibility in terms of phasing and construction arrangements as part of the implementation of the scheme as well as improving emergency access to the town.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The following change to the policy wording is proposed: c. Vehicle access from two existing junctions on the A428 (at Cambourne and Caxton Gibbet) and the Broadway overbridge. Possible further access from Ermine Street to support later phases. • Part 42) the following change to the policy wording is proposed in red: 42. All expansion proposals at Cambourne will be subject to a monitored and enforceable peak-hour vehicular trip budget, to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority. The indicative trip budget is approximately 2,500 trips in the AM peak and 2,500 trips in the PM peak. Any refinements to this trip budget based on more detailed evidence must be agreed with the Local Highways Authority prior to submission of the outline application. A monitor and manage approach will be undertaken to ensure that the development remains within the agreed trip budget for the site throughout its delivery, and any variations to this monitor and manage approach would need to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority. • Part 43) Endurance support this approach in principle but subject to the comments regarding need to adopt a vision-led approach and review of the proposed trip budgets outlined. Important to ensure that any proposed mitigation is proportionate to the scale and nature of any impacts. • Part 43) The following change to the policy wording is proposed: 43. To support delivery of the agreed masterplan, a strategic and local transport mitigation plan must be prepared by the developer in consultation with the Local Highways Authority and	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Local Planning Authority. This will include (but not be limited to) high-quality mobility services that prioritise modal shift and monitor ongoing performance. Innovative measures to drive higher sustainable mode shares, trip internalisation and reduce vehicular trips will be supported. • May also be beneficial to include commitment within part 43 of Policy S/CBN to adding other relevant stakeholders to what is currently a very short list, of those who the developer must consult with on the Strategic and Local Transport Mitigation Plan. • Considered that Policy S/CBN would benefit from clearly stating that the busway link and EWR are prerequisites and development will not commence/continue until these schemes are place, given the trip budget they state. • Transport evidence carried out to date suggests that development here can be mitigated, subject to the delivery of EWR and C2C with relevant extensions into the site at Cambourne North, along with other site specific highway, public transport and active travel improvements. County Council supports development of a stringent trip budget for the new settlement. This mitigation package is not inconsiderable. The County Council would like to continue working on a detailed transport and mitigation strategy for Cambourne. • Camcycle consider cambourne is a way of catering for the growth envisaged by the plan, but only if the Local Plan is honest about the scale of the challenge and willing	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
to embed enforceable requirements that make sustainable travel the default rather than an assumption.	
East West Rail (EWR) • Development is to justify the EWR rail line. • EWR not produced costed feasibility forecast or business plan. • East West Rail should be completely cancelled or at least postponed until a full business case is made for it which can be publicly scrutinised and challenged • Outrageously expensive white elephant that does not justify a station at Cambourne at all. • Without station there is no reason for development area almost linking Cambourne with Elsworth and Knapwell. • Should be focus on impact of traffic on villages related to the EWR station. • Site is appropriate for new development provided EWR proceeds. • Reliance on EWR for transport capacity is questionable, as evidence suggests only a small percentage of residents will use it for commuting, leading to increased road usage. • Idea EW will support 13,000 more Cambourne households is crazy.	**Individuals** 200987 (R Howard), 201286 (M Jordan), 202348 (C Farquharson-Robert), 203562 (D Pope), 205368 (J Daffarn), 203939 (A Parfitt), 204486 (D Brown), 204696 (D Sampson), 204765 (K Seifert), 205307 (C Smith), 205590 (C Meads), 207345 (K Rhodes), 207382 (C Deer), 208639 (S Keep) **Organisations** 202004 (Haslingfield PC), 203438 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited), 203628 (Cambridge Approaches), 204226 (Richborough), 206107 (Elsworth Parish Council), 207078

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Will lose huge amounts of money. The wrong route. Longer than needed and very expensive. The tunnel will be a disaster. • Railway line should take the original rail route as the infrastructure is mostly already there. • Station should be in South Cambourne, away from the A428. • There's an old disused railway that could be reintroduced at a fraction of the cost. • Long-distance guided bus and freightway would be more cost effective. • Contradiction between the environmental aspirations in the Plan and the carbon footprint of constructing EWR and the concreting over of a substantial area of green fields. • Funding for the railway station should not come from Section 106 monies from house builders. • Greater clarity should be provided about the provision of East West Rail and the Cambourne to Cambridge bus link. • the County Council's Transport Evidence Report shows only 1% of trips from extended Cambourne would go to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, contradicting EWR's justification for the route. • EWR would contribute minimally to Cambridge's economic growth. • Development of 13,500 houses appears viable without EWR.	(Cambourne Town Council), 208036 (Railfuture East Anglia), 208938 (Cambridge Growth Company), 209000 (National Highways), 209981 (Endurance Estates), 209982 (Endurance Estates), 209983 (Endurance Estates), 210015 (Endurance Estates), 210016 (Endurance Estates), 210017 (Endurance Estates), 210031 (Endurance Estates),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Insufficient justification for linking the housing development to the railway project, potentially wasting public funds through lack of accountability between planning authorities and EWR Company. • Completion of East-West Rail Stage 3, crucial for Cambourne North, is unlikely before the late 2030s, impacting deliverability of land to the north of Cambourne. • Proposed railway station is likely to attract additional vehicular traffic from neighbouring towns and villages seeking park-and-ride or informal commuter parking. Without adequate and well-planned provision, there is a significant risk of overspill parking impacting residential streets, local centres, and surrounding neighbourhoods. • Support significant housing growth around new station, but this development must be dense enough to ensure the railway can serve it effectively. • CGC recommends that consideration is given to building in flexibility for a greater level of employment ambition at Cambourne West and North linked to the provision of an EWR station. It could be clearer how the Local Plan draws from this evidence to set the vision for the role of the employment land in terms of the sectors catered for and on the amount of development that would optimise employment growth. The additional scale of growth is supported by the Council's evidence base and East West Rail. • National Highways are engaged in ongoing discussions with East West Rail (EWR) regarding the delivery of a new railway station at Cambourne, north of the A428.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Highway improvements needed to facilitate the station and associated track are currently being considered, and implications for futureproofing are being reviewed with the need for further meetings to discuss cumulative impacts. • Support East West Rail and C2C infrastructure schemes and consider that these provide a huge opportunity to create a truly sustainable new settlement subject to their future integration with North Cambourne development. • Considered important that EE, MGL and GCSP continue to engage with East West Rail to ensure that design ambitions for project are appropriately taken into account in design of the EWR alignment, station, and associated infrastructure. • EWR should be encouraged to design with new town in mind. • Support the new station interchange becoming focal point for new town. East West Rail's proposal to move the station towards the A428 roundabout is welcomed and ambition supported, ensuring that it is more central within the town and thus more accessible to both new and existing residents. • Fits with Government objectives of focussing development around train stations and using these as drivers of sustainable development. • Creating a hub around new station will ensure that a high-density mixed-use development can be delivered around station, providing a range of services and facilities in the most sustainable and accessible location, whilst also ensuring through	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
improved connectivity the scheme is properly integrated with the existing community at Cambourne. • Unclear why Part 11 (e) of policy is necessary. Since major infrastructure (EWR, C2C and A428 enhancements) are to be delivered by others and schemes will likely be implemented, approved and or advanced prior to submission of an application for Cambourne North, this is a difficult requirement to meet. • important to recognise that delivery of new station will be carried out by East West Rail rather than site promoters and it is therefore important that the Local Plan policy should recognise this and incorporate flexibility given that design is progressed by the East West Rail Co. and will be consented via the DCO process.	
EWR Co has reviewed the proposed Cambourne station location and updated its design proposals to move the station 700m west to a location north-east of the A428/Cambourne Road double roundabout. The updated station is expected to enable a greater degree of growth, be more consistent with adopted Local Plan (avoiding constructing on Local Green space), have lower environmental impact (further away from Knapwell Wood), be preferred by communities and stakeholders. EWR Co is in the process of identifying how the new entrance would integrate with the wider masterplan area and how it will interface with existing and new local transport services, and walking and cycling routes, including the proposed extension to the Chisholm Trail.	211882, 211893, 211894 (East West Rail)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land within the S/CBN allocation site identified as being required for the delivery of EWR, and includes land needed for the new railway, Cambourne station, and associated development. This land is included in the EWR safeguarded area. EWR Co supports the principle of criterion 12, but requests the following minor amendments for clarity and to ensure the proposals do not conflict with the Safeguarding Directions. EWR Co agrees that seamlessly integrating Cambourne with the new railway station to the north of the A428 and the EWR route will be critical. To this end, it supports criteria 50-54 of draft Policy S/CB, which sets out that Cambourne and Cambourne North (draft S/CBN) will be planned. In order to integrate the new station with Cambourne, EWR Co is proposing a new footbridge over the A428 to the north of Cambourne Sports Centre. The land required to deliver this new crossing within the S/CB allocation site. This land is included in the EWR safeguarded area. To avoid any potential for conflict between development within the proposed allocation site and the EWR Safeguarding Directions, EWR Co requests additions to draft Policy S/CB.	
Coalescence • Need green belt around Cambourne North to better protect the villages against coalescence.	**Individuals** 201807 (K Rhodes), 201907 (C Deer), 201909 (C Deer), 201914 (C Deer), 201307 (J Turner), 201763

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Opposed to destruction green belt land at Cambourne North. • Proposal impinges on neighbouring villages. • Too close to Knapwell. • Would ultimately join with Scotland Farm and Hardwick. • Development boundaries should be fixed to ensure no creep resulting in reduced space between Cambourne North and neighbouring settlements. • Proposal too close to existing settlements and would compromise character of conservation areas and listed buildings. • Parish boundaries must remain intact. • Loss of identity of villages. • Should be a minimum 1km buffer around existing villages, managed by parish council or woodland trust. • Landscape buffer should preserve the open aspect around Elsworth, not act like a fence. • Concern about long term stewardship of landscape buffer and forest. • Houses will be 400 metres from Elsworth and will not prevent coalescence. • Should be a more even distribution of housing. • Cambourne will be isolated due to the railway and A428 with no connections to the existing centre.	(A. Irvine), 201953 (R Milns), 202441 (P Deer), 203702 (S Wyer), 200992 (T Roberts), 200993 (T Roberts), 201470 (C Blencowe), 202347 (P Deer), 202354 (Boyd), 202610 (J Rolfe), 203599 (J Fordham), 203641 (B Skerritt), 203896 (R Chamberlain), 203981 (L Richards), 204095 (C Davies), 204572 (A Watson), 204656 (N Woods), 204765 (K Seifert), 204952 (C Gouldsbrough), 204817 (J Harris), 205189 (L Hanzi), 207176 (W Parker), 207399 (N Woods), 207382 (C Deer), 207539 (D Wood), 207422 (N Thornton), 207526 (P Deer), 208638 (S Keep), 208707 (J&C Collins), 210884 (R McClure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The evidence base does not demonstrate that the full extent of the non-developable area is necessary, proportionate, or the most effective means of achieving settlement separation. • The strategic enhancement area covers land not in the control of the Authorities or land promoter and so brings into serious question the environmental enhancement promoted by the policy and the soundness and effectiveness of the Cambourne North allocation. • Imposition of extensive designations across land owned and controlled by Varrier-Jones Foundation, without any engagement with the landowner, is unduly restrictive and risks prejudicing the ability of the emerging Local Plan to respond flexibly to future development needs. • Scale and large extent of draft strategic enhancement area allocation is disproportionate and covers land that could sustainably accommodate future development without compromising the separation of Papworth Everard and Cambourne North. • Object to Strategic Enhancement Area which extends over a significant portion of the • C/CBN. It would inhibit any future complimentary development potential offered by the Site Ref. 48096.	**Organisations** 202124 (Elsworth PC), 202127 (Elsworth PC), 202133 (Elsworth PC), 203385 (The Varrier Jones Foundation), 207024 (Mac Mic Land),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Environment • Placing adventure playground in new 'forest' area is perceived as a desperate measure to mitigate impact on more sensitive environments. • Green belt destroyed, protected species homeless. • Early proposals referenced a “forest” as a natural buffer. More recent plans fail to reflect commitment and offer no satisfactory or meaningful boundary. Critically important to shield the village from new development, prevent visual intrusion, and preserve its rural setting. • Expansion threatens to erode countryside and green spaces and related mental health and wellbeing benefits, diminishing opportunities for children to enjoy nature and for communities to maintain balance and wellbeing. • Insufficient consideration of environmental impacts and weak defence of removing important arable land which will be increasingly important in a changing climate. • Hope Farm should be preserved in its entirety due to its successful nature-friendly farming practices and positive impact on local wildlife. • 'Forest' is a misnomer. It's just a few trees. • Trees planting must start before any building.	201411 (Cllr P Sandford), 201807 (K Rhodes), 202000 (I Claydon), 202027 (D Askew), 202280 (L Meyer), 202348 (C Farquharson-Robert), 202354 (D Boyd, 202441 (P Deer), 202610 (J Rolfe), 203599 (J Fordham), 203602 (H Passan), 203702 (S Wyer), 204236 (G Tanner), 204526 (I Claydon), 204611 (A Watson), 204614 (A Watson), 204656 (N Woods), 204710 (H Rhodes), 204730 (A Watson), 204817 (J Harris), 204964 (M Jordan), 205307 (C Smith), 205505 (D Brown), 205591 (E & J King), 205672 (M Meyer-Kelly), 205674 (S Barnard), 207405 (N Woods), 207422 (N Thornton), 208647 (S Keep), 208648 (S Keep),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Tree planting for Cambourne Forest needs ongoing professional care, unlike all the dead sticks along the A14. • Countryside to the North of the A428 will be destroyed and the integrity of historic villages threatened. Ancient woodland and sites of historical importance will be compromised. • Impacts on local SSSIs and County wildlife sites, given length of time it will take to establish a Cambourne 'forest'. • Proposed Cambourne Forest is too narrow to effectively prevent coalescence; increasing its depth is recommended. • Visitor access and parking for the proposed forest should be carefully planned to avoid negative impacts on local villages. • Green/forest zones for Cambourne expansion are excessive and should be restricted to allow continued productive arable farming. Infrastructural details are scant and offer no mitigation for expected increase in traffic through Elsworth for rail travel. Elsworth already has intermittent flooding and proposals to improve drainage in the village and downstream to Fenstanton, Swavesey etc are required to cope with rapid runoff from housing developments. • There is no landscape buffer in the south east corner.	202801 (P Gladders), 210991 (C Newell), **Organisations:** 201542 (RSPB), 211078 (National Trust), 206112 (Elsworth Parish Council), 207610 (Natural England), 207611 (Natural England), 209332 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Loss of 100+ trees (aged 40 to 100) along St Neots Road unacceptable and will increase noise and sound pollution for some residential neighbourhoods in Cambourne. • Significant concerns regarding proximity to RSPB Hope Farm, which is within the Strategic Enhancement Area. • Should be contractual commitment for developers to plant woodland before construction, in collaboration with local authorities to ensure successful management. • The National Trust strongly supports the provision of on-site SANGs and new woodland. In accordance with guidance from Natural England, SANGs must be developed and available for use prior to the occupation of the new dwellings which they are intended to serve. The provision of new recreational space and woodland would help ease pressure on these sites and their designated features. However, it is not clear where the woodland would be located or how it would be delivered. This needs to be made clear in the proposed Submission Plan. • Forest should be managed/owned by independent professionals from day 1 to be of any value • To deal with environmental issues such as light pollution we want to see measures such as warm light, low spill light fittings being mandated. • Noise, light and visual pollution.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Note policy specifies that development must ensure ancient woodlands and SSSIs are kept free from public access and that measures that minimise ecological pressures from domestic animals must be identified and delivered. Whilst we agree with this in principle, have questions about how these points will be achieved in practice. There should be a requirement to monitor effectiveness of measures put in place and a commitment to implementing alternative solutions if initial measures are ineffective. • Support detailed consideration given to incorporating dark corridors into new settlement. This will be especially important for avoiding and mitigating potential impacts to bats associated with Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC but will equally be of benefit to many other species. • The term ‘SANG’ has a specific definition and set of criteria associated with it and the authority should carefully consider whether to use very prescriptive term, or whether alternative GI phrases should be used for a more bespoke approach e.g., 'SANG-like'. • Cambourne GBI Framework currently proposes 60ha of semi-natural greenspace, but to meet 3ha/1000, 93.6ha would be required. • To meet the official SANG standard of 8ha/1000, 249.6ha semi-natural greenspace would be required. We advise that 3ha/1000 greenspace which meets the Natural England GI Framework Standards criteria should be an absolute minimum,	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
particularly where mitigation for recreational pressure is needed, and that more should ideally be required. • Support for significant new greenspace and habitat, with consultation with RSPB Hope Farm to achieve nature conservation objectives, and recognition of impacts on Barbastelle bats and ancient woodlands.	
Habitats • Development threatens protected habitats, local character, and ecology and local wildlife. • Should be a detailed acknowledgement of what will be lost with a measured assessment of the inevitable damage • Imperative that the site is developed to enhance biodiversity. • Area is home to protected species, including multiple varieties of bats, turtle doves, barn owls, foxes, badgers, hares and tawny owls • Species rely on undisturbed countryside for survival, and their displacement would represent an irreversible loss to local biodiversity. Such environmental damage contradicts commitments to conservation and sustainable development. • Will not achieve the plan's biodiversity ambitions	201807 (K Rhodes), 203639 (J Tanner), 207176 (W Parker), 201452 (C Barnard), 204095 (C Davies), 204584 (A Watson), 205645 (C Deer), 205674 (S Barnard), 207468 (D Meyer), 208640 (S Keep), 208703 (J&C Collins), 208705 (J&C Collins), 209349 (D Pope), 211213 (C Askham) **Other organisations:**

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Mature native plants should be used for forest planting, it should occur before building works to ensure proper growth. • Need to ensure policy supports long-term viability of Hope Farm, which has demonstrated significant increases in biodiversity. • Provision must be made for addressing the ecological impact, both in the construction phase and longer term, through early evaluation and ongoing management and taking remedial action such as the creation of alternative wildlife habitats. • Concerns currently remain about how impacts to these sites will be avoided. • Part 33 of this policy is supported, although we advise that ecological survey and monitoring should also be added as a requirement for specific sensitive locations outside of the site's red line boundary that may be impacted by development. This would help to inform the requirements of part 22, and the suggestions mentioned above relating to this. • Endurance support approach in principle. This will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning. Extent and scale, delivery and management of the Cambourne Forest requires further consideration and clarification. This must be considered in the context of the wider package of greenspace, biodiversity and infrastructure enhancements. Expectations need to be realistic, and the Councils must also recognise that as woodland does not positively contribute to BNG calculations, some trade-offs may be required.	201542 (RSPB), 202987 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 202990 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 207086 (Elsworth PC), 206112 (Elsworth Parish Council), 207609 (Natural England), 207612 (Natural England), 210043 (Endurance Estates), 210555 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 210556 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 210557 (Cambridgeshire County Council),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Concerned that location and scale of the allocation site and adjacent to Cambourne North SEA have potential to adversely impact irreplaceable habitat (ancient woodland) and protected sites (including Special Area of Conservation). Do not believe this potential impact on biodiversity has been adequately considered. The allocation does not comply with the NPPFs notion of 'sustainable development' and there will be significant conflict with draft BG/BG. It also appears to be wholly at odds with the two Council's draft biodiversity strategies and their support of the LNRS. Urge that the current form of the site allocation is reviewed, including more detailed rigorous ecological investigations, reworked and potentially removed / relocated / scaled back to avoid significant impacts to biodiversity and avoid blocking the delivery of the LNRS. • Site may support functionally linked land for barbastelle bat population of Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Surprised not to see baseline study of bat usage in the landscape to inform the site allocation process, or a draft Habitats Regulations Assessment. Currently, there is not sufficient publicly available information to ascertain the usage of this landscape by bats and therefore, we recommend a more detailed assessment, potentially including detailed bat survey work, is complete to determine whether the proposed site allocation for Cambourne North is appropriate, in the correct location or of the correct type / scale.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Areas where natural and ecological considerations necessary for development of a sustainable new town will be extremely challenging, including loss of functional foraging habitat of Barbastelle bats and avoiding impacts on ancient woodlands. • Will not be possible to avoid or mitigate on site all impacts on the ancient woodlands. • Policy correctly acknowledges potential for adverse impacts on land used for foraging by Barbastelle Bats and is functionally linked to the internationally important maternity roost at Wimpole. Policy does not provide connectivity from Elsworth Wood and Knapwell Wood ancient woodlands to the south and south-west towards Wimpole. This is a major failing. • Providing proper landscape connectivity for Barbastelle bats will require strategic green infrastructure corridors across the A428 and East West Rail (EWR), including potentially a green bridge “dark corridor”. Even with these it will not be possible to include complete dark corridors particularly across the A428. • Inclusion of buffer zones and strategic green infrastructure network will provide some mitigation for impacts on the ancient woodlands within Cambourne North, but not sufficient to avoid recreational impacts on the woodlands, which may be significant. • Policy and supporting text should acknowledge it will not be possible or will be highly challenging to avoid or mitigate impacts on-site and there is high likelihood that compensatory measures will be required to address impacts on the ancient woods and Barbastelle bat population.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The LNRS Local Habitat Map, shows approximately half of the Cambourne North & adjacent SEA being allocated for habitat creation, primarily woodland. Strongly recommend these areas are excluded from the allocation site – if they continue to be included, then we would suggest they are allocated as woodland creation within the SEA, but it would be essential that woodland creation is secured in advance of urban development. Suggest to further minimise impact to biodiversity, that the allocation site if focused immediately adjacent to existing urbanised areas (e.g. A428, Cambourne and potential railway station), rather than sprawling into the rural countryside.	
Landscape • Loss of agricultural land • National need for self-sufficiency means it is madness to lose this area. • Valley south of Elsworth should be protected. ○ Planning Inspectorate rejected development on site due to: Elevated location contributing to its visibility from surrounding roads and villages, making any development highly noticeable. Despite potential mitigation measures like open space and landscaping, the proposed development would significantly adversely impact the rural landscape.	203939 (A Parfitt), 205368 (J Daffarn), 200987 (R Howard), 201770 (G O'Connell), 201771 (I Claydon), 201773 (I Claydon), 202441 (P Deer), 203509 (L Greenwood-Davies), 203519 (A Martins), 203543 (L Greenwood), 203602 (H Passan), 203605 (R Askham), 203702 (S Wyer), 204526 (I Claydon), 207470 (D Meyer),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The Inspectorate concluded that the negative landscape impact of the proposal outweighs other considerations, including the possibility of establishing a Park and Ride site. • New forest should be planted before development, including EWR. • New 'forest' tiny compared to housing, should be more gain for nature like original Cambourne. • The topography shows that the Cambourne is 260 feet or so higher than Elsworth so any building will tower over the village. • Area contains historical sites, including mounds, an abandoned village, and ancient woodland, which may be adversely affected by the development. • Given extent of proposed development we struggle to see how there will be any space left for arable fields. • Endurance support need for strong and robust landscape framework to be incorporated into proposed masterplan for scheme. However, it is considered that the extent and approach to the SEA needs further consideration to ensure the approach is supported by robust evidence and is deliverable. It is also important that detailed extent of development area is informed by the landscape framework to ensure a robust and integrated approach. Flexibility should be provided within the policy to enable departures from the indicative development envelope to enable this.	208019 (P Crisp), 208704 (J&C Collins), 208705 (J&C Collins), 208706 (J&C Collins), 209349 (D Pope), 209354 (A Pope), 209359 (B Skerritt), 209363 (B Skerritt), 209455 (C Davies), 210456 (P Deer), 210844 (R McClure), 210991 (C Newell), **Other organisations** 201542 (RSPB), 206110 (Elsworth Parish Council), 210009 (Endurance Estates), 210010 (Endurance Estates), 210011 (Endurance Estates), 210012 (Endurance Estates), 210013 (Endurance Estates), 210033 (Endurance Estates), 210034 (Endurance Estates), 210035 (Endurance Estates), 210036 (Endurance

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Policy requirements and context for S/SEA/CBN Cambourne North Strategic Enhancement Area seem unclear and it is considered that a specific policy / policy section should be set out for this rather than just being shown on the Policies Map and referenced within the Cambourne North policy. • Masterplanning process should secure objectives of Strategic Enhancement Area, allowing RSPB to manage Hope Farm effectively and continue monitoring nature. • Green Infrastructure should buffer Hope Farm to reduce disturbance impacts and support local wildlife, while recreational access should be limited to existing public footpaths. • Land-use and management in the surrounding SEA should complement wildlife populations on Hope Farm, with appropriate habitat creation. • Access restrictions and provision of SANGS are welcomed to protect ancient woodlands, but effective design measures must be ensured. • The land to the north, where the majority of the forest is planned (noting that this would be a mixture of different landscape typologies and not just planted trees), falls away from the ridge that the A428 is on. Therefore, planting in this buffer can only offer a limited visual buffer to the village to the north. However, Papworth has limited intervisibility with much of the site and there is scope to reduce the buffer here and increase the development envelope subject to detailed landscape assessment – due to the undulating nature of the land.	Estates), 210037 (Endurance Estates), 210038 (Endurance Estates), 210039 (Endurance Estates), 210040 (Endurance Estates), 210041 (Endurance Estates), 210042 (Endurance Estates), 210195 (Anglian Water), 210815 (Elsworth Parish Council), 210829 (Elsworth Parish Council), 211078 (National Trust),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Endurance considers there is no reason to include a buffer at western edge of proposed settlement between the A428 junction land at the East Rail Route. It is considered that this land should be incorporated into the scheme, providing additional employment land a further point of access directly onto the new A428 junction. Our suggested approach is illustrated further on drawing Masterplan Spatial Framework Strategy (Drawing Ref: 19-237-SGP-STE-XX-DR-A-011003-P03) which shows potential additional development areas to the west which Endurance consider to be suitable for development as part of the Cambourne North proposals. • Part 22) Constraints identified within the policy have been taken into account through concept masterplanning work to date and it is considered that there is sufficient land within the site to allow for appropriate buffers to the relevant designations and protected features to be delivered. Important that flexibility is maintained on the precise boundaries of the development areas and buffer zones to ensure these can be adjusted to reflect more detailed assessment and design work as the design of the scheme progresses. • Endurance support principle of creating dark corridors within development. Extent and nature of these will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Support principle of providing appropriate buffers to woodlands and watercourses within development. Extent and nature of these will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning. • Endurance support principle of retaining existing trees, hedges and water features within development wherever possible. Extent and nature of these will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning. • Parts 30, 31, 32 33a) Endurance support this approach in principle. This will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning. • Anglian Water supports landscape-led design to deliver ecological enhancement, and multi-functional green and blue infrastructure, which will contribute towards integrated water management and mitigating flood risk. • Support requirements within clause 19 under the Resources section of the policy regarding sustainable water management. Whilst the quantum of growth is lower than Cambourne North, we question why the approach in the Resources section, is not aligned with Policy S/CBN which includes the preparation of a Climate and Sustainability Innovation Delivery Plan and a Foul Drainage Strategy. • Want geographical ‘separation’ between the villages and Cambourne North. Hope that this could be achieved through the planning process (with red lines on development, provisions in planning consents that are enforced, section 106	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
agreements, etc.) and by physical means such as screening with tree planting and the preservation of existing SSIs. • Not clear where the woodland would be located or how it would be delivered. This needs to be made clear in the proposed Submission Plan.	
Heritage • Endurance agree that a proportionate and phased amount of desk based, and field evaluation will be required to determine impact on both known and unknown heritage assets. Whilst extensive archaeological features were identified during the survey work before the Caxton Gibbet to Black Cat extension works began, these did not impact upon the layout and route significantly. • Welcome preparation of Strategic Cambourne HIA and site specific HIA. However, not all the recommendations for the HIA have been fully reflected in the draft policy wording. Please check and ensure that these are included. • Broadly welcome criterion 11 but recommend some re-ordering of bullet points. In particular, Historic Landscape Characterisation and Archaeological assessment need to be undertaken first to inform the preparation of the comprehensive landscape strategy. Therefore, we would recommend that you move criterion 11c to 11a.	210014 (Endurance Estates), 210138 Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• In 11 c we would suggest referring to a '…more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment…' given that an HIA has already been undertaken. We recommend the wording could be amended to read: Historic Landscape Characterisation and Landscape Character Assessment, more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment, and Archaeological Assessment must be undertaken to understand the impacts of development on landscape character, long range and local views and heritage assets and their setting, identifying appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. The Council's HIA and the results of these further assessments must inform the masterplanning for the site. • In 11c i recommend inserting following '…that respond to topography, historic landscape characterisation and archaeological constraints. • In 11 c iii recommend the policy could allow for the conversion/restoration of the farmhouse and barns and finding a suitable use together with a conservation management plan for the assets going forward. Criterion should also state that development should be excluded from a buffer area immediately surrounding these assets as shown in the framework plan. • 11d Recommend further discussions concerning the timing of desk based archaeological assessment. • Areas of known archaeological sensitivity should be highlighted in the policy and shown on figure 78.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Welcome criterion 15. • Figure 78 should show heritage buffer identified in HIA around New Inn Farmhouse and Barns and the areas identified for strengthened landscaping in the HIA. • Figure 78 – concerned that the eastern most area shown as a Local Centre might be in the area of archaeological sensitivity. • Figure 78 should show the areas of archaeological sensitivity identified in the HIA. • Figure 78 concerned at the proposed location of employment development in close proximity to the listed New Inn farmhouse. The likely scale of the employment development may not provide a suitable setting for the listed buildings. • Supporting text is light on heritage (for example in comparison to the natural environment.). Suggest that the imbalance should be addressed. • Paragraph 3.3.25 The phrase 'to the south is potentially ambiguous – it could mean to the south of Childerley Hall whereas we think you mean within the southern portion of the site.	
Infrastructure • Development would overwhelm existing infrastructure.	201026 (F Panrucker), 201410 (M Eidevik-Skinner), 201680 (C Davies), 201953 (R Milns), 202027 (D Askew), 203639 (J Tanner),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Must accommodate all resulting needs within the proposed allocation, so that there are not detrimental, or cumulative impacts on services, facilities and infrastructure outside Greater Cambridge area. • Will there be sufficient water supply? • Services and access to them need to be provided at the same time as houses. • Will require safe, high-quality education provision. • Cambridgeshire schools rank poorly in funding per pupil - why add to this burden? • Insufficient water supplies. • Infrastructure should be delivered first. • Culture, performance and leisure facilities must be built before the houses. • New housing should not be considered until schools and early years provision is expanded. • Infrastructure will not enhance quality of life. • Local NHS hospitals and GP surgeries are already under significant pressure. They do not have the capacity to absorb the needs of residents from 13,000 new dwellings. • Build out speed crucial to delivery of services and facilities. • Plan silent on how CIL/S 106 might benefit parishes around Cambourne North. • Uncertainties on delivery of new infrastructure. • Services in Cambourne are insufficient, suggesting new area will face similar issues.	202280 (L Meyer), 202354 (D Boyd), 203602 (H Passan), 203674 (C Roberts), 203702 (S Wyer), 203939 (A Parfitt), 204236 (G Tanner), 204588 (A Watson), 204591 (A Watson), 204598 (A Watson), 204656 (N Woods), 204776 (C Drummond), 205184 (J Cowdrey), 205593 (E & J King), 205645 (C Deer), 207400 (N Woods), 207397 (L Skerritt), 207467 (D Meyer), 207539 (D Wood), 207770 (R McClure), 208020 (P Crisp), 208641 (S Keep), 208709 (J&C Crisp), 208710 (J&C Collins), 208711 (J&C Crisp), 208712 (J&C Crisp), 209358 (J Fordham), 209360 (B Skerritt), 209362 (B Skerritt), 209365 (C Roberts), 210454 (P Deer), 211211 (C Askham)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Infrastructure of areas like Elsworth and Knapwell cannot cope with the proposal. • Live performance hub should be assessed with local residents to address potential negative impacts. • Lack of clarity on community governance and how developer contributions will be allocated among affected parishes, raising concerns about the impact on Elsworth. • Should provide detail on investment to safeguard and provide facilities within villages. • Cambourne and Northstowe are cultural deserts. Expect N Cambourne to be the same. • Presents significant opportunity to enhance public rights of way network but this is not clearly reflected in the policy requirements. Existing public rights of way should be safeguarded and fully integrated into the masterplan. • Explicit policy support is needed to ensure connectivity, health and wellbeing benefits, and alignment with green infrastructure inclusive objectives. • Add doctors and dentists surgeries to plan from outset. Potentially even a local out of hours surgery, which would also serve surrounding villages. • Significant increase in population brings increased risk of crime, yet there is no robust infrastructure proposed to mitigate this. Expanding housing on this scale without parallel investment in safety and enforcement risks undermining the security and cohesion of an established, close-knit rural community.	**Other organisations** 207086 (Elsworth PC), 203608 (British Horse Society), “06109 (Elsworth Parish Council), 207071 (Cambourne Town Council), 207478 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 209224 (Sport England), 209982 (Endurance Estates), 209984 (Endurance Estates), 209985 (Endurance Estates), 209986 (Endurance Estates), 209987 (Endurance Estates), 210007 (Endurance Estates), 210017 (Endurance Estates), 210018 (Endurance Estates), 210019 (Endurance Estates), 210032 (Endurance Estates), 210061 (Endurance Estates),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Concerned by references to a “new” town centre for North Cambourne and reference to the existing High street to be a secondary High street. • Cambourne does not yet have a fully realised town centre, and there is a clear risk that proposals for an additional centre could undermine or delay delivery of the existing town centre strategy. • Under the subheading ‘Uses’ Section 9 – add a new criterion e. as follows; “e. Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding”. • Proposed development will put further pressure on an already stretched local NHS workforce. Many NHS employees at our local hospitals live in local area and therefore the increased stresses and pressures that they are put under could have a negative impact on their personal wellbeing which seems at odds to your wellbeing strategic priority of “to lead healthier and happier lives, ensuring that everyone benefits from the development of new homes and jobs. • Sport England raises concern regarding the use of the term “leisure” and not explicitly referring to indoor and outdoor sport provision. To ensure clarity Sport England recommends criteria a(f) refers to indoor and outdoor sport provision explicitly. The policy should also set out that the indoor and outdoor sports provision should be informed by an up-to-date PPS. Sport England recommend a Sports and Open Space Strategy is also sought as part of the policy.	210062 (Endurance Estates), 210065 (Endurance Estates), 210194 (Anglian Water), 210588 (Cambridgeshire County Council),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Framework for North Cambourne should also have sufficient flexibility to ensure that future development is not compromised by infrastructure and that the necessary roads, bridges and other infrastructure required for the new community can be delivered appropriately. • Support provision of a network of neighbourhood centres across the wider Cambourne North development to ensure all residents have suitable access to day-to-day services and facilities within walking or cycling distance, ensuring creation of walkable neighbourhoods and sustainable living patterns. • Incorporation of a range of high quality open spaces is supported, but suitable balance needs to be sought between open green spaces and higher density living and working spaces around the station. This balance will need to be explored further through masterplanning. • Part 10 (d) regarding provision of Infrastructure improvements is vague and unclear in terms of nature and geographic scope of potential requirements. Accordingly, this aspect should be subject to review as part of a clearer infrastructure policy and supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Up to date economic data on employment and retail demand should be used to inform the proposals for a station quarter – such that it can become a lively and well-used gateway to the wider development from early on in the delivery of the scheme.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Whilst Endurance generally support the idea of providing flexible spaces, it is considered that this level of detail on the design of the frontages is too detailed and prescriptive for this initial stage. These matters should be addressed through future applications when detailed design considerations can be fully considered. It is also important that the Policy does not unduly prejudice market interest from retailers by being too prescriptive about retail formats whilst recognising that creation of active frontages and a balance of uses within the centres will be important. • Endurance support principle of providing active frontages within centres and providing flexible spaces at ground floor that enable future adaptation. It is considered the level of detail on design of frontages are too detailed for this initial stage and should be addressed through future applications and Design Codes. • Part 46) Endurance support this approach in principle. This will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning in support of future applications. Endurance, MGL and GCSO should engage further with Anglian Water to ensure there is a deliverable strategy for the life of the development, given well publicised capacity constraints in the short term. • Part 47) Endurance support this approach in principle. This will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning in support of future applications and detailed assessment in urban design and transport terms. Endurance question whether the proposed Street Space and Kerbside Strategy is	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
necessary. It is currently unclear what this is trying to achieve and it is considered in any event that it can be covered by other documents. • Part 50) Endurance support this approach and consider it essential to the successful delivery of the project. There needs to be recognition that delivery of some of the infrastructure is dependent upon 3rd parties and beyond the promoter's control. Further discussions with stakeholders will be required to ensure that the full range of requirements, anticipated costs and responsibilities for delivery are appropriately assigned. • Quantum of development, which will be delivered beyond the lifetime of the plan, will need to be appropriately phased to align with delivery of supporting infrastructure. • The strong framework for delivering green and blue infrastructure, aligned with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, provides important multi-functional benefits, including water management and mitigating flood risk. • Support the robust requirements for managing surface water run-off and provision of foul drainage and sewerage proposal. • Agree that the preparation of a Climate and Sustainability Innovation Delivery Plan sets out the key expectations for delivering a climate resilient community and ensures the sustainable use of natural resources, including high standards of water efficiency and on-site water use. • Requirement for a Foul Drainage Strategy is also welcomed.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Item 9c should include provision of special school, which is likely to be required to mitigate impact of such a large allocation. For Northstowe and some other developments there is a separate reference to education needs in the “Uses” list, so a similar approach is suggested for Cambourne North and amend to "Education facilities to meet the needs of the development including early years, primary schools, secondary schools, sixth form and for special educational needs”.	
Flooding • Flood mitigation measures to be implemented before construction begins. • Flood prevention needed as Elsworth floods frequently. • Elsworth was subject to a major flood event in 2001 when more than 20 homes were flooded • Conington and Fen Drayton already flood from surface water. Future-proofing flooding impact is vital. • Concerns regarding increased flood risk from developments within Swavesey surface water catchment area, as the existing drainage system is already at capacity. Water from large-scale developments should be conditioned to include attenuation basins capable of holding water for up to 4 weeks when the Webb’s Hole Sluice is closed.	201452 (C Barnard), 201519 (A Brown), 201680 (C Davies), 201768 (R Crowther), 201770 (G O’Connell), 201807 (K Rhodes), 202441 (P Deer), 201953 (R Milns), 202348 (C Farquharson-Robert), 202354 (D Boyd),203460 M Passan), 203639 (J Tanner), 203519 (A Martins), 203562 (D Pope), 203702 (S Wyer), 204526 (I Claydon), 204579 (A Watson), 204656 (N Woods), 204765 (K Seifert), 204776 (C Drummond),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Major developments should negotiate S106 contributions for onsite and offsite mitigation to address local flood risk concerns and improve existing infrastructure. • Flood and drainage management plans essential to address existing flooding risks in Elsworth, Knapwell, and Conington, particularly with the proposed increase in housing. • This policy should refer to the need to adopt a sequential approach, prioritising the location of more vulnerable development outside areas at risk of surface water flooding. Recommend that this policy refers to the requirement for the site-specific FRA to include hydraulic modelling of ordinary watercourses within the site to inform site layout and design levels. The policy should also refer to the recommendation to consider the integration of water management and SuDS at the site into the wider strategy for Blue and Green Infrastructure for Cambourne and how the site can contribute to wider flood and water management benefits across the sub-catchment. The policy could highlight that the adjacent Strategic Enhancement Area may offer opportunities to reduce flood risk through water storage or nature-based solutions. • Better to acknowledge that Cambourne and North Cambourne are separate and plan accordingly (this does not mean there shouldn't be bridges, cycleways etc.). • Part 44) Endurance support this approach in principle. This will require careful consideration through further assessment work and masterplanning.	204782 (I Maddison), 204817 (J Harris), 204952 (C Gouldsbrough), 207398 (L Skerritt), 207402 (N Woods), 207465 (A Irvine), 207482 (N Hall), 207769 (R McClure), 207929 (H Sutton), 208649 (S Keep), 208703 (J&C Collins), 208704 (J&C Collins), 209351 (D Pope), 209353 (A Pope), 209355 (G Pope), 209364 (B Skerritt), 211216 (C Askham) **Other organisations** 203059 (Swavesey PC), 211183 (Environment Agency), 210057 (Endurance Estates), 210816 (Elsworth Parish Council), 211183 (Environment Agency),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Development presents an opportunity to implement effective flood prevention measures in Elsworth, with an invitation for further discussions on this issue. • Policy should refer to need to adopt a sequential approach, prioritising the location of more vulnerable development outside areas at risk of surface water flooding. • Recommend policy refers to requirement for site specific FRA to include hydraulic modelling of ordinary watercourses within the site to inform site layout and design levels. • Policy should also refer to recommendation to consider the integration of water management and SuDS at the site into the wider strategy for Blue- Green Infrastructure for Cambourne and how the site can contribute to wider flood and water management benefits across the sub-catchment. • Policy could highlight that adjacent SEA may offer opportunities to reduce flood risk through water storage or nature-based solutions.	
Housing • Too many houses • No evidence of need for more, houses than currently in pipeline.	203939 (A Parfitt), 205189 (L Hanzi), 205590 (C Meads), 204952 (C Gouldsbrough), 207401 (N Woods),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• 100 houses in Cambourne for sale (127atm) and no buyers - no desirability to live there. • Current rates of housebuilding are insufficient to meet demand and are delivered too slowly. Alternative construction methods - such as modular or modern methods of construction - should be actively encouraged to accelerate delivery. • Current approach of developing small parcels over extended periods (often around 18 months), as seen in West Cambourne, is not acceptable for North Cambourne. • Clear delivery targets should be established, with an ambition to complete individual parcels within six months where feasible. • All new housing should be delivered as zero-carbon or near-zero-carbon and include Renewable-based heating systems, High standards of insulation and energy efficiency, Solar panels and battery storage installed as standard, rather than merely “provisioned for”. measures should be mandatory rather than optional to ensure genuine long-term sustainability. • concerned that many homes are built with little regard for future adaptation. North Cambourne should adopt similar principles, ensuring homes can evolve as residents’ needs change over time.	**Other organisations** 207073 (Cambourne Town Council), 207076 (Cambourne Town Council), 207077 (Cambourne Town Council), 207511 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service), 209977 (Endurance Estates), 210000 (Endurance Estates), 210001 (Endurance Estates), 210004 (Endurance Estates), 210023 (Endurance Estates), 210024 (Endurance Estates),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Provision of approximately 13,000 homes at Cambourne North is supported and welcomed and it is considered that there is sufficient land available for development to deliver this, though further consideration of density assumptions is advised. • Endurance support aspirations of policy but consider that further flexibility is required in relation to a number of aspects set out to ensure the scheme is responsive to changing needs over time, reflective of the long-term nature of the proposal. For example, Endurance consider that requirement for 10% specialist accommodation is too specific. We support the need for a range of accommodation types for all needs, but10% of 13,000 homes would give rise to 1,300 specialist homes. Our suggestion is that such prescription is not necessary and should be evidence driven by documents such as updated Housing Needs evidence at the time, recognising the long term nature of these proposals with need likely to evolve over the 30-year implementation period. • Prescribed levels of specialist and Gypsy and Traveller pitch accommodation is not justified by Council's evidence base. Policy requires further flexibility to ensure that proposals can respond to changes in need over time as scheme matures and more up-to-date evidence on these needs becomes available. Council's evidence identifies alternative means to deliver pitches for G&T which are preferred to allocations on strategic sites. An approach which includes additional text policy such as	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
‘approximately’ ‘or at levels as determined through an up-to-date assessment of local needs at the time’, would allow for anticipated changes in need over time. • Endurance support in principle the need for a report covering an Intergenerational Housing Strategy to inform the level of housing typologies to meet the local need. • Part 14c) Challenging market conditions, cost of finance, and implications of Building Safety Act have created very challenging conditions for housebuilders to deliver apartments. Whilst these circumstances may adjust and improve, our view is that the policy should be flexible enough to account for changing circumstances over time through to 2060. Such a prescriptive density range in today’s market, in this location, is considered a challenge. • A greater range of densities will aid overall delivery with lower densities in edge of settlement and other sensitive areas (such as near heritage assets) and higher densities in the town centre / the new Station Quarter. Suggested that a density range of 40-90dph, would allow for more design flexibility to respond to the various placemaking objectives and allow for a scheme that can deliver 13,000 dwellings. •	
Employment • Few local jobs will be created, increasing commuting pressures. • Incentives required to attract higher skilled jobs/companies to Cambourne North.	203639 (J Tanner), 205645 (C Deer)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Support inclusion of mixed industrial, laboratory, and office campus uses. However, a different approach to delivery is required. In Cambourne, employment sites have too often been delivered late in the development cycle, undermining local job creation and increasing commuter travel. • Concerned about imposition of unreasonable planning conditions, such as mandatory residential units above commercial premises. In many cases, commercial sites should remain wholly commercial. • Given increasing viability pressures on local commercial development, particularly from online retail, planning policy should focus on removing barriers to delivery rather than introducing additional constraints. • The opportunity at Cambourne allows one or more specialised clusters to be planned for from the outset allowing room for future expansion of businesses. • CGC recommends that consideration is given to building in flexibility for a greater level of employment ambition at Cambourne West and North linked to the provision of an EWR station. It could be clearer how the Local Plan draws from this evidence to set the vision for the role of the employment land in terms of the sectors catered for and on the amount of development that would optimise employment growth. The additional scale of growth is supported by the Council's evidence base and East West Rail.	**Other Organisations** 207086 (Elsworth PC), 207075 (Cambourne Town Council), 208938 (Cambridge Growth Company), 209978 (Endurance Estates), 209990 (Endurance Estates), 209991 (Endurance Estates), 209993 (Endurance Estates), 209994 (Endurance Estates), 209995 (Endurance Estates), 210002 (Endurance Estates), 210003 (Endurance Estates), 210006 (Endurance Estates), 210021 (Endurance Estates), 210026 (Endurance Estates), 210027 (Endurance Estates),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Insufficient allowance is currently being made for employment development to ensure a balanced, self-contained and prosperous new town is ultimately achieved. The proposed 108,000sqm of floorspace is not considered to be sufficient to support these aspirations to achieve a balanced, self-contained community consistent with the requirement to operate within a limited trip budget. • Employment is critical part of development mix to ensure a mixed, balanced and prosperous new community, with sustainable travel patterns and high degree of self-containment. • The proposed jobs target and amount of land provided for employment is considered to be too small to support size of the new town and ensure a self-sustaining town which minimises out-commuting. Revise the approach to employment development to be delivered as part of the allocation. • Number of movements from existing settlement, as well as from future residents, can be reduced if a large number and wide range of high-quality jobs are provided as this will have the impact of reducing number of in/out commutes for a proportion of the future population. This has material relevance to working within a limited Trip Budget. • Important that allowance is made for a wide range of employment provision that reflect different market demands and provide flexibility as needs and demand will evolve over time, particularly given the long term nature of the proposals.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Additional land between A428, EWR and A1198 is considered to be ideal for further employment, facilitated by an additional access onto new A428/A1198 roundabout currently under construction and as illustrated on the attached plan Employment Development Access Off Proposed Northern Dumbbell Roundabout General Arrangement Plan (Drawing Ref 48168-P005-001) showing a potential additional access from new A428 / A1198 Junction currently under construction and utilising land under Endurance Estates' control. Proposed additional access can have significant benefit in reducing pressure on the main Cambourne A428 dumbbell access junction whilst also helping to separate and reduce heavy goods traffic from residential access arrangements and station approach, improving character and amenity of these areas and ensuring they are more welcoming for pedestrians and cyclists. • Endurance would support working with MGL and GCSP to develop an Economic and Employment Strategy at an early stage to help define parameters for this critical ingredient of the project, as part of a compelling overall vision for Cambourne. • Part 14b) Endurance consider approach is too inflexible and does not currently provide sufficient flexibility to reflect wide range of potential commercial uses appropriate to support a town of this size and market demands. Whilst such an approach will be appropriate for office and research and development uses, it would be less appropriate for industrial and logistics or mid-tech uses or many commercial and retail uses. The stacking of some employment uses has not, to our knowledge,	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
been achieved in the Greater Cambridge market and we would question whether this requirement is realistic, justified or necessary and we are concerned that it would make the site less attractive in the market and therefore be contrary to the aim of achieving an economically prosperous new town. More flexibility should be incorporated to enable different approaches to be taken to enable a wide range of employment uses to come forward in response to market demand. • The need for co-working spaces should be considered further as part of the Employment Strategy as it is important to avoid over-provision with spaces that then sit empty. The policy needs flexibility to enable the scheme to respond to market demand, viability and changes in way people work/live. • Endurance support intention to encourage a flexible range of mixed-use and employment uses which respond to their context. It is important that sufficient flexibility is built-in to the wording of the policy to reflect different types of employment uses that may come forward in different parts of the site.	
Elsworth The proposal will have a detrimental impact on Elsworth and its residents due to: • Close proximity of new settlement to village. • Risk of coalescence.	201174 (K Smith), 201303 (A Brown), 201307 (J Turner), 201396 (S Ireland), 201519 (A Brown), 201765 (A Mitchell), 201773 (I

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Increased traffic through village, including during construction. • Loss of natural and historic landscape. • Impact on rural lifestyle. • Forest should be as wide as possible and planted early. • Do not want active travel links to new settlement. • Elsworth will become a suburb of “Cambourne City”. • Visual, noise and light pollution. • Negative impact on conservation area. • Effectiveness of landscape buffer. • Impact on character of Elsworth, a conservation area with grade II listed properties • Increased risk of flooding. Amendments suggested include: • Increasing buffer between Elsworth and new development. • Improve alternative routes around Papworth to alleviate traffic through Elsworth. • Provide bypass for Elsworth.	Claydon), 201891 (C Deer), 202212 (M Stevenson), 203460 M Passan), 203651 (L Skerritt), 203923 (T Hegan), 203939 (A Parfitt), 204765 (K Seifert), 207421 (N Thornton), 207422 (N Thornton), 207423 (N Thornton), 207469 (D Meyer), 207769 (R McClure), 207771 (R McClure), 208645 (S Keep), 208646 (S Keep), 209352 (D Pope), 209356 (G Pope), 209357 (G Pope), 201754 (K Smith) 206109 (Elsworth PC)
Boxworth • Concerns at impact of traffic accessing A14 through village.	201283 (J Witherow)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Knapwell • Increased traffic through Knapwell, which would negatively impact residents on the narrow High Street which cannot be widened. • Traffic calming needed. • Rural approach to Knapwell would be urbanised, with village dominated by development, obscuring detailed landscape to the north. • Knapwell's historical significance, with its medieval layouts and field patterns, must be preserved by expanding the conservation area to prevent detrimental infill. • Potential for flash flooding due to road sealing and roof run-off, as Knapwell is located at the bottom of a geographic funnel.	203981 (L Richards), 204526 (I Claydon), 207463 (A Irvine), 207464 (A Irvine), 207465 (A Irvine), 207771 (R McClure),
Papworth Everard • Papworth Everard doesn’t want to be surrounded by roads railways and housing. • Concerns at what will happen in Strategic Enhancement Area. • Routes around Papworth should be improved to alleviate traffic through Elsworth. • Development boundaries should be fixed to ensure there is no creep during development delivery, or over subsequent years which would result in the reduction of spacing between Cambourne North and in Papworth Everard. • Papworth area is likely to build houses in the 'Cambourne Forest'.	201170 (T Carter), 201414 (J Carey), 201426 (E Chavda), 201470 (C Blencowe), 201501 (C Meads), 201519 (A Brown)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue

Policy S/CB: Cambourne

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments focus on the adequacy of infrastructure, services and overall place-making of the town, with many respondents questioning whether Cambourne can sustainably accommodate further large-scale growth. Comments note that the existing town already lacks key facilities, with references to limited retail, absence of a post office, insufficient healthcare provision and poor accessibility to everyday services. Several comments describe Cambourne as a “dormitory town” and car-dependent design, raising concerns that new development risks compounding these issues unless community facilities, employment space and town

centre functions are delivered early and alongside the provision of new housing. There are also calls for stronger planning obligations to ensure essential services and infrastructure are operational before occupation thresholds are reached.

Transport and connectivity were raised by several people, with mixed views on the proposed policy. Many respondents support the principle of improved sustainable transport, particularly the early delivery of the Cambourne railway station, enhanced bus provision, and high-quality walking and cycling networks. However, significant concerns were raised about the deliverability of mode-share assumptions, the limited expected uptake of East West Rail, and the risk that most trips will continue to be car-based. Comments highlight potential increases in congestion, pressure on local roads, and safety risks, particularly around schools and junctions. There are several comments requiring clearer transport modelling, binding mode-shift targets, early provision of infrastructure (including crossings of the A428), and stronger integration between development phasing and transport delivery.

Environmental constraints and impacts are also frequently highlighted. Respondents raise concerns about habitat loss, impacts on designated sites including ancient woodland, and the need for stronger buffer zones and biodiversity net gain. Issues relating to water resources and aquifer capacity are also noted, with suggestions to delay development until sustainable water supply solutions are secured. Other environmental concerns include impacts on landscape character, and the need for dark corridors and sensitive lighting. Several comments also stress the importance of protecting and enhancing green infrastructure to mitigate recreational pressure and ensure meaningful ecological outcomes.

A further theme relates to the scale and form of development and its relationship with surrounding communities. Many respondents express concern that continued expansion risks coalescence with nearby villages and the erosion of rural character. This is coupled with criticism of design quality, with some describing proposed development as bland or poorly conceived, and calling for stronger

design standards, health considerations, and better integration with existing neighbourhoods. While some developers and stakeholders support the strategic growth of Cambourne and its role in meeting housing need, they emphasise the importance of clear phasing, coordinated infrastructure delivery, and high-quality placemaking to ensure that growth is balanced, deliverable, and beneficial to both new and existing communities.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy supports the continued delivery of services and facilities required to support the existing town. This includes within Cambourne West, Cambourne Business Park and Cambourne Town Centre. Through the further provision of new facilities, as well as the proposed development of Cambourne North, the Council's aspiration is that Cambourne continues to grow into a successful town that includes a wide range of amenities to meet existing and future needs.

The policy previously required an improved network of Public Rights of Way to surrounding villages as well as throughout the town to enable people to travel into and around the town using active modes. This has been retained within the policy. Additionally, development at Cambourne West has been permitted and continues to be built out with most streets near the Village College providing traffic free routes for non-motorised users.

The policy notes the importance for connections (including by active travel and public transport) to Cambourne North and the proposed Cambourne railway station. It is important that these connections are delivered to minimise the use of private vehicles within the town and maximise the opportunities presented by new active travel infrastructure. Similarly, the policy wording has been amended to reflect the requirement for Cambourne West to financially contribute to the Cambourne to Cambridge public transport corridor. Whilst the merits of the East West Rail and Cambourne to Cambridge projects will be considered as part of a separate

planning process, the councils have undertaken further transport modelling to understand the impacts of development in this area on the local and strategic road network and the necessary mitigation measures required during the plan period. This has been undertaken in collaboration with the Highways and Transport authorities as well as National Highways and considers both the local and wider network, including within areas covered by other authorities. This evidence demonstrates that development in this area can be accommodated based on highways capacity and that an ambitious, yet deliverable, mode share is required to ensure compliance with the proposed Trip Budget for Cambourne North.

The quality of new buildings, design considerations and the impact of heat island effects are considered by other policies in the Plan and so are not repeated in this policy.

The provision of employment uses within the town continues to be an important part of the policy, both within Cambourne West but also the Business Park and Town Centre. There is significant potential for Cambourne to provide employment opportunities close to existing and planned homes, as supported by the policy. The Housing Trajectory for the Local Plan has been underpinned by the Housing Delivery Study (2026) and confirms that the council's housing needs will be met during the plan period.

The Defined Development Extent of the town has been reviewed and set out in the Policies Map. The site submitted close to the Caxton Gibbet junction of the A428 has been considered through the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (2026).

Support from the house builders at Cambourne West is noted. The Cambourne North policy sets out clear requirements in relation to the coordinated design and delivery of infrastructure of that site and how it must provide movement connections with the existing

town. The Indicative Spatial Framework for Cambourne and Cambourne North has been updated and reflects the further evidence undertaken by the councils in relation to transport/movement, ecology, landscape and heritage.

Financial contributions to emergency services is addressed through Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery whilst the management and maintenance of sports facilities is addressed in Policy WS/CF: Community, Sports and Leisure Facilities and so are not repeated in this policy.

The policy has also been updated to reflect the comments in relation to dark corridors and local heritage assets that could be impacted by development proposals within the site.

The landscape, transport, environmental and ecological impacts of the Cambourne North allocation have been considered and addressed against that policy. Water availability is a known issue in the Greater Cambridge area, and the Local Plan identifies that new development will only be able to come forward providing the necessary water infrastructure is in place, anticipated from 2032.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Cambourne lacks the amenities and facilities which were previously promised.	129984 (A Wilson)

No easy way to get to Cambourne to catch the bus or visit shops. One muddy pathway which is not lit at night and is impossible to use for anyone who is vulnerable. Bins are never emptied. Also need more pharmacies locally.	201158 (G Whitehouse)
Cambourne whilst being well connected with the A428, train and bus, is a failure of a town. It has very limited town services, for example no post office, only a single small super market, no centre. It's a town by design split by its infrastructure which limits non vehicle mobility and increases car use, it's currently and in future best described as a dormitory town.	201294 (T Roberts)
Support Cambourne railway station and believe its early delivery is essential. Local Plan should prioritise station and clearly link major development phases to secured funding and a defined delivery timetable. Without early provision, growth risks increasing car dependency and congestion, contrary to sustainability and climate objectives.	201346 (S Olechowski)
In the same manner as the Bourn outline planning permission, the section 106 agreement for Cambourne West secures funding towards CtoC. However, we note there is no reference to the requirement for a contribution within draft Policy S/CB (Cambourne West). This should be inserted to ensure consistency across the policies.	203435 (Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited)
Designs look ugly and bland. Developers should not be allowed to impose identikit maximum profit minimum cost design. On "Key principles" please add reference to neuroarchitecture (in particular research findings in this field on the impact of building facades on mental stress levels in the brain) and ensure that building designs are subject to health impact assessments and demonstrate minimal impacts on raised mental stress generation. Also, urban heat islands.	203578 (A Carpen)

Highlights that adding 13,500 houses would triple trip demand, yet EWR's own 2023 data shows only 3% of Cambridge commuters would use the railway – remaining 97% would drive. The plan lacks quantitative evidence that roads won't exceed capacity. While EWR's business case claims credit for 25,000 new houses, it only serves 3% of commuters. The response argues GCSP must prove rail mode share can reach nearly 100% to avoid overwhelming the road network, warning that ideology-driven planning may fail commercially, citing poor Northstowe sales as a cautionary example.	203621 (Cambridge Approaches (William Harrold))
Active travel and public transport provision must be increased: - permeability for walking, cycling and public transport (e.g. via bus gates) must be a primary objective to connect the settlement together, with links open to private motor traffic an exception rather than a default choice - early delivery of strategic bus and active travel crossings across the A428 and rail corridor must be required - a protected and well-designed cycle network between neighbourhoods, the station, town centre, school and employment must be planned - introduce binding mode-share targets with penalty if not met	203745 (T Preud'homme)
Cambourne's perimeter bridleway provides excellent community facility for horse riders, walkers, runners, dogwalkers, families, cyclists to enjoy outdoors, nature and travel sustainably. Makes Cambourne a lovely place to live.	204057 (S Rogers)
We moved to Elsworth to be in a rural location as it’s quiet and surrounded by the countryside. This is the way the village has always been. We do not want to be beside a huge town. This is not what we bought into moving here. The distance of greater Cambourne is coming far too close and will impact	204264 (J Brown)

the rural feel and traffic through the village. This is not acceptable for residence whiting to remain in a quiet village.	
Concerns raised about habitat destruction, particularly the loss of ancient sites like Coton Orchard and recreational pressure on SSSIs such as Overhall Grove and Elsworth Wood. Buffer Zones for SSSIs: Expansion of "green gaps" between development parcels and ancient sites like Overhall Grove to mitigate recreational pressure and 20% or higher BNG.	204302 (L Allpress)
The Environment Agency has objected to large-scale housing due to risks to the local water environment and underground aquifers. No further housing occupations should be permitted until the Environment Agency confirms that new sustainable water sources (such as the proposed Fens Reservoir) are operational to prevent chalk stream depletion.	204302 (L Allpress)
Opponents argue that expansion and infrastructure, including the C2C busway, will cause irreversible damage to the Green Belt and rural landscape.	204302 (L Allpress)
Local schools, including Cambourne Village College, have expressed concerns that planned road layouts will lead to severe congestion and safety hazards for cycling pupils. For sites near Cambourne Village College (e.g., Parcel 2.3), planners must replace narrow residential lane access with a dedicated, high-capacity link road to separate school traffic from residential streets. Implement LTN 1/20 schemes.	204302 (L Allpress)
Calls for growth to be halted until the East West Rail station location and delivery dates are confirmed, as current plans may not integrate well with future rail links.	204302 (L Allpress)

Cambourne Town Council has noted objections regarding insufficient employment uses within the allocation of some proposals. Mandatory Employment Space: Amending applications to strictly enforce the ratio of employment land (offices/light industrial) to housing, preventing Cambourne from becoming a "dormitory town."	204302 (L Allpress)
The Cambourne to Cambridge busway has been criticized for a low benefit-cost ratio and high estimated costs exceeding £200 million. Realigning the C2C Busway to follow existing road corridors (like the A1303) instead of cutting through the Coton Orchard and the Green Belt.	204302 (L Allpress)
Experts question the feasibility of delivering the required 400 dwellings per year to meet 2041 targets.	204302 (L Allpress)
Residents fear that continued sprawl will cause surrounding villages to lose their distinct identity and merge into a single urban area. Redesigning the Cambourne North masterplan to revolve around the future East West Rail station, ensuring high-density development is centred on the rail hub rather than spread out as car-dependent sprawl. Establishing permanent, legally protected "green wedges" between Cambourne West and Caxton/Bourn to ensure these villages do not lose their individual character to urban coalescence.	204302 (L Allpress)
Changing the "Section 106" agreements to ensure that community facilities (shops, GPs, and community centres) are built and operational before a certain threshold of houses (e.g., the first 500) are completed.	204302 (L Allpress)
The policy is not justified as the policy maps require amendments to include additional land within the development framework boundary for Cambourne West. The settlement boundary currently follows the Outline Planning Permission for Cambourne West and needs to be adjusted to include land north of this boundary up to the A428 road. Should include site 115583 and Oak Tree Cottage.	204369 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Vistry welcomes Policy S/CBN: Cambourne North, supporting its strategic approach to balanced growth, sustainable transport, low-carbon development, and biodiversity net gain. Vistry endorses Policy S/CB: Cambourne, recognising Cambourne as a strategic growth location with planned transport infrastructure improvements to meet Greater Cambridge's housing needs.	205053 (Vistry Group)
Vistry appreciates the policy's focus on linking new development with existing settlements, highlighting the importance of coordinated design, timely infrastructure delivery, and strong placemaking.	205053 (Vistry Group)
Vistry encourages the Local Planning Authority to provide clear guidance on phasing and infrastructure delivery to ensure timely development of transport and community facilities. Vistry requests that the policy be retained and strengthened as the plan progresses, and welcomes ongoing engagement with planning officers.	205053 (Vistry Group)
Map and especially section near Cambourne playing fields between Great and Upper Cambourne is confusing and not clear. The lack of clarity means it's not a sound or legally robust plan. It is not clear if three bridges are proposed or just one and why it is needed when there is one nearby already. This is an important wildlife area and corridor and will also impact local residents in this area.	205100, 206811 (M Jordan)
The whole orange-circled area and its surroundings constitute an important wildlife corridor, yet this is not recognised in the plan.	206812 (M Jordan)
There has been no direct consultation with residents in the yellow area of the orange circle, despite the likely noise, air-pollution and safety impacts from construction and early bridge works to an empty field and a non-operational East West Rail station.	206813 (M Jordan)

Support Policy S/CB: Cambourne. The policy provides a clear and consistent framework for managing future development in Cambourne.	205171 (Taylor Wimpey East Anglia)
Cambourne is rightly identified as a strategic location for growth, supported by significant planned improvements to transport, road, rail, and public transport corridors. This means it is well placed to help meet Greater Cambridge's substantial future housing needs identified in the draft plan.	205610 (Taylor Wimpey East Anglia)
Welcome policy's holistic approach to integrating new development with existing town. Its emphasis on coordinated design, infrastructure delivery, and strong placemaking principles will ensure growth benefits both established and future communities across Cambourne.	205611 (Taylor Wimpey East Anglia)
Current town centre is dominated by a supermarket, namely Morrisons. There is no permanent Post Office which is ridiculous and no real thought has gone into how to develop Camborne as a town in the past. Frankly it is far too big already to be considered a village.	207461 (L Payne),
Under the subheading 'Uses' – add a new criterion k. as follows; "k. Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding".	207479 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207512 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service)
We would encourage the authority to add wording to the Nature sections of this policy about sensitive lighting strategies and providing dark habitats/corridors where possible, particularly if these can link with those planned in Policy S/CBN, and around the outer edge of the settlement.	207613 (Natural England)

Benefits of locating growth at Cambourne recognised due to proposed busway, improvements to the A428 between Black Cat and Caxton Gibbet, as well as the proposals for East West Rail (EWR) providing rail services between Oxford, Bedfordshire and Cambridge. What work has been undertaken to date to identify impacts on the local and strategic road network outside of the Greater Cambridge area, and the mitigation identified to combat these impacts.	208501 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
Vision led approach to transport, with the emphasis on delivery of sustainable transport schemes such as EWR and the Cambourne to Cambridge busway is supported, as recognition in Policy I/ST, point 3, of the need to address transport infrastructure in the wider area including across the district boundary. There will inevitably be an impact on the A1 corridor and local road network within Central Bedfordshire, which does not appear to be reflected within the impact assessment or Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	208502 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
Strongly supports EWR but that Cambourne would be better served by light rail mass transit linking to Cambridge, with EWR rerouted south avoiding Cambourne. This would support accessibility to key employment sites in Cambridge.	208757 (Cambridge Connect)
Opposes Cambourne to Cambridge on strategic and environmental grounds. A regional travel hub should be provided at the Girton Interchange.	208757 (Cambridge Connect)
There are a number of Conservation Areas to the south of Cambourne, all of these contain numerous listed buildings. There are other listed buildings to the west and the east of Cambourne. There are a number of scheduled monuments in the area as well as two further registered parks and gardens in the area at Bourn Hall (grade II) and Longstowe Hall (grade II*). Any development of this site has the	210139 (Historic England)

potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. There does not appear to be an HIA for this allocation. It is important that the policy identifies on-site, and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. Amend policy accordingly.	
Are you planning to build three new bridges (road, cycle and foot) within the orange-circled 500 m stretch, or just one, and where exactly will it be located?	206810 (M Jordan)
Why is a new cycle/footpath route to Cambourne North required when an existing route is only 500 m away – the proposed route seems an unnecessary expense.	206812 (M Jordan)
Sport England supports the ambition for significant sports and leisure provision, including a regionally significant facility. However, the type and quantity of provision must be informed by a robust, up-to-date PPS, BFS, FPM. Sport England recommend that the policy also includes a requirement for management and maintenance plans for indoor and outdoor sports facilities.	209223 (Sport England)
Expansion to the south of Cambourne should be planned for, either as a stand-alone extension to the settlement, or in combination with development in another direction. As detailed in the submitted documents and plans, Land South of Lower Cambourne is unconstrained and could provide a highly sustainable extension to Cambourne. The benefit of developing multiple areas is considered to be underestimated in the document, particularly in the deliverability section and this is considered to clearly be the preferred option for growth. This needs to be reassessed and it is considered that provision of new development both to the north and south of Cambourne, would have substantial benefits in sustainability terms and boosting housing supply in the short term, and that it is clearly the most suitable option when considered against the alternatives.	204253 (Richborough)

Cambourne doesn’t have the amenities and infrastructure promised from last 20yrs! and now bursting. Will old promises be kept to restore any kind of faith and trust in councils and developers before our support is expected?	200980 (A Wilson)
Cambourne is one of the most challenging locations in Greater Cambridge in which to deliver genuinely sustainable travel at scale. The Local Plan does not yet demonstrate that this challenge has been fully confronted. Plan relies too heavily on future public transport investment to meet transport needs. Without binding mode share and trip internalisation targets, a clear pipeline of transport interventions, and wider changes to the fabric of Cambourne such as new local amenities, trip budgets risk becoming aspirational rather than effective. The Local Plan should: Make permeability for walking, cycling and public transport the primary objective of stitching the settlement together, with a presumption against vehicular permeability between the existing and expanded Cambourne Require early delivery of strategic bus and active travel crossings across the A428 and rail corridor, tied to clear phasing triggers Secure a continuous, protected and legible primary cycle network linking neighbourhoods to the station, town centre, schools and employment. Strengthen the trip budget approach by introducing binding mode-share targets and clear consequences if these are not met	211774, 211775 (Camcycle)

Policy S/GF: Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was acceptance of the need to deliver more housing in Greater Cambridge. There was some support for the allocation of development in new settlements. The allocation was supported by multiple respondents.

Concerns were raised about the oversupply of lab space and the empty sites at local science parks, and therefore a need for homes in this area.

Concerns were raised about the need for housing in this location, how the site was selected, if the site is appropriate for this level of development and the evidence that supports its allocation.

Concerns were raised about impact on landscape as this area is predominately rural and the site has varied typography and how this could create a challenge for a development of this scale in this location.

Concerns were raised about impacts on heritage, on the Conservation Areas in Great and Little Abington, on local Listed Assets and on the Scheduled Monument at the Roman Road.

Concerns were raised around local infrastructure provision, including schools, and impacts on surrounding local businesses.

Concerns were raised about utilities such as water supply, waste water treatment and electricity to ensure that there is enough

provision to accommodate new growth and minimise impacts on existing development.

Concerns were raised about flooding and management of sewers. Concerns were raised about timing of infrastructure delivery.

Concerns were raised about the impacts on existing communities of development of this scale, and how deliverable this site is. Concerns were raised about impacts on the chalk stream and pollution.

Ecological concerns were raised, comments were made about impacts on ecological network and habitats, SSSIs, hedgerows and protection of trees.

Transport concerns from local residents centred around traffic congestion, impact on the local road network, deliverability of CSET, and active travel connections.

Concerns were raised around impact on wider surrounding settlements including Hildersham, Abingtons and other nearby villages.

Concerns were raised about the design of the development. Concerns were raised about the housing delivery mix and impact of Traveller's site.

Further responses were raised by statutory consultees on protection of the Roman Road, Barrows and SSSI.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- Support noted, including the need for new homes, the benefits of planned housing, jobs, and infrastructure over ad hoc rural developments.

- The Councils have considered the representations made and have been working with the site promoters to develop further evidence to support the allocation and address the concerns raised during the consultation. The Councils have engaged with statutory consultees to iterate the wording of the policy and ensure the impacts of the development are managed and mitigated. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are working in partnership to produce a joint local plan.

- Through the development of the joint plan, the Councils have had to consider a range of development strategy options, from sites on the edge of Cambridge through to developments in villages, to consider the most sustainable way development needs could be met. This included reviewing freestanding new settlement site options, noting in our evidence that new settlements located on public transport corridors can be sustainable locations for development.

- South of Cambridge, the area around the M11 and the A1307 corridor is home to a range of major business parks with world-leading facilities and has some excellent and improving public transport links. The Government, Combined Authority and Local Partners have made clear the expectation for continued economic growth in the knowledge intensive sectors that already have space and plans to grow south of the City. The nationally significant science and digital cluster located in this area will require more employees – and suitable housing to realise its potential. A new community at Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 (Grange Farm) provides an opportunity to deliver new homes near to existing KI based campuses, and where planned improvement to public transport which would offer connections to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The homes could be supported by services and green spaces that respond to its setting.

- The strategy of the Local Plan is informed by selecting sites that are in the most sustainable locations. Sites that are in locations in areas of high quality public transport and connected to existing defined development extents are selected as a priority for development. The strategy looks first to allocating brownfield sites in the City and Edge of Cambridge and in sustainable locations and then looks to meeting housing need with new settlements at Cambourne North and Grange Farm for example. Of the proposed options for new settlements, Grange Farm is the best of the available options for development, as demonstrated by the HELAA and SA assessments. Options higher up the hierarchy have been prioritised

first and selected considering impacts on the environment, public transport and deliverability. Grange Farm as a site allocation has been selected through the evaluation of sites.

- The Housing Target for Greater Cambridge is calculated via the standard method, and this has given an identified need figure of 48,195 minimum dwellings to be delivered over the plan period. This is also similar to the figure that Greater Cambridge has an identified need for and therefore is the number of homes that the Local Plan is looking to deliver. Through all the sites allocated in the Local Plan, this delivers a figure of 48,065 dwellings to 2045 which is the end of Plan Period. Grange Farm will need to contribute 2,550 dwellings in the plan period to continue to demonstrate a 5 year land supply and deliver the number of units needed in Greater Cambridge in the most sustainable locations. The allocation of Grange Farm addresses the acute Housing Need in Cambridge, as identified in the Housing and Accommodation Needs Assessment.

- The Employment and Housing Evidence Update (2023) by Iceni Projects sets out that there is demand for lab floorspace. GCSP have undertaken engagement with landowners at these campuses where they have ambitions to expand, there is evidence that development is needed in this location for development. Development at Wellcome Genome Campus in Hinxton is allocated for predominately expansion of research and development floorspace and the delivery of 1,500 campus workers to support the function and expansion of the campus. The research campuses in this location are all looking to grow and expand, and therefore further housing is required to provide housing for the workers. Land at Grange Farm, east of A11 & north of A1307 Grange Farm is close to the committed 1,500 homes at Wellcome Genome Campus expansion, but those homes are specifically for staff at Wellcome Campus and as such that there shouldn’t be the same level of impact on delivery rates were both sites to be for market housing. Both sites are required to meet the identified need for homes in Greater Cambridge over the plan period.

- To sustain a development of this size, and to offer employment opportunities within the site, 35,000 sqm of employment floorspace has been identified as an appropriate mix of uses for the site. Greater Cambridge sustains a pipeline of an oversupply of employment floorspace to encourage job creation and ensure there is robustness and flexibility in the meeting needs of the market in terms of employment floorspace. Furthermore, this site is in close proximity to a number of expanding campuses such as Wellcome and Babraham, and will be well connected to Cambridge via the CSET connection.

It therefore proposes a settlement that can provide additional employment floorspace and be well connected to local employment opportunities.

- The Greater Cambridge Local Plan sets a vision for delivering sustainable development for the City and South Cambridgeshire. It is a joint Local Plan responding to cross-boundary issues. The site scored an overall red following the HELAA assessments. This is not untypical for large scale strategic sites where impacts on matters such as landscape will be significant compared with the existing baseline situation. Cambourne North, for example, also scored an overall Red in the HELAA. The process is site specific evidence and testing that will identify how these reds and other impacts can be mitigated as much as possible. For example, through landscape and heritage studies, we would identify specific sensitivities (like local or strategic viewpoints) and feasible mitigation measures, which are then incorporated into the policy.

- The initial HELAA assessment of the Grange Farm proposal reflects the initial site boundary submission from the landowner. Additionally, the Councils also tested a larger site within the HELAA which is aligned with the draft allocation and Strategic Enhancement Area boundary which was in the draft Local Plan. The supporting documents submitted by the landowner can be found on our consultation platform, please see the Supporting Evidence tab. Please note that the landowner did previously request that the initial site submission documents, submitted in 2021, be withdrawn from the HELAA process as it was prepared and submitted on their behalf by their former site promoter. These documents have therefore been withdrawn and superseded by the documents in the link above. It is common for site promoters to withdraw sites, supersede supporting studies/evidence and change promoters/planning agents during the course of the Plan making process, and this process is commonplace.

- The development strategy has allocated this sire as a suitable location for development. The potential sites have been considered and assessed by the HELAA and then if appropriate for development were assessed as reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability Appraisal. Then this informed the list of allocated sites. Then for each allocated site further evidence has been prepared to support its allocation. The development of evidence is underway and will continue. There is no pre-determined development at Grange Farm. Options are being worked through with site promoters to work out how development can be accommodated in the most sustainable way.

- The use of new settlements to meet housing demand has been assessed and evidenced through the HELAA, Sustainability Appraisal and Strategy Topic Paper. It is the approach that will reduce carbon emissions from transport emissions the most and ensure there is sufficient critical mass to be able to support critical infrastructure such as schools, healthcare and transport to ensure the development is sustainable and meets the needs of its residents.

- The site has been demonstrated to be deliverable, as set out in the Housing Delivery Study Addendum. The development is phased from 2034 to ensure sufficient water and transport infrastructure is in place, as well as based on out standard assumptions for delivery timescales of a site of this size. It is demonstrated that 2,550 units are deliverable at Grange Farm within the plan period, and this is set out in the Housing Delivery Study Addendum.

- On balance, when considering the site against the reasonable alternative options, the councils are therefore of the view that this site presented a deliverable and sustainable growth option for the emerging Local Plan.

- In response to concerns that this is the wrong location due to transport, officers are working with the site promoter and statutory consultees to plan work through options to deliver a transport mitigations for the site that will align with the trip budget that has been identified for the site to ensure that impacts on the wider transport network are minimised. This trip budget has been refined by the preparation of further evidence and the development of options to prioritise active travel and public transport to reduce the number of vehicles entering the wider network. The wider Transport Strategy for Cambridgeshire will also seek to manage wider transport issues, considering development and growth across Cambridgeshire.

- The councils have undertaken additional evidence since the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan consultation on a number of themes which were identified in the comments. These relate to heritage, ecology in the HIA, viability and infrastructure in the IDP. In consultation with the Councils' and statutory consultees, the site promoter has undertaken additional evidence since the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan consultation on a number of themes. These relate to primarily to landscape, ecology, heritage and transport and are addressed in more detail below and within the Site Allocations Topic Paper. This evidence

includes undertaking landscape assessments, heritage baseline assessments, preliminary ecological assessments and transport assessments and placemaking studies to demonstrate how homes can be delivered sustainably in this location. This has been developed in consultation with officers and statutory consultees.

- To be feasible and viable, it has been identified that 4,200 units is required to be delivered at Grange Farm to sustain a critical mass large enough to support the infrastructure needed for a sustainable settlement. The use of new settlements has been identified as being more sustainable than individual extensions to existing villages because it ensures that infrastructure can be developed to sustain the development and limits the amount of pressure on existing infrastructure. The site capacity has been reviewed in the context of the scale of development that is feasible to be delivered and the impact on the landscape.

- Further capacity testing has been completed by officers and by the site promoters to refine the capacity for the site. Officers have considered the impacts on landscape, ecology, requirement for delivery of biodiversity and green space and the number of units required to establish a critical mass to make infrastructure deliverable. The site capacity has been refined to approximately 4,500 homes, a reduction from 6,000 to minimise the impact of the development.

- There is an identified need to deliver sites for Gypsy and Traveller's in Greater Cambridge. The strategy to meet this need is a combination of optimisation of existing sites to ensure that these sites are occupied by Gypsy and Travellers at safe densities with correct utilities provision and then creating new Gypsy and Traveller sites adjacent to New Settlements. Policy H/GT sets out clear criteria to deliver Gypsy and Traveller sites in a way that minimises impacts on existing development and provides good quality pitches for Gypsy and Travellers. The delivery of sites for Gypsy and Travellers is part of the identified need for housing in Greater Cambridge and sites must be made available for them. The optimal capacity for a traveller site has been identified as 12 pitches per hectare. This figure has been identified as an appropriate scale to ensure that each pitch has sufficient amenity, access to utilities and a safe scale for occupants. This is set out in Policy H/GT as well as being a standard scale of delivery of G&T sites on strategic sites.

- The provision of homes at Grange Farm will be a mix of types, tenures and sizes to provide for a wide range of residents. There is a requirement for 10% of the total homes as specialist accommodation (within Classes C2 and C3), particularly for older people or those with disabilities. Housing affordability is an issue across Greater Cambridge and the delivery of this mix on strategic sites will contribute to meeting the need for affordable homes.

- The IDP has identified the school provision for the site. Further discussions with County have refined the details of this ask and the outputs have been included in the policy wording. At this point, it is assumed that Grange Farm will provide enough school places for the development at Grange Farm. The education and healthcare infrastructure projects identified in Chapters 11 and 12 of the IDP will also mitigate the additional demand on these services arising from planned population growth. Whether residents decide to pursue education and healthcare facilities within or outside of Greater Cambridge is a matter of personal choice, but the IDP identifies projects within or in close proximity to areas of planned housing growth to mitigate the additional demand in full. Local authorities are also legally obliged to cooperate with NHS bodies to secure the provision of healthcare facilities.

- The councils are acutely aware that developments identified in the local plan will need to be accompanied by the right infrastructure. The draft Local Plan consultation in 2025 was accompanied by assessments of infrastructure that would be needed to support proposed developments. Work on the infrastructure requirements is continuing for the next phase of the local plan process. The phasing of the delivery of Grange Farm will align with the construction of transport infrastructure and wider infrastructure delivery.

- The IDP has been developed using an evidence-led methodology that evaluates current infrastructure capacity and increased demand resulting from planned housing and commercial development. Working with delivery stakeholders including Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority, the Greater Cambridge Partnership and more, the Council has identified a range of priority transport measures in section 5.3 of the IDP. These transport measures are therefore planned to mitigate the transport impacts of growth brought forward by the emerging Local Plan, ensuring sustainable growth across Greater Cambridge throughout the plan period.

- In terms of infrastructure impacts on the Abingtons and Hildersham and the surrounding area, Grange Farm is designed to not impact on facilities through the provision of its own infrastructure aligned to the phasing of the development including healthcare facilities and schools. The Council welcomes collaborative working with West Suffolk Council on the infrastructure requirements arising from growth planned at Cambridge East, Grange Farm and any other developments proximal to West Suffolk to identify the potential need of cross-boundary infrastructure requirements. The Council also welcomes further engagement with West Suffolk Council on strategic cross-boundary matters and infrastructure issues during the preparation of the next stage of the emerging Local Plan.

- Whilst the Council understands that the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS) is progressing, the GCTS will assess major transport infrastructure projects taking into account the overall impacts of all identified schemes and cross-boundary impacts are considered where they are likely to occur. The Council will continue working with the Combined Authority to identify the potential impact of demand arising from Greater Cambridge on the transport network external to the area.

- Engagement with statutory consultees and the evidence will continue to iterate progressing towards the creation of planning application and considering the full transport strategy for Cambridgeshire. The phasing of infrastructure has informed the phasing of homes including the delivery of CEST and the extension to CSET. This has been agreed in discussion with statutory consultees. An initial trip budget has been prepared for the site as well as a list of infrastructure improvements needed as set out in policy to inform the transport strategy for the site.

- The site promoter has been developing further transport evidence in consultation with National Highways and the Highways Authority and planning policy officers to develop an evidence base for the transport strategy at Grange Farm and to further refine the policy requirements under the movement section including a refinement of the trip budget. Modelling has been undertaken to understand impacts on the Fourwentways Roundabout to consider the impacts of wider transport congestion in the area.

- The trip budget identified by GCSP evidence has been refined by further evidence completed by the site promoter in consultation. The policy requires a number of additional transport assessments to be undertaken as a development proposal

is being prepared as part of a planning application. It is at this stage that more detailed testing and transport interventions will be identified and secured. The transport evidence and Local Plan recognise that additional mitigation measures may be necessary beyond the plan period in order to facilitate the full build out of the site.

- Given the inherent scale of new growth required, the local plan site assessment process (including our Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment) acknowledges that proposals such as new settlements could result in significant landscape and other impacts. However, given the sustainability benefits the Councils have determined that new settlement proposals that met evidence-based location and scale criteria should nevertheless be subject to consideration for allocation.

- The development strategy and consideration of spatial options and assessment of reasonable alternatives have contributed to the consideration of the configuration and setting of Grange Farm in its wider context. The spatial framework has been prepared to also recognise the interrelationships with existing settlements and the wider area, and this will be used to inform the masterplan.

- The acknowledged impact on the landscape is being mitigated by the use of the use of SEA to provide a buffer. The SEA will be predominately used for agricultural uses, GI and provision of new habitat and restoration. The Strategic Enhancement Area will contribute to retaining a clear green buffer between settlements and it is intended that some of this land remain in agricultural use to respond positively to the local setting. This has been reflected in the policy wording. The boundary of the Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 Grange Farm has been revised to mitigate impacts on the landscape. This includes mitigating views from the site to Roman Road which were identified in the GCSP HIA. These have been reflected in the spatial framework. The management of impacts on the landscape is not just about creating a barrier but also positively contributing to the landscape by being able to see through to the town to enhance the changing landscape. The Eastern Boundary aligns with the typography of the site and slopes down to a buffer created by the SEA. Agricultural uses are encouraged in the SEA to further minimise the impact on development on the landscape by retaining similar uses.

- The spatial framework has been drafted to set out mitigation measures required to minimise impacts on the Abington's and Hildersham. The Strategic Enhancement Area is proposed to contribute to creating a buffer between the developments to

reinforce the integrity of the distinct defined development extents. The use of screening and green buffer in appropriate locations will also contribute to maintaining these edges. The wording of the policy has been further iterated to specify what is acceptable in the SEA. This will improve the clarity of the role of the SEA. The PRoW are being considered in the development of the assessments of the site and will be reflected and protected in the Masterplan. The PRoW along the Roman Road has been identified on the spatial framework.

- The spatial framework has also been developed to set out key constraints, design considerations and a high level indicative layout to inform the design of the site. This contributes to ensuring that the design is of high quality and is suitable in its context- key design principles are established in policy. The policy wording also specifies that this development must be site wide Masterplan led and this Masterplan must be agreed with the Councils' ahead of any planning application approval. Furthermore, a side wide Design Code must be submitted alongside the Masterplan. This will ensure that development follows a clear overarching design and placemaking objectives and principles which will contribute to a high quality settlement. A range of densities have been suggested for this site to ensure that the building heights are reflective of the landscape and align with the typology of the development, with the tallest buildings being in the lowest parts of the sites. These will continue to evolve as plans go into more detailed planning stages. This will be done in collaboration with the Council to ensure design is of a high standard. The site promoter is proposing a unique stewardship model and their current plans for continued local interest in the site that will contribute to a high quality design.

- GCSP has produced a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to support the allocation of the Grange Farm. This document identifies any impacts on heritage assets, listed buildings, scheduled monuments and any key viewpoints and provides mitigation suggestions which have been brought into policy wording and the Spatial Framework to ensure mitigation is considered in the masterplan of the development. GCSP have also been continually engaging with Historic England and the County Archaeology team to work through and agree any mitigation measures for the impact of the development on assets. The Bronze Age Barrows to the west of the site have been reviewed for listing and these are now a Scheduled Monument. These are indicated on the Spatial Framework with a setback for development to minimise impacts. A Geophysical Survey for the Roman Road and the Bronze Barrows has been undertaken by the site promoter and the findings of this has been reflected in the GCSP HIA. GCSP will continue to work with the site promoters and statutory consultees to further discuss

and mitigate against impacts and produce further archaeological evidence as needed, including a site wide DBA and successor surveys as identified by this document.

- GCSP is continually liaising with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency through the water scarcity group to ensure that options are being evaluated to set out a clear strategy on how waste water will be managed to manage impacts on the chalk stream and aquifers. Through the Integrated Waste Water Management Study and Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment to set out strategies for managing impacts of flooding and runoff from greenfield sites.

- The site promoter has engaged independently with Environment Agency, Anglian Water and Cambridge Water to understand how impacts can be reduced. This includes exploring options for sanitisation of water to recharge the aquifer. The options for mitigating impacts on the chalk stream and the River Granta will continue to develop through the development of evidence through to the planning application submission, in consultation with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water.

- Whilst the allocation will reduce the amount of arable farmland in this location, the policy seeks to minimise this through compact forms of development, and key areas of activity within the development. It also supports the continuation of farming within the SEA. The planning application for the site will also be required to complete a site specific flood risk assessment including the sequential test and exemptions test where relevant to ensure that the correct flood risk mitigation measures are in place.

- Grange Farm has been assessed in the Habitat Regulation Assessment and mitigation measure identified in this document have been incorporated in the policy wording, as well as suggested mitigations from engagement with Natural England. The policy and spatial framework has been revised to include policy wording to divert footpaths to just the PROW and not impact on the SSSI. Enhancements to the SSSI are also required in policy.

- The site promoter will be required to complete a preliminary ecological assessment, a cohesive stewardship strategy through early phase community engagement including through conservation groups to deliver community-based enhancement stewardship as endorsed by Natural England; and a recreation pressure assessment for the SSSI to support any planning

application. The Councils' and the site promoter will continue to work with Natural England to minimise the impacts on the SSSI and local ecology. Furthermore, ecological survey and monitoring is required for specific sensitive locations outside of the site's red line boundary that may be impacted by the development is required in the policy to minimise impacts on local habitat and ecological networks.

- Policy WS/HS Pollution, health and safety will apply to all development. This policy will require assessments to mitigate against the impacts of development and its construction. Mitigations through buffers will reduce impact on noise and light pollution. In terms of air pollution, an air pollution assessment will be required, and the prioritisation of active ravel and public transport will reduce impacts on air quality.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Support • Really good proposal. people crying out for more homes • Benefits of planned housing, jobs, and infrastructure over ad hoc rural developments. • Support development that aligns with the local area's character, advocating for lower density and height of properties, particularly near existing buildings. • Do not object in principle to the development of a small new town instead of expanding existing villages.	201460 (D Watts), 201750 (J Hall), 201889 (W Cooper), 201804 (R Zimmern), 201889 (W Cooper), 201924 (M Dance), 202876 (C Pippen), 208420 (K Franklin), 208421 (K Franklin), **Other bodies:** 201556 (Stapleford PC), 201669 (Linton PC),

• approve principle of having developments near places of work and understand that they have to be of a certain size. • Contingent on adequate water, education, healthcare, and transport links. • Promotes active and sustainable travel methods, which is viewed positively. • BioMed Realty supports the allocation of Grange Farm as a new settlement. • Supports vision and objectives for Grange Farm as a new settlement that will serve existing and future communities, enhancing sustainability and infrastructure in surrounding areas, including Linton. • Open to exploring how land at Ley Rectory Farm could be sensitively assimilated into the wider development. Wish to stress the importance of ensuring that our residual farm remains viable for the long term. Please continue to liaise directly with The Pampisford Estate and its Trustees. • Pampisford Estate welcome suggestion that delivery will be within the Local Plan period and beyond. PE note Council's updated Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study Addendum assumes delivery of 2,550 new homes in the period to 2045. This is lower than position set out within our initial Delivery Strategy and we remain committed to this objective (c. 4,750 dwellings). PE do welcome ambition to plan for a coherent, well planned new town, with a scale and mix of uses to promote self-containment, with range of uses and amenities provided on site to support the needs of all residents. As landowner, PE look forward to working	203371 (BMR Granta Park Propco Limited), 204840 (Vistry Group), 209252 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209254 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209256 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209264 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210722 Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210905 (Great Shelford Parish Council),

constructively with GCSP and wider stakeholders to determine the most appropriate form of development for the site. • As landowner, PE have been stewards of farm for generations. Committed to ensuring that scheme is sensitive to character and context, and is distinctive and separate from the surrounding settlements. PE look forward to working with GCSP to develop masterplan principles which will achieve this shared objective. • PE support ambition for mixed use town centre, and early delivery of amenities to support community integration from earliest stages of development. • Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Tr are very supportive of the principle of allocation, broad scale and location of the development and mix of uses proposed. Highlighted a number of areas where more work is necessary to achieve level of precision required for allocation at Regulation 19 stage.	
Do not support • I'm a resident of great Abington and I am not happy about this at all I moved from the city to get away from it and to enjoy a nice quite village now the village is going to be like the city and residents comments need to be respected in this matter I oppose this and do not wish for this to go ahead what so ever.	201310 (K Middleton), 201399 (W Bailey), 205486 (R Sainsbury); 208559 (Abington Residents Campaign), 209069 (Camcycle)

• We were horrified to discover that you are proposing to build a development at Grange Farm which would involves the construction of between 6,000 and 8,000 houses. • Request that the council remove or significantly reduce to respect exiting communities and environmental limits • Abington Residents Campaign (ARC) are completely opposed to Policy S/GF which proposes the introduction of a new Town at Grange Farm. • . In Camcycle's view, the site fails to meet the core requirements of a genuinely sustainable community and should not proceed.	
Not needed • Strategy is wrong and underpinned by an optimistic growth forecast. • Appears to surplus development capacity in the local plan. • Staff of the large science sites in the area already have houses. • Need for the development is not made, it is in excess of housing requirement. • What evidence is there that a development of this magnitude is required? Demand based on current evidence is nowhere near the level indicated in Plan. • Up-to-date forecasting model is required to reflect the future more accurately. • Is a supply of housing being developed near the Hinxton Genome campus, questioning the need for further housing in area. • Focus should be on brownfield sites.	201368 (J Lawrence), 201480(G Brookman), 201624 (D Farrant), 201624 (D Farrant), 201782 (J Tanner), 202022 (A Marns), 202142 (M Turner), 203123 (J Searle), 204111 (J Batchelor), 204201 (P Williams), 204586 (R Elston-Green), 204725 (C Gill), 204733 (M Appleton), 205360 (M Hardinge), 205741 (G Saunders), 205746 (C Feenan), 205947 (S Zmigrod), 206193 (R Barnes), 206199 (R Barnes), 206323 (C Cameron),

• Consultation material indicates the Draft Local Plan allocates materially more homes than the stated local need. • Not "justified" or "positively prepared." Remove allocation or significantly reduce and treat as long-term contingency, pending clearer evidence that optimistic growth scenarios are being realised. • Projections in the Draft Plan for additional population growth and corresponding supply of homes are asserted without any presentation of evidence underpinning those or the relevant sensitivity analysis. • Lack of concrete evidence that there is demand to live at Grange Farm from real individuals involved at local centres of economic activity.	207672 (T Collett), 207783 (P Williams), 207789 (P Williams), 208531 (C Alda), 208629 (G Jones), 210488 (C Gill), 210489 (C Gill), 211647 (G King), 211725 (P Seddon), **Other bodies:** 204707 (Little Abington PC), 204948 (Robinson College),
Should be somewhere else • Inappropriate location, threatening the 'necklace village' concept and damaging the South Cambs landscape. • Should consider brownfield sites. • Edge of city would be better. • There are better and more suitable sites. • Would be more prudent and flexible to continue the sustainable development of existing communities in the area of which Little Abington is a good example. • Inconsistent with national planning policy	201031 (R Smith), 201348 (K Christodoulides), 201367 (M Joslin), 201368 (J Lawrence), 201400 (J Wingfield), 201480(G Brookman), 201494 (J Tharby), 201518 (J Jackson), 201530 (I Rogers), 201531 (H Rogers), 201538 (T Davenport), 210539 (A Patterson Lee), 201542 (L Davenport), 201539 A Patterson-Lee), 201544 (L Davenport), 201577 (G Smith), 201591 (L Menzies), 201624 (D Farrant), 201635 (J

• Does not adequately assess or rule out alternative safeguarded locations further from existing settlements, suggesting a lack of a robust site selection process. • Other locations such as the "Duxford Triangle" bounded by the M11, A11 and A505 should be considered. • Alternatives have not been fully or robustly explored or justified. • Should be relocated to near Horningsea where the sewage farm would have been put. • Should be away from our settlement and built on level ground away from 1307. • Consideration should be given to other sites, e.g. junction off A11. Land near to Fulbourn? • Site is wrong side of A11. • North or South of A11 close to Wilbrahams. • Proximity of this site to Hinxton, Babraham and Granta Park seems to be only reason for choosing it. • More appropriate and sustainable alternative sites exist, including land at Hinxton adjacent to the Wellcome Genome Campus. • Will just provide expensive commuter belt housing as it's close to access roads to London.	Shaw), 201684 (S Bowen), 201694 (S Bowen), 201706 (R James), 201747 (B Seddon), 201753 (L Dav), 201756 (G Sharman), 201762 (D Turnidge), 201766 (F Snell), 201785 (G Farrant), 201798 (J Thirkettle), 201803 (S Fryer), 201804 (R Zimmern), 201821 (Y Arkwright), 201846 (E Goodyear), 201855 (J Hudson), 201884 (L McNicholas), 201887 (K Lander), 201890 (K Cooper), 201912 (J Dodd), 201952 (J Hann), 202009 (D Langley), 202020 (J Rivers), 202023 (P Cullimore), 202067 (D Milns), 202082 (D Palmer), 202092 (R Harman), 202142 (M Turner), 202337 (S James), 202477 (J Herbert), 202518 (H Brown), 202608 (C Cameron), 202708 (D Golding), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 202796 (S McDonnell), 202907 (J Williams), 202912 (R King), 203141 (V Jury), 203187 (M Jury), 203188 (S Hughes), 203190 (M Furlow), 203389 (G Brookman), 203459 (L

• Needs to be focused on areas where sustainable transport is practicable from the start, not on constrained and remote sites such as this, which virtually demand use of cars. • Should be a plan for sustainable 'infill' developments in existing settlements to secure local schools, shops, services. • Alternative nearby sites, such as Bancroft Park, should also be considered to meet urgent accommodation needs. • Brownfield sites and other alternatives have not been fully explored, particularly the Cowley Road site which could accommodate over 8,000 homes. • If costs of delivering a viable Grange Farm settlement are comparable to — or exceed — the WWTW relocation costs, then decision to abandon NEC should be reconsidered. • Appears to have been rushed, likely as a reaction to Anglian Water wastewater treatment plant at North East Cambridge. • Greater Cambridge HELAA from 2025 shows that Grange Farm Site is not suitable or appropriate - overall suitability was "RED". • Publish a transparent reappraisal of reasonable alternative sites, including locations capable of accommodating new settlements, such as land at Six Mile Bottom, and any additional growth areas identified through forthcoming Cambridge Growth Company work.	Lambourne), 203582 (S Hatchell-Watson), 203648 (E Pimblett), 203653 (S Appleton), 203751 (T Preud'homme), 203797 (R Nagasaki), 203803 (J Cutting), 203805 (A Butchart), 203839 (T Solomonides), 203868 (M Broadhurst), 203911 (E Lambourne), 203931 (A Ross), 203961 (S Somerville), 204015 (J Fairs), 204111 (J Batchelor), 204147 (L Paine), 204156 (B Barkataki), 204196 (A Cooke), 204415 (J Fairs), 204586 (R Elston-Green), 204608 (R Hoadley), 204612 (D Potts), 204617 (J Mannion), 204644 (L Sainsbury), 204682 (E Lane), 204733 (M Appleton), 204759 (M Huntsman), 204783 (R Smith), 204810 (E McKeown), 204871 (V Valge-Archer), 204919 (K King), 205018 (J McDonald), 205020 (S Lee), 205092 (M Whittaker), 205147 (I Sainsbury), 205170 (J Graham), 205249 (K Brightwell), 205400 (S Nuttall), 205443 (A Williams), 205454 (R DeBeaux), 205512 (S Somerville),

• Would be more appropriate for North Cambridgeshire, where infrastructure is already established. • Should be located within walking distance of a mainline train station where all travel to work needs would be addressed. • Consider other locations with better road access and ones that would not cause dreadful congestion to surrounding areas. • Choice of an appropriate site should be led by results of an open presentation on all the alternative irrespective of the land ownership and the clear individual benefit. It appears that the current proposal has been promoted by local landowners without enough consideration of the alternatives. • Allocations to the north of Cambridge demonstrably optimise spatial alignment between new homes and the city's primary employment growth areas—Cambridge Science Park, St John's Innovation Park, the North East Cambridge district, and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. • Further along A11 towards Fulbourn. • There is so much open land between existing villages to the east that it is closer to the M11, Whittlesford Station and the planned Transport Hub. • Turning Sawston into a town is both logical and beneficial for all. • Housing need could be met by 80 villages each having small developments that would be beneficial to increasing the footfall for businesses and providing an	205540 (G Minhas), 205733 (W Bailey), 205922 (C Paton), 205924 (J Snell), 205925 (J Snell), 205926 (F Snell), 205927 (F Snell), 206595 (A Butchart), 206606 (S Solomonides), 206892 (I Sainsbury), 206899 (I Sainsbury), 207226 (E Lane), 207227 (E Lane), 207235 (S Appleton), 207236 (S Appleton), 207237 (S Appleton), 207238 (S Appleton), 207406 (H Rogers), 207503 (K Lester), 207560 (L Sainsbury), 207561 (L Sainsbury), 207562 (L Sainsbury), 207563 (L Sainsbury), 207564 (R Elston-Green), 207593 (V Valge-Archer), 207597 (R King), 207605 (V Jury), 207673 (T Collett), 207675 (T Collett), 207679 (T Collett), 207921 (H Sutton), 208477 (D Pimblett), 208478 (D Pimblett), 208481 (G Crowe), 208527 (G Brookman), 208528 (G Brookman), 208529 (G Brookman), 208530 (G Brookman), 208547 (D Fraser), 208548 (D Fraser), 208549 (D Fraser), 208550 (D Fraser), 208551 (D Fraser), 208552 (D

increased reservoir of volunteer activities needed to sustain such groups as the scouts, youth groups, village halls and community activities. • Suggest between Babraham and Sawston or land between Pampisford Hall, Sawston, SW to Hinxton. • So much open land between existing villages to the east that it is hard to fathom why Grange Farm could be considered favourable. • Hildersham Parish Council (and a significant number of the residents) cannot help but feel that site near Cambridge North would be a much better choice. • When compared with Land at Hinxton (HELAA Reference 200765) as a reasonable alternative, Grange Farm appears less well aligned with the aim of directing development to locations where active and public transport are the natural choice and where there is a strong relationship with existing (and proposed) major transport infrastructure.	Fraser), 208556 (T Solomonides), 208569 (A Ross), 208570 (A Ross), 208571 (A Ross), 208572 (A Ross), 208573 (A Ross), 208574 (A Ross), 208575 (A Ross), 208576 (A Ross), 208578 (J Bowen), 208666 (E Taylor), 208667 (E Taylor), 209048 (J Darrell), 209717 (J Darrell), 209740 (J Barnes), 210385 (M Cookson), 210432 (B Davies), 210477 (W Bailey), 210486 (E Lambourne), 210664 (F Snell), 210665 (F Snell), 210817 (A Marns), 210826 (C Paton), 211020 (M Hardinge), 211034 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211734 (P Seddon), **Other bodies:** 201603 (Great Abington Parish Council), 203371 (BMR Granta Park Propco Limited), 204112 (P Gill), 204707 (Little Abington PC),

	208111 (Sawston Parish Council), 208153 (Great Abington Parish Council),208159 (Great Abington Parish Council), 209965 (Granta Land Ltd), 210707 (Great Abington Parish Council), 210963 (Great Abington Parish Council), 211676 (Smithson Hill),
Deliverability • No guarantee site can be available since there is an agricultural tenancy. • without clear delivery pathway, timescale, or funding strategy is deemed ineffective and risks long term planning blight, failing to meet national policy requirements. • Relies heavily on future studies, strategies, and mitigation measures to address known and significant impacts, including transport capacity, ecological protection, heritage impacts, wastewater treatment, and already strained healthcare, small schools/education facilities with lack of funding, and policing. • The Local Plan should not overly depend on new settlements for housing delivery in the early and middle stages, as medium-scale sites like Balsham Road, Linton can contribute effectively.	201367 (M Joslin), 201494 (J Tharby), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport),207920 (H Sutton) 204840 (Vistry Group), 207790 (P Williams), 208322 (PX Land Ltd), 208781 (Axis Land Partnerships Ltd), 209965 (Granta Land Ltd), 211104 (Hallam Land Management), 211414 (CALA Group Ltd),

• Housing trajectory expects delivery of completed dwellings to start within 8 years of adoption of new Local Plan. Drawing on experience from other new allocations in the region, this would not appear to be realistic. • Questioned whether Grange Farm will be capable of delivering any new homes within the plan period and its inclusion within the GCLP therefore becomes untenable. • Requires a binding Delivery Strategy committed by promoter. • Dependent on, amongst other new infrastructure, the Cambridge South East Transport scheme which is not due to even be at public inquiry until later this year. This raises questions over its deliverability. • Deliverability Paper submitted for Grange Farm as part of 'call for sites', confirms that 3,560 dwellings (market and affordable) can be delivered during Local Plan period with the first dwellings being delivered in 2030. Councils' housing trajectory states that only 2,550 dwellings can be delivered during Plan Period. Question how accurate these figures are by both Councils and promoter for Grange Farm. • Discrepancy between number in Housing Trajectory provided by Council (up to 300 dwellings in 2040) and 275 dwellings in promoters Housing Deliverability Paper. Concerns that Council will not be able to deliver that number of dwellings across Plan Period.	

Unsustainable • Size and concentration of proposed development in this rural area deemed undesirable and unsustainable. • Bringing the city to the villages. • New town rather than a proportionate extension • Scale of development is not appropriate at this location. • Lacks explanation for selecting land adjacent to Abington for safeguarding. • Failing to provide proportionate and transparent evidence. • Relies excessively on future mitigation, rendering it unjustified, ineffective, and inconsistent with national policy. • Will function more as a large suburb rather than a self-sufficient town. • Does not provide sufficient positive benefits. • Area is already overpopulated. • An impact (positive and negative) assessment on local areas and towns - and further detail of what will be required to overcome negative impacts. • 6,000 homes identified to be built nearer to Granta Park, Babraham and Biomedical Campus in one block is not sustainable. There are not 12,000 jobs at these sites therefore people need to travel elsewhere for work which is not possible by foot or bike.	201281 (C Wolverson), 201311 (M Donovan), 201330 (J Sharman), 201480(G Brookman), 201482 (A Cameron), 201494 (J Tharby), 201681 (J Weston), 201689 (F Irwin), 201730 (C Paton), 201740 (G Lee), 201753 (L Dav), 201756 (G Sharman), 201764 (J Snell), 201795 (R Barker), 201805 (J Dowling), 201912 (J Dodd), 202142 (M Turner), 202163 (R Livermore), 202726 (A Victory), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 203734 (D Fraser), 203773 (A Russell), 204111 (J Batchelor), 204810 (E McKeown), 205032 (A Spicer), 205457 (M Fentiman), 205741 (G Saunders), 205745 (R Lee), 205919 (C Paton), 205920 (C Paton), 207235 (S Appleton), 207236 (S Appleton), 207237 (S Appleton), 207238 (S Appleton), 207504 (P Hayden-Smith), 207573 (M Howes), 207927 (H Sutton),207967 (S Trueman), 208546 (D Fraser), 208547 (D Fraser), 208548 (D Fraser), 208549 (D Fraser), 208550 (D Fraser), 208551 (D

• Does not represent a sustainable development and in spite of proximity to the biomedical campus and proposed park & ride / guided busway schemes, will become a car-based commuter settlement, with easy access to London to the south. • Too small to be a sustainable new town or to deliver the scale of facilities on-site to prevent significant additional car journeys. • Inappropriate, being too small to be self-sustaining and too large to fit comfortably within the landscape, necessitating a reduction in size and ambition. • In transport terms, the site is not sustainable. • No plans to make new settlement a self-sufficient community, instead it is envisaged that residents will travel to work and presumably also for shopping, schools etc., • In transport terms, site is not sustainable. • Not in alignment with GCLP strategy to direct development to where active and public transport is the 'natural choice'. • Allocation not a logical conclusion when evidence on sustainable patterns of development around Greater Cambridge area are taken into account.	Fraser), 208552 (D Fraser), 208667 (E Taylor), 206602 (S Solomonides), 210820 (C Newgreen), 211645 (G King), **Other bodies:** 201556 (Stapleford PC), 203001 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 203060 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207393 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207384 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207385 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 208322 (PX Land Ltd), 208781 (Axis Land Partnerships Ltd), 209698 (CEG Land Promotions Ltd), 209965 (Granta Land Ltd), 210905 (Great Shelford Parish Council),

Size of development • Needs to be considerably scaled back. • More modest development in keeping with the local need, natural environment and market. • Scale of development should be dramatically reduced to a level the area can realistically support and must not be 10x larger than the existing village population. • Disproportionate to the local settlement hierarchy and risks urbanising a rural area. • Should be at reduced scale as a village not a new town, and without warehouse land. • Too large for a rural area, risking unsustainability in local services such as shops, schools, and healthcare. • Already huge development in this area. • Out of character for rural setting. • Scale it down by at least 50%. • Scale and form are inconsistent with the settlement hierarchy and do not support the plan's strategy of focusing growth in sustainable, infrastructure supported locations. • Site seems wholly inappropriate for a development of the proposed scale and density.	200994 (M Logan), 201407 (G Sanders), 201517 (C Woodward), 201538 (T Davenport), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport), 201545 (J Yarker), 201577 (G Smith), 201591 (L Menzies), 201635 (J Shaw), 201684 (S Bowen), 201696 (S Tossi), 201706 (R James), 201716 (C Rodgers), 201747 (B Seddon), 201753 (L Dav), 201756 (G Sharman), 201798 (J Thirkettle), 201855 (J Hudson), 201892 (R Berry), 201919 (G Menzies), 201952 (J Hann), 202337 (S James), 202616 (I Smith), 202696, (S Roberts), 202731 (J Barnes), 203123 (J Searle), 203141 (V Jury), 203190 (M Furlow), 203459 (L Lambourne), 203512 (R Tovey), 203636 (W Dott), 203648 (E Pimblett), 203652 (T Randle), 203653 (S Appleton), 203680 (S Jarvis-Dott), 203683 (D Simmons), 203797 (R Nagasaki), 203911 (E Lambourne), 204201 (P Williams), 204785 (R Foale), 204871 (V Valge-Archer), 204891 (D Newgreen),

• Expansion of the Draft Local Plan allocation beyond the originally promoted Grange Farm scheme raises questions about the necessity and role of newly included land. • Inappropriate, being too small to be self-sustaining and too large to fit comfortably within the landscape, necessitating a reduction in size and ambition. • Scale of development threatens the viability and identity of existing communities, potentially leading to commuter dormitory scenarios. • Inconceivable that a development of the scale proposed at Grange Farm, which is 75,000% larger than what the Draft Plan considers appropriate for category of settlement which Draft Plan itself prescribes for Little Abington, should proceed in light of this. • Significant overdevelopment in close proximity to Grange Farm development. • Disingenuous to bring forward site without detailed reference being made to the already contemplated additional plan to develop site further should adjacent Ley Rectory Farm become available. • The proposed development of approximately 6,000 dwellings is likely to generate between 9,000 and 12,000 private vehicles, in addition to buses, delivery vehicles, and commercial traffic required to support residential and employment uses. This level of traffic generation is wholly incompatible with the existing highway infrastructure.	204895 (J Clifford), 204931 (P Seddon), 205271 (P Dsantos),205486 (R Sainsbury) 205640 (L McNicholas), 205875 (C Randle), 205908 (A Hutchings), 205917 (M Rusted), 205923 (J Snell), 205967 (R Randle), 206164 (C Newgreen), 207138 (T Davenport), 207139 (T Davenport), 207140 (T Davenport), 207141 (T Davenport), 207142 (T Davenport), 207143 (T Davenport), 207144 (T Davenport), 207145 (T Davenport), 207146 (T Davenport), 207147 (T Davenport), 207148 (T Davenport), 207386 (W Dott), 207387 (W Dott), 207406 (H Rogers), 207685 (T Collett), 207925 (H Sutton), 207968 (S Trueman), 208601 (M Appleton), 208602 (M Appleton), 208607 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 205724 (F Goad), 210387 (M Cookson), 210390 (M Cookson), **Other bodies:**

• Not large enough to provide 6000 houses and all the infrastructure of a town – shops, offices, churches, library, fire station, police station, pub, restaurants, parks, museum, health centre care home etc. • New settlement as massive as the Grange Farm Development must be completely self-contained • Area is characterised by organic, incremental village growth over long periods, creating diversity in scale, design, and character. A large, single phase new settlement cannot replicate this. More appropriate approach would be small seeded settlement, followed by incremental, demand led development that reflects local character and avoids the “instant town” problem. • We were horrified to discover that you are proposing to build a development at Grange Farm which would involves the construction of between 6,000 and 8,000 houses. Based on the average figures from the Office of National Statistics these would be homes for about 2.35 people per household or between 14,000 and over 18,000 people	203060 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 204948 (Robinson College), 207383 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207384 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207385 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 208585 (Little Abington PC), 208588 (Little Abington PC), 208594 (Little Abington PC),
Infrastructure, Services and Facilities • Must be retail outlets (shops, pubs and restaurants) on the site. • Access to general practitioners is already limited and will likely worsen with the development.	200994 (M Logan), 201031 (R Smith), 201203 (A King), 201275 (E Pepperall), 201281 (C Wolverson), 201311 (M Donovan), 201312 (M Cookson), 201316 (M Craven), 201323 (H

• essential infrastructure—including roads, public transport, schools, NHS provision, policing, waste management, utilities, and mobile connectivity—to be fully funded, approved, and delivered before any housing is built. • More detail needed on timescale for facilities delivery. • Current infrastructure will note cope. • Existing schools do not have capacity for this growth. • GPs do not have capacity. • Lack of detail. • No mention of policing. • Addenbrookes does not have the capacity for this growth. • Increased demand for electricity. • Local shops and amenities are insufficient to support the anticipated increase in population. • Essential infrastructure delivery is unproven, risking housing ahead of services. • residents will need to travel for essential services and amenities, exacerbating congestion and reliance on cars. • Have facilities on site, Doctors, School, allotments, small general store/Post office. Picnic area, swimming pool, skate park. • Provide a partner led GP practice and plan effectively with Addenbrookes.	Biggs), 201330 (J Sharman), 201340 (G Broad), 201348 (K Christodoulides), 201358 (R Parkin), 201360 (V Hefford), 201369 (G Marshall), 201375 (B Spencer), 201398 (Francoise Goad), 201434 (G Moore), 201459 (T Stone), 201482 (A Cameron), 201483 (J Sneddon), 201517 (C Woodward), 201518 (J Jackson), 201529 (M Cooper), 201533 (A Smith), 201538 (T Davenport), 201541 (T Davenport), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport), 201545 (J Yarker), 201570 (R Perucchini), 201577 (G Smith), 201580 (S Fraser), 201591 (L Menzies), 201665 (K Hefford), 201681 (J Weston), 201689 (F Irwin), 201696 (S Tossi), 201706 (R James), 201716 (C Rodgers), 201720 (J Fairs), 201723 (A Hutchings), 201725 (J Carr), 201726 (J Mayes), 201731 (L Scott), 201740 (G Lee), 201747 (B Seddon), 201748 (M Radcliffe), 201750 (J Hall), 201753 (L Dav), 201761 (B Gutteridge), 201764 (J Snell),

• Businesses and shops in the new town may require a larger catchment area to thrive. • Similar developments in Waterbeach and Northstowe were promised shops, schools and doctors and they are still waiting. • numerous examples both locally and around the country where infrastructure provision that was promised at the start of a project has been slow in coming or in many cases yet to materialise in spite of houses being built and people moving in • Fails to adequately address cumulative impacts. • No mention of additional emergency services. • Build swimming pool; climbing centre; pump track for bikes. • Proposed retail and postal facilities at Grange Farm could undermine existing village services. • Should include a specific policy safeguard that retail provision at Grange Farm is limited in scale and does not include a supermarket or competing postal facility, in order to protect existing village services. • Successful delivery of Grange Farm depends on resolving significant infrastructure interventions and funding arrangements. • Under the subheading 'Uses' Section 7– add a new criterion n. as follows; "n. Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding".	201772 (H Howe), 201782 (J Tanner), 201788 (H Cornwell), 201790 (S Ackerman), 201795 (R Barker), 201798 (J Thirkettle), 201802 (R Cornwell), 201804 (R Zimmern), 201846 (E Goodyear), 201850 (S Zmigrod), 201848 (R Allum), 201882 (N Rumble), 201883 (A Quinn), 201887 (K Lander), 201890 (K Cooper), 201892 (R Berry), 201912 (J Dodd), 201919 (G Menzies), 201921 (E Crutchington), 201943 (J Dowling), 201952 (J Hann), 201996 (S Fordham), 202017 (J Reynolds), 202020 (J Rivers), 202023 (S. Byatt), 202024 (S Byatt), 202047 (M Tiplady), 202067 (D Milns), 202092 (R Harman), 202142 (M Turner), 202299 (R Barnes), 202325 (E George), 202477 (J Herbert), 202568 (K Deeming), 202605 (Z Smith), 202638 (C Yeomans), 202696, (S Roberts), 202699 (K Russell), 202701 (K Russell), 202727 (A Annis), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 202876 (C Pippen), 202915 (A Batty), 203123

• Lacks funded commitments for essential infrastructure, risking unsustainable stress on existing water supply, transport, and healthcare services. • New settlement would have a peak electricity demand of some 15MW requiring a 33kv supply from National Grid. More than one feeder connection would be required, and this would undoubtedly be above ground on posts or pylons making further intrusions into the landscape. • Object to Policy S/GF relating to the proposed new settlement at Grange Farm, for the reasons set out below. In its current form, the proposal is unsound due to unresolved transport constraints, poor accessibility to strategic public transport infrastructure, and serious flood risk implications for surrounding communities. • CCC note that Grange Farm is likely to require a new special school or expansion to Granta school, add special educational needs to Item 7k. • First phase should include community space and shop (even if on a temporary basis until further phases have been completed and purpose built community space and retail units built). • Policy should be modified to ensure that the quantity and type of indoor and outdoor sport provision onsite are informed by an up-to-date PPS, BFS, FPM. Sport England recommend that a management and maintenance plan is required for the indoor and outdoor sport facilities, and a Sports and Open Space Strategy is submitted if these were not secured as part of the outline planning permission.	(J Searle), 203407 (P Allum), 203459 (L Lambourne), 203529 (O Barnes), 203615 (A Palmer), 203636 (W Dott), 203648 (E Pimblett), 203803 (J Cutting), 203911 (E Lambourne), 204147 (L Paine), 204181 (S Morgan), 204201 (P Williams), 204725 (C Gill), 204773 (G Boselli), 204807 (P Munns), 204821 (Abington Stores and Post Office), 204871 (V Valge-Archer), 204919 (K King), 204921 (R Rix), 205032 (A Spicer), 205142 (N Whittaker), 205164 (T Stone), 205425 (S McDonald), 205457 (M Fentiman), 205482 (M Brattesani), 205602 (S Richards), 205606 (S Goodhart), 205616 (M Whittaker), 205618 (S Lee), 205632 (R Rix), 205641 (L McNicholas), 205660 (K Cooper), 205679 (S Fordham), 205681 (R Gilmour), 205732 (W Bailey), 205740 (G Saunders), 205766 (J Sneddon), 205814 (R Perucchini), 205815 (R Perucchini), 205823 (E Scott), 205940 (R Barker), 206035 (J Dowling), 206036 (J

• PE support desire to include primary and secondary education. Should be extended to include early years provision. Note in particular that these should be delivered “from the early phases” of development. We support sentiment but are aware that there is considerable experience in the Greater Cambridge area of careful management of timing of opening new schools (both primary and secondary), with implications for other nearby schools. • PE support in principle the desire to see provision of a new healthcare facility on the development. We wish to encourage early dialogue with the Integrated Care Board to understand the likely requirements and land take. • PE support intentions of policy, noting further work is required to establish the scale of each element of open space, sports provision and to work through how best to integrate into a landscape led masterplan. • A&E facilities at Addenbrookes hospital already under strain and cannot take any further capacity until it is developed and expanded. • Major infrastructure such as energy and roads should be comprehensive but other services and facilities should be in response to demand. Would not need large out of town grocery store to support first seeded development as would destroy viability of stores in existing local villages. • Proposal does not include any meaningful comparative analysis of facilities, amenities, public services, open space, or infrastructure required to sustain a	Dowling), 206204 (R Barnes), 206252 (P Brown), 206320 (G King), 206604 (S Solomonides), 206605 (S Solomonides), 201048 (R Sainsbury), 207049 (R Sainsbury) 207050 (R Sainsbury) 207138 (T Davenport), 207139 (T Davenport), 207140 (T Davenport), 207141 (T Davenport), 207142 (T Davenport), 207143 (T Davenport), 207144 (T Davenport), 207145 (T Davenport), 207146 (T Davenport), 207147 (T Davenport), 207148 (T Davenport), 207236 (S Appleton) 207386 (W Dott), 207386 (W Dott), 207543 (R Allum), 207544 (R Allum), 207545 (R Allum), 207555 (C Rodgers), 207585 (D Donohue), 207594 (V Valge-Archer), 207597 (R King),207963, 207975 S Trueman), 208012 (J Logan), 208428 (N Brown), 208481 (G Crowe), 208530 (G Brookman), 208533 (C Alda), 208554 (T Solomonides), 208581 (J Bowen), 208599 (M Appleton), 208663 (E Taylor), 209049 (J Darrell), 209718 (A Spicer), 209728

population of this size, nor how these would be delivered in an area currently characterised by rural villages and agricultural land. • Concerned that policy does not prejudge appropriate uses, or timing, which will be negotiated application stage. PE committed to ensuring early provision of community facilities to encourage and foster strong sense of community, potentially through some meanwhile uses. However, desire to see this in place “from the outset” could infer this is required before any occupiers and demand. We are keen to learn from best practice in other successful new communities, in places such as Welbourne, Nansledan and Poundbury, for inspiration. • PE support planning for essential services, facilities and infrastructure and we are committed to working with all statutory undertakers, GCSP and other interested parties to ensure timely delivery of infrastructure. Viability will be an important consideration.	(E Jones), 209745 (J Barnes), 210076 (V Cox), 210394 (M Cookson), 210395 (M Cookson), 210408 (M Cookson), 210425 (O Barnes), 210437 (R Wells), 210484m (E Lambourne), 210808 (A Marns), 210809 (A Marns), 210819 (C Newgreen), 210828 (R Barnes), 211016 (R Froment), 211656 (G King), 211709 (J Dowling), 211710 (J Dowling), 211718 (J Clifford), 211728 (P Seddon), Other bodies: 201556 (Stapleford PC), 202029 (Weston Colville PC), 202041 (Weston Colville PC), 202042 (Weston Colville PC), 202043 (Weston Colville PC), 204840 (Vistry Group), 207480 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207513 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service), 210589 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 208112 (Sawston Parish Council),

	208115 (Sawston Parish Council), 208158 (Great Abington Parish Council), 208774 (Croudace Homes), 208947 (CPRE Cambridgeshire and Peterborough), 209225 (Sport England), 209265 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209266 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209267 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210495 (Robinson Collage), 210724 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210771 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210906 (Great Shelford Parish Council), 211413 (CALA Group Ltd),

Sewer and Flooding • Sewage plant is planned as a prominent feature on a main access route to Little Abington. • Impact of odours on nearby dwellings. • Run-off poses a flooding risk for the A1307 and the Abingtons. • Location for the new water treatment plant is undesirable due to potential odours affecting nearby housing. • How large an area of land will need to be allocated for the sewerage treatment works and when will the anticipated location be mapped out? • No discharge to River Granta. • Rainwater recycling. • Will treatment plant have facility to accept tankers to discharge effluent/sludge from other sources. • Will treatment plant be exclusively for the use of Grange Farm development. • Will large area of land be needed for treatment works and when will location be mapped out. • Should not be used for replacement Cambridge sewerage treatment works. • Would cause unpleasant smells which would disproportionately impact Abington residents due to the location. • Move water treatment plant to the side furthest from the Abingtons.	201031 (R Smith), 201281 (C Wolverson), 201316 (M Craven), 201330 (J Sharman), 201360 (V Hefford), 201369 (G Marshall), 201375 (B Spencer), 201415 (M Fryer), 201416 (M Fryer), 201417 (M Fryer), 201418 (M Fryer), 201459 (T Stone), 201482 (A Cameron), 201518 (J Jackson), 201529 (M Cooper), 201539 (A Patterson-Lee), 201554 (R Martin), 201624 (D Farrant), 201665 (K Hefford), 201681 (J Weston), 201694 (S Bowen), 201696 (S Tossi), 201724 (M Rusted), 201761 (B Gutteridge), 201785 (G Farrant), 201790 (S Ackerman), 201795 (R Barker), 201804 (R Zimmern), 201805 (J Dowling), 201821 (Y Arkwright), 201848 (R Allum), 201881 (R Randle), 201883 (A Quinn), 201919 (G Menzies), 201952 (J Hann), 202017 (J Reynolds), 202067 (D Milns), 202092 (R Harman), 202142 (M Turner), 202296 (R Barnes), 202299 (R Barnes), 202477 (J Herbert), 202699 (K Russell),

• Loss of natural drainage. • Surface water flooding already a problem. • Fails to adequately address cumulative impacts. • Development should not proceed unless assessments demonstrate no harm to the chalk stream or increased flood risk. • No detailed, independent and verified flood, water and waste water impact assessment. • The proposed site and much of the adjoining area is in the drainage field for the protected Granta river and a treatment plant here would present a clear threat to it. • River through village often bursts its banks in winter, following heavy rainfall. • PE note requirement to ensure that foul water can be appropriately managed, as part of overall water cycle. Have commissioned work in this area from a suitably qualified expert, and we expect that this will help shape an appropriate policy for the site, based on what is practical and deliverable. We are clear that ultimately the Water companies have a statutory duty to provide for waste water collection and recycling, but we are aware of constraints locally and environmental pressures, and are committed to exploring what we can do to ensure integration into the wider network.	202701 (K Russell), 202726 (A Victory), 202731 (J Barnes), 203190 (M Furlow), 203389 (G Brookman), 203407 (P Allum), 203459 (L Lambourne), 203680 (S Jarvis-Dott), 203805 (A Butchart), 203934 (L Donahue), 204015 (J Fairs), 204201 (P Williams), 204395 (P Klein-Ensminger), 204617 (J Mannion), 204635 (M Starr), 204664 (S Haynes), 204807 (P Munns), 204810 (E McKeown), 204879 (J Dowling), 204891 (D Newgreen), 204919 (K King), 205032 (A Spicer), 205147 (I Sainsbury), 205164 (T Stone), 205387 (M Hardinge), 205432 (N Marshman), 205482 (M Brattesani), 205508 (M Victory), 205601 (S Richards), 205620 (J McDonald), 205712 (A Wells), 205713 (A Wells), 205726 (F Goad), 205764 (R Wells), 205822 (C Randle), 205911 (M Rusted), 205939 (R Barker), 205974 (R Randle), 206029 (J Dowling), 206168 (C Newgreen), 206198 (R Barnes), 206322 (G

	King), 206326 (C Cameron), 206597 (A Butchart), 206896 (I Sainsbury), 206897 (I Sainsbury), 207068 (L Cookson), 207149 (M Huntsman), 207179 (S Bowen), 207227 (E Lane), 207237 (S Appleton), 207387 (W Dott), 207408 (S Haynes), 207504 (P Hayden-Smith), 207543 (R Allum), 207557 (G Smith), 207559 (G Smith), 207562 (L Sainsbury), 207571 (P Gill), 207574 (M Howes), 207585 (D Donohue), 207590 (D Donohue), 207596 (R King), 207599 (P Brunning), 207653 (A&C Soares), 207659 (P Lester), 207680 (T Collett), 207786 (P Williams), 207965 S Trueman), 208430 (N Brown), 208432 (N Brown), 208532 (C Alda), 208543 (K Auckland), 208572 (A Ross), 208603 (M Appleton), 208605 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 208555 (T Solomonides), 208664 (E Taylor), 209719 (A Spicer), 209721 (A Spicer), 209743 (J Barnes), 210075 (V Cox), 210403 (M Cookson), 210431 (B Davies), 210485 (E

	Lambourne), 210660(S Zmigrod), 210705 (G Saunders), 210797 (D Marns), 210802 (D Marns), 210819 (C Newgreen), 210841 (G King), 211015 (R Froment), 211017 (R Froment), 211021 (M Hardinge), 211033 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211036 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211655 (G King), 211699 (J Dowling), 211720 (J Clifford), 211732 (P Seddon), 211786 (H Sutton) Other bodies: 207743 (Whittlesford Parish Council), 208119 (Sawston Parish Council), 208590 (Little Abington PC), 208592 (Little Abington PC), 210769 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust),

Drinking Water • Existing concerns regarding the supply of drinking water in the area. • Chalk aquifer and sewage system will not support an additional 6000 homes. • Abington is the driest area of an already dry part of UK. The site is on chalk which supplies our drinking water and keeps the river Granta as a rare chalk stream. • Lack of water locally with solution to come from a new reservoir which is north of Cambridge (pumping costs). • Proposal of more houses without a plan to supply potable water is of great concern. • Water is a vital commodity that requires long term planning and protection. • No mention of a water management plan. • Grange Farm requires 3-4 million litres daily by 2032. Grafham Water Transfer will not be online until 2032. Suspend allocation unless Cambridge Water confirms water supply for 2025-2032 in writing, or defer to post-2032. • Site is over major aquifer highly sensitive to contamination from pollutant runoff. Extent to which risk can be mitigated is unclear, but a major development in this location is clearly undesirable in this water-stressed region.	201031 (R Smith), 201281 (C Wolverson), 201316 (M Craven), 201369 (G Marshall), 201375 (B Spencer), 201459 (T Stone), 201482 (A Cameron), 201624 (D Farrant), 201655 (P Zimmem), 201681 (J Weston), 201785 (G Farrant), 201804 (R Zimmern), 201805 (J Dowling), 201848 (R Allum), 201881 (R Randle), 201882 (N Rumble), 201883 (A Quinn), 201952 (J Hann), 202017 (J Reynolds), 202022 (A Marns), 202477 (J Herbert), 202600 (L Cameron), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 203459 (L Lambourne), 203680 (S Jarvis-Dott), 203911 (E Lambourne), 204181 (S Morgan), 204196 (A Cooke), 204201 (P Williams), 204395 (P Klein-Ensminger), 204664 (S Haynes), 204725 (C Gill), 204773 (G Boselli), 204810 (E McKeown), 205387 (M Hardinge), 205387 (M Hardinge), 205432 (N Marshman), 205618 (S Lee), 205731 (W Bailey), 205767 (J Sneddon), 205914 (M Rusted), 206030 (J Dowling), 206896 (

	Sainsbury), 207237 (S Appleton), 207408 (S Haynes), 207504 (P Hayden-Smith), 207550 (B Garnish), 207562 (L Sainsbury), 207566 (S Fryer), 207590 (D Donohue), 207681 (T Collett), 207784 (P Williams), 207924 (H Sutton), 207964 S Trueman), 208016 (J Logan), 208429 (N Brown), 208481 (G Crowe), 208529 (G Brookman), 208578 (J Bowen), 208599 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 210431 (B Davies), 210485 (E Lamborne), 210490 (C Gill), 210796 (D Marns), 210801 (A Marns), 211651 (G King), 211701 (J Dowling), 211732 (P Seddon), **Other bodies:** 203005 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 207743 (Whittlesford Parish Council), 208118 (Sawston Parish Council), 208587 (Little Abington PC), 208947 (CPRE Cambridgeshire and Peterborough),

Landscape & countryside • Views and vista from Roman road need to be considered. • Too close to Roman Road. • Near ancient woodland. • Loss of countryside • Loss of best and most versatile (Grade 2/3) agricultural land. • Questions if loss of land can be compensated by increased open spaces and biodiversity. • Topography makes it unsuitable. • Will be visible many miles away. • Impact of high rise properties. • Undermines national policy aimed at preventing the coalescence of settlements and preserving countryside character. • Coalescence of Abington, Hildersham and Pampisford • Cumulative impact of nearby developments, including Babraham and solar projects, will further harm the local environment. • Would scar the landscape, harming the character of the Abington villages and the A1307 corridor. • Insufficient Mitigation and Landscape Capacity.	200994 (M Logan), 201031 (R Smith), 201275 (E Pepperall), 201281 (C Wolverson), 201323 (H Biggs), 201330 (J Sharman), 201357 (K Battom), 201367 (M Joslin), 201372 (A Wells), 201375 (B Spencer), 201408 (R Lee), 201434 (G Moore), 201467 (R Wells), 201482 (A Cameron), 201483 (J Sneddon), 3201494 (J Tharby), 201518 (J Jackson), 201530 (I Rogers), 201531 (H Rogers), 201538 (T Davenport), 210539 (A Patterson Lee), 201541 (T Davenport), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport), 201545 (J Yarker), 201591 (L Menzies), 201624 (D Farrant), 201651 (M Mannassi), 201681 (J Weston), 201690 (J Kelly), 201691 (C Randle), 201694 (S Bowen), 201696 (S Tossi), 201706 (R James), 201723 (A Hutchings), 201726 (J Mayes), 201753 (L Dav), 201756 (G Sharman), 201782 (J Tanner), 201785 (G Farrant), 201788 (H Cornwell), 201790(S Ackerman), 201803 (S Fryer), 201805 (J

• Evidence supporting site selection admits the boundary is too constrained to properly mitigate harm to sensitive environmental assets. • Site is not suitable for a new town of this size. • Erosion of the rural landscape that currently provides a clear and valuable break between settlements. • Strong, enforceable protections for countryside, must be guaranteed. • Cannot be in keeping due to its scale. • Proximity of Grange Farm to the Kingsway Solar Farm a potential issue. • Concrete over more arable land increases reliance on food imports. • Jeopardising the green belt and the rural landscape south of the city. • Land outside the development boundary may remain in agricultural use and not default to informal open space. • Policy should ensure built forms are well-screened and integrated into the landscape with significant tree planting to mitigate visual impact. • Policy should restrict development to low rise to reduce impact on landscape. • Make clear that ancillary development, such as the bridge, is subject to the same policy requirements regarding landscape, heritage and ecology. • Would cause irreversible harm to a sensitive chalkland, rural-edge location. • Damaging views from the High Street's heritage assets, the Gog Magogs, and the wider Hertfordshire Chalk Downs.	Dowling), 201846 (E Goodyear), 201855 (J Hudson), 201881 (R Randle), 201882 (N Rumble), 201892 (R Berry), 201898 (R Pargeter), 201912 (J Dodd), 201943 (J Dowling), 202015 (D Marns), 202017 (J Reynolds), 202020 (J Rivers), 202023 (P Cullimore), 202055 (P Snow), 202067 (D Milns), 202092 (R Harman), 202104 (M Barry), 202162 (L Crisp), 202163 (R Livermore), 202296 (R Barnes), 202337 (S James), 202359 (A-M Melloy), 202481 (P Brown), 202571 (R Haining), 202600 (L Cameron), 202696 (S Roberts), 202708 (D Golding), 202726 (A Victory), 202731 (J Barnes), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 202792 (A McDonnell), 203002 (S Price), 203141 (V Jury), 203187 (M Jury), 203389 (G Brookman), 203417 (F Davis), 203512 (R Tovey), 203529 (O Barnes), 203615 (A Palmer), 203680 (S Jarvis-Dott), 203730 (K Auckland), 203797 (R Nagasaki), 203805 (A

• Must require a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). • Note that an amount of greenspace has not yet been specified. Natural England advise 3ha/1000 greenspace which meets the Natural England GI Framework Standards criteria should be an absolute minimum, particularly where mitigation for recreational pressure is needed, and that more should ideally be required. For a site of 6000 homes, a minimum of 43.2ha semi-natural greenspace would be needed. • Precautionary, landscape-led approach that reduces development intensity, strengthens environmental protections, and aligns growth with environmental and infrastructure capacity is required. • Impact on local and wider views. • No detailed, independent and verified visual impact assessment. • Will be visible from further away than Trumpington, Duxford, Great Chesterford and Bartlow. • Council's own Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy concludes site is unsuitable for tall or visually prominent development and identifies a high residual risk of harm even with mitigation. • Soft landscaping proposals will not mask development. • Boundaries of "green" shown on the drawing within the Grange Farm plan does not specify the size of these or how they will be protected.	Butchart), 203807 (S Solomonides), 203839 (T Solomonides), 203934 (L Donahue), 204111 (J Batchelor), 204147 (L Paine), 204156 (B Barkataki), 204586 (R Elston-Green), 204617 (J Mannion), 204635 (M Starr), 204803 (E Jones), 204807 (P Munns), 204895 (J Clifford), 204919 (K King), 204921 (R Rix), 204994 (V Cox), 204999 (D Stephen), 205142 (N Whittaker), 205193 (V Silvey), 205271 (P Dsantos), 205401 (B Davis), 205425 (S McDonald), 205430 (E Davies), 205457 (M Fentiman), 205487 (G Minhas), 205512 (S Somerville), 205544 (G Minhas), 205607 (S Goodhart), 205619 (J McDonald), 205635 (M Furlow), 205680 (S Fordham), 205705 (A Wells), 205730 (W Bailey), 205734 (J Wingfield), 205742 (R Lee), 205749 (C Feenan), 205750 (C Feenan), 205751 (C Feenan), 205757 (R Wells), 205759 (R Wells), 205762 (R Wells), 205763 (R Wells), 205765 (J Sneddon), 205813 (R Perucchini), 205876

• The development would significantly affect the distinctive chalk landscape, open views and rural approaches. Supply of electricity would be via above ground post or pylons making further intrusions on the landscape. • PE are concerned about lack of clarity about purpose, appropriate land uses, location, definition/purpose and spatial extent of proposed SEA. The term Strategic Enhancement Area is potentially misleading given wide-ranging nature of policy intention and its generalised use across different contexts and boundary interfaces. PE are fully supportive of a landscape led design, but consider that further work is required to establish size and nature of proposed SEA, the purposes and land uses for this area. As long term landowners, both PE and Mr Franklin intend to continue to farm their residual land holdings, and therefore definition over the proposed SEA and consideration of impacts on the residual farm will be important considerations for both landowners. • Support in principle need for robust landscape framework. We have commissioned expert consultants on landscape, ecology and heritage to explore these issues further. Remain concerned about current definition of SEA and agree that this should be devised based on a more detailed evidence driven understanding of site constraints and opportunities, and a landscape led masterplan proposal. • Policy should require legal mechanisms that prevent buffer at the Ley Rectory Farm Barns interface being thinned, repurposed or built upon in future years	(C Randle), 205905 (A Hutchings), 205912 (M Rusted), 205920 (C Paton), 205921 (C Paton), 205945 (R Barker), 205955 (S Zmigrod), 205968 (R Randle), 206027 (J Dowling), 206150 R Livermore), 206153 (R Livermore), 206196 (R Barnes), 206197 (R Barnes), 206202 (R Barnes), 206250 (P Brown), 206314 (G King), 206315 (G King), 206595 (G Butchart), 206602 (S Solomonides), 206603 (S Solomonides), 206605 (S Solomonides), 206900 (I Sainsbury), 207653 (A&C Soares), 207139 (T Davenport), 207140 (T Davenport), 207141 (T Davenport), 207142 (T Davenport), 207143 (T Davenport), 207144 (T Davenport), 207145 (T Davenport), 207146 (T Davenport), 207147 (T Davenport), 207148 (T Davenport), 207149 (M Huntsman), 207178 (S Bowen), 207227 (E Lane), 207235 (S Appleton), 207238 (S Appleton), 207406 (H Rogers), 207504 (P Hayden-Smith), 207556 (C Rodgers), 207559

	(G Smith), 207563 (L Sainsbury), 207565 (S Fryer), 207569 (P Gill), 207580 (J Weston), 207591 (D Stephen), 207591 (D Stephen), 207593 (V Valge-Archer), 207595 (V Valge-Archer), 207599 (P Brunning), 207679 (T Collett),207922 (H Sutton), 208011 (J Logan), 208425 (N Brown), 208433 (N Brown), 208527 (G Brookman), 208543 (K Auckland), 208544 (K Auckland), 208547 (D Fraser), 208548 (D Fraser), 208549 (D Fraser), 208550 (D Fraser), 208551 (D Fraser), 208552 (D Fraser), 208570 (A Ross), 208578 (J Bowen), 205579 (J Bowen), 208582 (J Bowen), 208605 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 208663 (E Taylor), 208665 (E Taylor), 208667 (E Taylor), 208739 (F Orgee), 208748 (T Orgee), 209047 (J Darrell), 209188 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 209257 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209272 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited

	and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209724 (E Jones), 209731 (J Barnes), 209732 (J Barnes), 209739 (J Barnes), 209741 (J Barnes), 210396 (M Cookson), 210409 (M Cookson), 210416 (O Barnes), 210417 (O Barnes), 210418 (O Barnes), 210419 (O Barnes), 210420 (O Barnes), 210649 (S Zmigrod), 210650 (S Zmigrod), 210654 (S Zmigrod), 210661 (S Zmigrod), 210681 (G Saunders), 210706 (G Saunders), 789210791 (R Perucchini), 210803 (A Marns), 210819 (C Newgreen), 210822 (C Paton), 210836 (R Barnes), 210850 (N Brown), 211027 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211033 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211652 (G King), 211654 (G King), 211694 (J Dowling), 211695 (J Dowling), 211716 (J Clifford), 211717 (J Clifford), 211732 (P Seddon), 2117323(P Seddon), 211787 (H Sutton),

	Other bodies: 201602 (Great Abington Parish Council), 202029 (Weston Colville PC), 202031 (Weston Colville Parish Council), 203060 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207383 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 203266 (Horseheath Parish Council), 204948 (Robinson College), 207384 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207385 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207614 (Natural England), 208114 (Sawston Parish Council), 208154 (Great Abington Parish Council), 208155 (Great Abington Parish Council), 208592 (Little Abington PC), 208947 (CPRE Cambridgeshire and Peterborough), 209272 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210906 (Great Shelford Parish Council),

Impact on chalk stream (Granta) • Threatens one of only 260 chalk streams in the World which runs through our village. • Strong, enforceable protections for chalk stream must be guaranteed. • Chalk aquifer and sewage system will not support an additional 6000 homes. • The site is on chalk which supplies our drinking water and keeps the river Granta as a rare chalk stream. • No amount of water management on site will prevent contamination. • Chalk streams are internationally important and are already impacted by existing agriculture and sewage plants upstream at Linton. • Policy must provide robust evidence on how the development can proceed without further jeopardizing the fragile local water table and the health of these rare chalk stream habitats. • No detailed, independent and verified environmental and hydrogeological impact assessment. • Development should not proceed unless assessments demonstrate no harm to the chalk stream or increased flood risk.	201368 (J Lawrence), 201372 (A Wells), 201407 (G Sanders), 201467 (R Wells), 201482 (A Cameron), 201538 (T Davenport), 201541 (T Davenport), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport), 201554 (R Martin), 201570 (R Perucchini), 201624 (D Farrant), 201655 (P Zimmem), 201662 (N Ockendon), 201706 (R James), 201761 (B Gutteridge), 201762 (D Turnidge), 201790 (S Ackerman), 201795 (R Barker), 201855 (J Hudson), 201882 (N Rumble), 201912 (J Dodd), 201985 (J Sainsbury), 202017 (J Reynolds), 202142 (M Turner), 202337 (S James), 202600 (L Cameron), 202731 (J Barnes), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 203190 (M Furlow), 203417 (F Davis), 203868 (M Broadhurst), 203911 (E Lambourne), 204181 (S Morgan), 204196 (A Cooke), 204725 (C Gill), 204807 (P Munns),

• Under strategic plan green infrastructure initiatives number 1 is the revitalisation of the chalk stream network - part of the same area as the Grange farm development - nothing mentioned in the Grange Farm plan on how the chalk streams will be protected or affected by this development. • The allocation sits above the river Granta chalk-stream catchment where ecological status is not good, and where regional plans recognise water scarcity and the need to avoid increases in abstraction until new strategic resources come on line. Large scale developments here risks run-off a water - quality impacts on a nationally rare Habitat. • The site sits on a shallow chalk aquifer and adjacent to the rare River Granta chalk stream; construction runoff could pollute these highly sensitive ecosystems. • In the absence of clear, robust and enforceable evidence demonstrating no adverse effect, permission should be refused at Grange Farm. • Exhibits laudable elements and characteristics (being up-slope) so that it could, if all the proposed mitigations and water handling systems are included, be neutral to positive in overall impact on the River Granta. • Trustees have for years been very concerned about impact of CSET proposals, particularly on Nine Wells and the Brook. The Trust supports on-road alternative being put forward by Better Ways for Busways group.	204891 (D Newgreen), 204895 (J Clifford), 204919 (K King), 205147 (I Sainsbury), 205164 (T Stone), 205387 (M Hardinge), 205401 (B Davies), 205430 (E Davies), 205546 (G Minhas), 205601 (S Richards), 205706 (A Wells), 205711 (A Wells), 205731 (W Bailey), 205737 (J Wingfield), 205748 (C Feenan), 205758 (R Wells), 205767 (J Sneddon), 205805 (R Martin), 205942 (R Barker), 205949 (S Zmigrod), 205950 (S Zmigrod), 206168 (C Newgreen), 206898 (I Sainsbury), 207786 (P Williams), 207138 (T Davenport), 207139 (T Davenport), 207140 (T Davenport), 207141 (T Davenport), 207142 (T Davenport), 207143 (T Davenport), 207144 (T Davenport), 207145 (T Davenport), 207146 (T Davenport), 207147 (T Davenport), 207148 (T Davenport), 207150 (M Huntsman), 207237 (S Appleton), 207387 (W Dott), 207564 (R Elston-Green), 207571 (P Gill), 207574 (M Howes), 207583 (G Brookman), 207591 (D

	Stephen), 207592 (D Stephen), 207599 (P Brunning), 207659 (P Lester), 207928 (H Sutton), 208016 (J Logan), 208429 (N Brown), 208532 (C Alda), 208543 (K Auckland), 208599 (M Appleton), 208605 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 208752 (T Ogree), 206026 (J Dowling), 208429 (N Brown), 206898 (I Sainsbury), 208752 (T Ogree), 210074 (V Cox), 210403 (M Cookson), 210413 (O Barnes), 210492 (C Gill), 210678 (G Saunders), 210679 (G Saunders), 210792 (R Perucchini), 211651 (G King), 211693 (J Dowling), **Other bodies:** 201609 (Great Abington Parish Council), 203005 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 203060 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207383 (Cambridge Past, Present and

	Future), 207384 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207385 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 208157 (Great Abington Parish), 208592 (Little Abington PC), 209017 (Hobson's Conduit Trust),
Pollution • Noise and air pollution • Such light and noise pollution in such a rural setting is not something that should be promoted by any local authority, or body representing it. • Extensive public lighting will create light pollution and ensure the settlement will be visible from afar night and day. • Introduce a “quiet zone” on the south□eastern edge that excludes high□impact, noise□generating and HGV□intensive uses. • Development will be subject to high levels of traffic noise for most of the 24 hour day. • Construction lasting up to 20 years will generate prolonged noise, dust and mud, adversely affecting nearby residents and wildlife.	201368 (J Lawrence), 201375 (B Spencer), 201635 (J Shaw), 201696 (S Tossi), 201821 (Y Arkwright), 202047 (M Tiplady), 202142 (M Turner), 202296 (R Barnes), 202699 (K Russell), 204773 (G Boselli), 202701 (K Russell), 204879 (J Dowling), 204891 (D Newgreen), 205715 (A Wells) 205877 (C Randle), 205951 (S Zmigrod), 205954 (S Zmigrod), 205969 (R Randle), 207559 (G Smith), 207566 (S Fryer), 208547 (D Fraser), 208548 (D Fraser), 208549 (D Fraser), 208550 (D Fraser), 208551 (D Fraser), 208552 (D Fraser), 208604 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 206034 (J Dowling), 206041 (J Dowling), 210680 (G Saunders), 210805 (A Marns), 211708 (J Dowling),

	Other bodies: 202029 (Weston Colville PC), 208591 (Little Abington PC),
Habitats and Wildlife • Impact on habitats. • Strong, enforceable protections for wildlife must be guaranteed. • Impact on SSSIs. • Increased pressure on existing open and biodiverse spaces in Stapleford parish, including Magog Down, Chalk Hill Down, and Wandlebury Country Park. • Established open spaces may become overcrowded, negatively impacting natural assets, and recommend using CIL/S106 funds to manage the impacts of increased footfall. • impact on precious flora and fauna especially Grey Partridge populations. • Sufficient and sufficiently robust and legally binding safeguards are essential to ensure commercial developers are held to the requirements, both during construction and for the long term maintenance of, for example, biodiversity mitigation.	201311 (M Donovan), 201316 (M Craven), 201357 (K Battom), 201372 (A Wells), 201467 (R Wells), 201538 (T Davenport), 201541 (T Davenport), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport), 201662 (N Ockendon), 201753 (L Dav), 201762 (D Turnidge), 201785 (G Farrant), 201788 (H Cornwell), 201790(S Ackerman), 201803 (S Fryer), 201821 (Y Arkwright), 201898 (R Pargeter), 201915 (G Battom), 201919 (G Menzies), 202023 (P Cullimore), 202047 (M Tiplady), 202082 (D Palmer), 202481 (P Brown), 202912 (R King), 203407 (P Allum), 203934 (L Donahue), 204999 (D Stephen), 205164 (T Stone), 205271 (P Dsantos), 205457 (M Fentiman), 205618 (S Lee), 205678 (J Sainsbury),

• Must include specific mitigation strategies and funding to manage the impacts of increased recreational activity on the important ecological, heritage and amenity assets on the adjacent Gog Magog Hills – so that they continue to contribute to the quality of life of the wider Cambridge population. • Item 11d should be revised to replace ‘minimise’ with ‘avoid’ and to take into account Wandlebury and Magog Down by adding 'and other nature and heritage sites’ • How will the development prevent unofficial access points to the Roman Road being created? • Welcome inclusion of SEA to buffer Roman Road SSSI from development, but concerns currently remain about how impacts will be avoided. • Grange Farm is taking away from a natural environment and whilst the plan acknowledges various things as previously mentioned there is no specific detail on how this will be protected or enhanced with only throwaway lines like ”consider these assets” “deliver enhancement wherever possible” these mean nothing and will allow the developer to ignore. • Will the houses have eaves for swallows and house martins, and purpose-built bricks for swifts, and areas for sparrows etc.? • Ecological survey and monitoring should also be added as requirement for specific sensitive locations outside of the site’s red line boundary that may be impacted by	205680 (S Fordham), 205709 (A Wells), 205710 (A Wells), 205878 (C Randle), 205970 (R Randle), 206250 (P Brown), 206316 (G King), 206599 (A Butchart), 207068 (L Cookson), 207653 (A&C Soares), 207138 (T Davenport), 207139 (T Davenport), 207140 (T Davenport), 207141 (T Davenport), 207142 (T Davenport), 207143 (T Davenport), 207144 (T Davenport), 207145 (T Davenport), 207146 (T Davenport), 207147 (T Davenport), 207148 (T Davenport), 207227 (E Lane), 207564 (R Elston-Green), 207565 (S Fryer), 207566 (S Fryer), 2307567 (J Wallace), 207584 (G Brookman), 207585 (D Donohue), 207591 (D Stephen), 207592 (D Stephen), 208527 (G Brookman), 208547 (D Fraser), 208548 (D Fraser), 208549 (D Fraser), 208550 (D Fraser), 208551 (D Fraser), 208552 (D Fraser), 208569 (A Ross), 208629 (G Jones), 206028 (J Dowling), 205913 (M Rusted), 210403 (M Cookson), 210414 (O Barnes),

development. Should be requirement to monitor effectiveness of measures put in place to combat recreational disturbance on SSSI, for example, and commitment to implementing alternative solutions if initial measures are ineffective.	210791 (R Perucchini), 210824 (C Paton), 211652 (G King), 211694 (J Dowling), 211696 (J Dowling), 211728 (P Seddon), **Other bodies:** 201556 (Stapleford PC), 201604 (Great Abington Parish Council), 201605 (Great Abington Parish Council), 202029 (Weston Colville PC), 203001 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 203060 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207383 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207384 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207385 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207614 (Natural England), 2207615 (Natural England), 08592 (Little Abington PC), 210906 (Great Shelford Parish Council),

Historic Assets • Impact on local heritage. • Evidence supporting site selection admits the boundary is too constrained to properly mitigate harm to sensitive heritage assets. • Strong, enforceable protections for heritage assets must be guaranteed. • Impact on Roman Road. • Impact on scheduled ancient monument and Fleam Dyke. • Heritage buildings should be protected from being overshadowed by new developments, requiring careful and sympathetic consideration. • Concerns regarding the archaeological significance. • Impact on Abington's Conservation Area • Preservation of heritage assets have not been fully assessed or mitigated. • Must include specific mitigation strategies and funding to manage the impacts of increased recreational activity on the important ecological, heritage and amenity assets on the adjacent Gog Magog Hills – so that they continue to contribute to the quality of life of the wider Cambridge population. • How will the development prevent unofficial access points to the Roman Road being created? • No Heritage Impact Assessment.	201316 (M Craven), 201483 (J Sneddon), 201531 (H Rogers), 201538 (T Davenport), 201541 (T Davenport), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport), 201591 (L Menzies), 201624 (D Farrant), 201690 (J Kelly), 201731 (L Scott), 201753 (L Dav), 201762 (D Turnidge), 201782 (J Tanner), 201795 (R Barker), 201803 (S Fryer), 201805 (J Dowling), 201821 (Y Arkwright), 201898 (R Pargeter), 201919 (G Menzies), 202023 (P Cullimore), 202092 (R Harman), 202163 (R Livermore), 202414 (M Whitcombe), 202481 (P Brown), 202616 (I Smith), 202675 (N Fraser), 202726 (A Victory), 202731 (J Barnes), 203407 (P Allum), 203512 (R Tovey), 203931 (A Ross), 204181 (S Morgan), 204196 (A Cooke), 204201 (P Williams), 204465 (H Sutton), 204617 (J Mannion), 204810 (E McKeown), 204939 (G Brown), 205016 (G Dalton), 205457 (M Fentiman), 205487 (G Minhas), 205387 (M Hardinge), 205545 (G

• Must acknowledge and assess cumulative landscape harm of Grange Farm alongside Kingsway Solar Farm and CSET corridor. It should state that development will be refused if the combined impact creates a continuous "urban wall" across the southern landscape. • Scale of proposed development and its proximity to designated and sensitive sites mean that significant adverse impacts are still likely, despite mitigation. • Impact on Roman Road, Brent Ditch, Fleam Dyke, the A11, the Henge next door to the Bronze Age Barrows, • Does not “preserve or enhance” designated heritage assets, nor the appearance of the Conservation Area of Little Abington (and Great Abington), nor the views into or out of them. • Would be contrary to Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as it would dominate and damage the conservation area's character and appearance due to the proposed size and population density and dominant elevated location on the hill overlooking Little Abington. • There is an historic ancient right of way from the A1307 into a chalk pit which lies within the development. This path was used for centuries by villagers to obtain chalk and clunch to maintain and repair their homes. This heritage should be preserved.	Minhas), 205635 (M Furlow), 205760 (R Wells), 205768 (J Sneddon), 205820 (E Scott), 205821 (E Scott), 205943 (R Barker), 206250 (P Brown), 206317 (G King), 206901 (I Sainsbury), 207051 (R Sainsbury), 207068 (L Cookson), 207138 (T Davenport), 207139 (T Davenport), 207140 (T Davenport), 207141 (T Davenport), 207142 (T Davenport), 207143 (T Davenport), 207144 (T Davenport), 207145 (T Davenport), 207146 (T Davenport), 207147 (T Davenport), 207148 (T Davenport), 207227 (E Lane), 207235 (S Appleton), 207504 (P Hayden-Smith), 207563 (L Sainsbury), 207565 (S Fryer), 207653 (A&C Soares), 207788 (P Willaims), 208011 (J Logan), 208013 (J Logan), 208481 (G Crowe), 208528 (G Brookman), 208569 (A Ross), 208570 (A Ross), 208629 (G Jones), 210389 (M Cookson), 210397 (M Cookson), 210409 (M Cookson), 210824 (C Paton), 210836 (R

• PE support Heritage Impact and Historic Landscape Character Assessments. We support in principle the need for robust landscape and masterplanning framework. Have commissioned expert consultants on landscape, ecology and heritage to explore these issues further, to ensure that we can respond to these key issues. • Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there are a number of designated heritage assets nearby. Any development of this site has potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. • HIA notes there will be a high risk of residual harm to heritage given scale and nature of proposals. Essential that every opportunity is taken to mitigate impacts and also maximise enhancements for heritage. • Criterion 6 change 'historic assets' to 'heritage assets' and 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' to 'Scheduled Monument'. Amend 'Abington Conservation Area' to 'Great and Little Abington Conservation Area'. • b i Delete Ancient • bii Good to mention GII listed Worsted Lodge but other nearby listed buildings should also be mentioned e.g. 8 Cambridge Road • Needs to reference nearby Great and Little Abington Conservation Area and associated listed buildings. • B iii barrows, not burrows.	Barnes), 211027 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211653 (G King), 211694 (J Dowling), **Other bodies:** 201669 (Linton PC, 203060 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 203268 Horseheath Parish Council), 207383 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207384 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207385 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 208584 (Little Abington PC), 208596 (Little Abington PC), 209273 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210140 (Historic England), 210727 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210728 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210729 (Pampisford Estate Farms

• Suggest referring to a '…more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment…' given that an HIA has already been undertaken. • Do you mean Historic Landscape Characterisation? Purpose should be to inform the masterplanning. • Recommend re-ordering of the bullet points. • Recommend wording could be amended to read: 'Historic Landscape Characterisation and Landscape Character Assessment, more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment, and Archaeological Assessment must be undertaken to understand the impacts of development on landscape character, long range and local views and heritage assets and their setting, identifying appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. The Council's HIA and the results of these further assessments must inform the masterplanning for the site.' • Include reference to 'improve understanding and legibility of Worstead Street Scheduled Monument and links to other Roman networks through interpretation and public art' (as recommended in the HIA). • 11 c should mention scheduled monument designation of Roman Road • 11 g should also mention that 'the open character of the landscape buffer should be maintained' (as recommended in the HIA). • 23 Lifespan – needs to include reference to the need for a Conservation Management Plan for the heritage assets.	Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210730 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust)

• Figure 82 Spatial Framework We welcome the identification of green space, landscape features around heritage assets. • The Town Centre is shown quite high up the hill. Given that heights of buildings are likely to be taller at the town centre, there is the potential for the built form to be visible above the ridge. We therefore recommend that Centre is moved lower down slope. • Paragraph 3.3.66 Long term Conservation Management Plan also needed for Roman Road and other heritage assets. This should also be included in the Policy. • Further work required to understand heritage importance of Roman Road, and area south of Roman Road and its interface with development. As landowner, geophysical survey work has been commissioned to aid our understanding of the site's heritage significance. Whilst it is recognised that there will be a need to provide some buffer to sensitive heritage and landscape features, there is further work required to determine the most appropriate way to achieve this. Design approaches, such as framing buried remains of interest to give them a visual setting, thereby enhancing their significance, may also be appropriate. • Further work required to determine most appropriate location for "centre" accounting for range of factors. Site topography and building heights will be important considerations, but there will be wider considerations including proximity and access to nearby communities, mix of uses proposed, phasing of	

development and infrastructure required to support delivery of such facilities. Policy should therefore be amended to support identification of a site for a new local centre, but leave flexibility in policy to find the appropriate design led response. • PE support variety of built form as set out in draft policy but conflicts with 7 A) which promotes an average density target of 50 – 55 dwellings per hectare. • PE support landmark features and buildings in appropriate locations, taking account of landscape and other technical work which will provide guidance on appropriate locations for taller buildings.	
Highways • Impact on A1307. • Impact on Four Wentways. • Exit onto A1307 will cause problems. • Consideration should be given to a new junction onto the A11. • Impact on A505/A1301 roundabout • will likely lead to more 'rat running' through Little Abington. • A505 needs increased capacity • Need safe continuous cycle links to other villages • A505 and A1307 are already badly congested during am/pm rush hours. • A1307 is high casualty road which will be made worse.	200994 (M Logan), 201011 (M Lunn), 201031 (R Smith), 201231 (M Sims), 201275 (E Pepperall), 201281 (C Wolverson), 201311 (M Donovan), 201312 M Cookson), 201316 (M Craven), 201323 (H Biggs), 201330 (J Sharman), 201340 (G Broad), 201348 (K Christodoulides), 201357 (K Battom), 201358 (R Parkin), 201360 (V Hefford), 201367 (M Joslin), 201368 (J Lawrence), 201369 (G Marshall), 201372 (A Wells), 201375 (B Spencer), 201407 (G Sanders), 201408 (R

• Timescale needed for adding/upgrading junctions. • No guarantee residents would walk or cycle to Welcome or Babraham Institute. • Scale of development warrants own highways infrastructure. • Underpass or bridge to new P&R • Dedicated lane on A1307 to Addenbrookes for emergency vehicles. • Buses already full. • Put park and ride near housing. • Will site be able to access Balsham Road junction on A11. • Transport estimates are widely optimistic with no scientific backing. • Claiming improved buses and cycling will fix this is unrealistic • Traffic analysis conducted just after post-Covid at the height of people still working from home. • Reliance on the proposed CSET scheme is speculative at best: it may never be approved or funded, and it would not connect most residents to their workplaces, meaning car use will remain inevitable. • Residents will need to travel for essential services and amenities, exacerbating congestion and reliance on cars. • Site is easily accessed from North London and commuting by train from Whittlesford. • Huge volume of traffic now as many staff at Addenbrooke's live in Haverhill.	Lee), 201415 (M Fryer), 201419 (M Fryer), 201434 (G Moore), 201443 (T Randle), 201459 (T Stone), 201482 (A Cameron), 201517 (C Woodward), 201518 (J Jackson), 201529 (M Cooper), 201530 (I Rogers), 201533 (A Smith), 201541 (T Davenport), 201542 (L Davenport), 201544 (L Davenport), 201545 (J Yarker), 201570 (R Perucchini), 201580 (S Fraser), 201584 (E Scott), 201591 (L Menzies), 201624 (D Farrant), 201635 (J Shaw), 201655 (P Zimmem), 201662 (N Ockendon), 201665 (K Hefford), 201667 (A Eleftheriou), 201668 (R Roberts), 201690 (J Kelly), 201691 (C Randle), 201694 (S Bowen), 201696 (S Tossi), 201697 (H Ward), 201720 (J Fairs), 201723 (A Hutchings), 201725 (J Carr), 201726 (J Mayes), 201731 (L Scott), 201748 (M Radcliffe), 201750 (J Hall), 201753 (L Dav), 201756 (G Sharman), 201761 (B Gutteridge), 201762 (D Turnidge), 201782 (J Tanner), 201785 (G Farrant), 201788 (H

• Only 2 routes directly onto the 1307 which doesn't auger well for a steady flow along the road. • Should be new traffic survey. • Should be different access to and from site. • Assuming all will take the bus or cycle is unrealistic. • Impact on those travelling to/from Haverhill. • Introduce additional frequent bus services into Cambridge. • Lack of understanding that it will attract visitors from surrounding villages, necessitating adequate transport provisions. • Concerns about accessibility and connectivity, making it feel more like an enclave. • Fully evaluate the impact of this development on the existing roads. • Need to take account of planned development further along A1307 at Haverhill and villages in-between. • Planned travel hubs would not alleviate impact as they are north on the A1307. • Already dangerous country lanes terrifying to walk and ride on. • Already congested area, with the A1307 at capacity, experiencing peak traffic of 1200 vehicles per hour in one direction. • Whittlesford Station is small and current transport plans, including the travel hub and Linton Greenway, are incomplete. • Enlarge Whittlesford train station.	Cornwell), 201790 (S Ackerman), 201798 (J Thirkettle), 201802 (R Cornwell), 201803 (S Fryer), 201805 (J Dowling), 201821 (Y Arkwright), 201846 (E Goodyear), 201848 (R Allum), 201855 (J Hudson), 201881 (R Randle) 201882 (N Rumble), 201883 (A Quinn), 201887 (K Lander), 201889 (W Cooper), 201890 (K Cooper), 201895 (A Cassidy), 201898 (R Pargeter), 201912 (J Dodd), 201919 (G Menzies), 201921 (E Crutchington), 201923 (D Rogers), 201924 (M Dance), 201952 (J Hann), 201996 (S Fordham), 202017 (J Reynolds), 202020 (J Rivers), 202022 (A Marns), 202023 (S. Byatt), 202024 (S Byatt), 202034 (D Reed), 202047 (M Tiplady), 202055 (P Snow), 202067 (D Milns), 202082 (D Palmer), 202092 (R Harman), 202299 (R Barnes), 202142 (M Turner), 202162 (L Crisp), 202163 (R Livermore), 202296 (R Barnes), 202325 (E George), 202359 (A-M Melloy), 202477 (J

• If transport hub at Babraham does not proceed, Grange Farm will just put even more traffic on the already overcrowded A1307. • Need mixed-use pedestrian/cycle path to the proposed research centre at Duxford Air Museum. • Plan to create a community of this size that is less dependent on the car may be slightly naive. • Access to the local train stations at Audley End, Whittlesford and Chesterford would only reinforce those congestion issues along with the lack of parking at those locations. • Allow for more private car parking spaces. • Relies entirely on major new transport infrastructure that is not consented, does not have secure finance and is technically challenging. • In transport terms, the site is not sustainable. • Public transport is future-dependent and not clearly committed (i.e., CSET). • Commission detailed modelling of the transport impacts of this development to identify the full suite of transport interventions required to make the development acceptable in planning terms, and to test its viability. • Design supporting bus infrastructure and services to link this development to destinations along the A11 and A505, potentially as far as Royston.	Herbert), 202481 (P Brown), 202568 (K Deeming), 202583 (H Pimblett), 202600 (L Cameron), 202616 (I Smith), 202632 (J Doncaster), 202638 (C Yeomans), 202675 (N Fraser), 202675 (N Fraser), 202699 (K Russell), 202701 (K Russell), 202708 (D Golding), 202726 (A Victory), 202731 (J Barnes), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 202792 (S McDonnell), 202876 (C Pippen), 202915 (A Batty), 203010 (J Wallace), 203141 (V Jury), 203188 (S Hughes), 203359 (B Garnish), 203362 (A Hoare), 203389 (G Brookman), 203407 (P Allum), 203417 (F Davis), 203459 (L Lambourne), 203512 (R Tovey), 203529 (O Barnes), 203582 (S Hatchell-Wilson), 203586 (H Thomas), 203636 (W Dott), 203648 (E Pimblett), 203652 (T Randle), 203677 (E Randle), 203680 (S Jarvis-Dott), 203734 (D Fraser), 203773 (A Russell), 203798 (C Alda), 203805 (A Butchart), 203807 (S Solomonides), 203842 (A Chan), 203911 (E

• Does not explicitly identify A505 as critical infrastructure, nor does it set out a clear, funded and deliverable strategy for mitigating impacts of proposed new settlement and other growth on this corridor. • Test the feasibility and viability of this site allocation without CSET, given that scheme is both unfunded and at risk of not securing the order required for its construction. • Does not explicitly require public rights of way or equestrian access to be considered. Existing rights of way, including byways and footpaths, should be safeguarded and embedded within the masterplan. • Transport and active travel infrastructure linking Grange Farm with surrounding communities must be designed as inclusive, multi-user routes accommodating pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. • Severe cumulative impact on the already-failing A11 Fourwentways roundabout and A1307(34 accidents in 10 years, one fatality), creating unacceptable danger to schoolchildren, elderly, and cyclists. • Should ensure that there is a fast through route for buses that stops right at the centre of the development site to foster frequent bus services that serve both Haverhill and Grange Farm without slowing passengers down. • Centre of Grange Farm too far from CSET for pedestrians.	Lambourne), 203931 (A Ross), 203934 (L Donahue), 203961 (S Somerville), 204015 (J Fairs), 204111 (J Batchelor), 204147 (L Paine), 204156 (B Barkataki), 204181 (S Morgan), 204196 (A Cooke), 204395 (P Klein-Ensminger), 204617 (J Mannion), 204635 (M Starr), 204664 (S Haynes), 204773 (G Boselli), 204785 (R Foale), 204807 (P Munns), 204810 (E McKeown), 204879 (J Dowling), 204891 (D Newgreen), 204895 (J Clifford), 204921 (R Rix), 204931 (P Seddon), 204977 (P Sainsbury), 205016 (G Dalton),205018 (J McDonald), 205020 (S Lee), 205032 (A Spicer), 205142 (N Whittaker), 205147 (I Sainsbury), 205154 (R Froment), 205164 (T Stone), 205187 (S Goodhart), 205193 (V Silvey), 205218 (S Richards), 205227 (P Mc), 205271 (P Dsantos), 205387 (M Hardinge), 205387 (M Hardinge), 205425 (S McDonald), 205430 (E Davies), 205432 (N Marshman), 205457 (M

• Full modelling of traffic volumes, junction capacity, and realistic travel behaviour must be completed before site is allocated. • The current draft cannot show whether the A1307 and A11 can safely or efficiently support the development. • Potential for 'rat-running' through villages. • Ensure any transport infrastructure which is critical to accommodating sustainable growth in this location is secured and adequately planned for. • Allocates land at Grange Farm based on transport provisions (CSET bus□way and A11/A1307 crossing) that have no confirmed consent or funding, making the allocation unrealistic. • Reliance on a future A11 transport hub to manage increased demand lacks a tested design, clear access strategy, and evidence of capacity beyond current needs. • Impact on public rights of way. • Grange Farm not suitable to service nearby campuses. • The IDP does not clearly indicate how CSET busway is to be funded, but it is assumed that the entirety of that cost will fall on the Grange Farm allocation. • Relies entirely on major new transport infrastructure that is not consented, does not have secure finance and is technically challenging.	Fentiman), 205502 (M Victory), 205545 (G Minhas), 205547 (G Minhas), 205606 (S Goodhart) 205633 (M Furlow), 205634 (M Furlow), 205642 (L McNicholas), 205662 (R Berry), 205707 (A Wells), 205708 (A Wells), 205714 (A Wells), 205725 (F Goad), 205727 (F Goad), 205729 (W Bailey), 205736 (J Wingfield), 205738 (J Wingfield), 205747 (C Feenan), 205769 (J Sneddon), 205810 (R Perucchini), 205811 (R Perucchini), 205812 (R Perucchini), 205816 (E Scott), (205879)n C Randle), 205880 (C Randle), 205906 (A Hutchings), 205907 (A Hutchings), 205915 (M Rusted), 205941 (R Barker), 205948 (S Zmigrod), 205971 (R Randle), 205972 (R Randle), 206031 (J Dowling), 206032 (J Dowling), 206033 (J Dowling), 206149 (R Livermore), 206154 (R Livermore), 206248 (P Brown), 206203 (R Barnes), 206249 (P Brown), 206251 (P Brown), 206319 (G King), 206327 (C Cameron), 206328 (C Cameron),

• Success of Culina transport company means an increase articulated lorry movements on A1307 and this will only increase as they use Haverhill depot as a dock location between the ports and the Midlands/London area. • Assumes that transport impacts can be resolved through later-stage interventions and modal shift, rather than demonstrating that sufficient, deliverable capacity exists at the outset to accommodate development. • Lacks clarity on how traffic would realistically move through A11/A1307 corridor, how peak-hour volumes would be managed, or how congestion would be avoided during construction and early occupation. • Reconstruct A11/A1037 junction. • Widen carriageway, junction improvements, bus priority of A1307 to Cambridge. • Provide traffic calming through the Abingtons. • Increase bus frequency. • New railway station at or near site. • Traffic data used to support the allocation appears to include periods affected by Covid-19 travel suppression. Baseline conditions may not reflect current or future traffic levels. • Delivery relies heavily on the successful approval of the Transport and Work Act (TWA) application for the CSET proposals for which no public inquiry date is set and no extension to Grange Farm provided.	206598 (A Butchart), 206601 (S Solomonides), 206602 (S Solomonides), 206605 (S Solomonides), 206689 (R Williams), 206690 (R Williams), 206895 (I Sainsbury), 207006 (B Davies), 207066 (L Cookson), 207067 (L Cookson), 207138 (T Davenport), 207139 (T Davenport), 207140 (T Davenport), 207141 (T Davenport), 207142 (T Davenport), 207143 (T Davenport), 207144 (T Davenport), 207145 (T Davenport), 207146 (T Davenport), 207147 (T Davenport), 207148 (T Davenport), 207150 (M Huntsman), 207178 (S Bowen), 207226 (E Lane), 207236 (S Appleton), 207386 (W Dott), 207389 (R Haining), 207407 (S Haynes), 207504 (P Hayden-Smith), 207523 (R Charles), 207551 (B Garnish), 207555 (C Rodgers), 207558 (G Smith), 207561 (L Sainsbury), 207565 (S Fryer), 207568 (J Wallace), 207570 (P Gill), 207572 (M Howes), 207579 (J Weston), 207582 (G Brookman), 207586 (D Donohue),

• Little evidence that people walk/cycle from South Cambridge villages and Cambridge to existing Science Parks. • Planned CSET route currently stops short of Grange Farm, terminating to the west of the A11 and would necessitate a further extension of the busway and a new Transport Hub to the east of the A11 to serve the new settlement. • Reliance on bus-led public transport strategies alone rarely achieves the desired modal shifts required to make a new settlement of this scale sustainable. • Occupation should be restricted to align with completion of CSET and its proposed extension in order to offer a choice of transport modes on day one. • Growth at Grange Farm could bring significant and potentially adverse impacts but acknowledge the generation of further evidence. • Has proposed segregated public transport connection been fully costed, and has necessary land been secured? Connection is presented as a fundamental dependency for viability of Grange Farm site. If it cannot be delivered, would the site be withdrawn? • National Highways require the CSET connection over A11 to be grade separated and not rely on the A11 junction. • CCC agrees that Grange Farm can be delivered in transport terms with sufficient mitigation, it is only deliverable if CSET Phase 2 is built as well as the extension to	207592 (D Stephen), 207594 (V Valge-Archer), 207597 (R King), 207605 (V Jury), 207653 (A&C Soares), 207659 (P Lester), 207667 (K Brown), 207674 (T Collett), 207785 (P Williams), 207923 (H Sutton), 207969 (S Trueman), 207978 (G Brown), 208017 (J Logan), 208431 (N Brown), 208478 (Pimblett), 208481 (G Crowe), 208482 (S Phipps), 208541 (D Simmons), 208542 (K Auckland), 208547 (D Fraser), 208548 (D Fraser), 208549 (D Fraser), 208550 (D Fraser), 208551 (D Fraser), 208552 (D Fraser), 208553 (D Fraser), 203839 (T Solomonides), 208426 (N Brown), 208546 (D Fraser), 208573 (A Ross), 208583 (J Bowen), 208598 (M Appleton), 208608 (N Brown), 208665 (E Taylor), 208738 (F Orgee), 208750 (T Orgee), 208751 (T Ogree), 209044 (J Darrell), 209045 (J Darrell), 209050 209069 (Camcycle), (J Darrell), 209720 (A Spicer), 209725 (E Jones), 209733 (J Barnes), 209734 (J Barnes),

CSET with grade separation over the A11 with bus priority across a new junction on the A1307. • CCC note that it is important to note that the size and scale of this development is vital in order for this to be deemed a sustainable location. CCC believe that this site would benefit from a detailed transport strategy to refine the trip budget for the site and set out the full mitigation package required. • Only viable if proposal for a Cambridge to Haverhill railway is taken forward, otherwise it will become similar to the original flawed planning many years ago for Cambourne, now only being corrected by East West Rail. • Grange Farm appears likely to bring significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impacts on safe and efficient operation of A11 and SRN junction, based on transport evidence currently available. Acknowledged that testing of Draft Plan in transport evidence currently available, demonstrated development of this site is reliant on introduction of extension to Cambridge South East Transport Scheme over the A11. National Highways require this crossing to be grade separated and not rely on A11 junction as this would likely interfere with operation of the junction. • Pampisford Estates are very supportive of ambitions of CSET project, which would bring improved public transport connections very close to the site, with the Travel Hub to be located south west of Fourwentways roundabout. Full integration with CSET is supported, however, the policy sets out a “segregated connection”, supported by a preliminary study by Mott MacDonald as part of the Council’s	209735 (J Barnes), 209736 (J Barnes), 209737 (J Barnes), 210070 (V Cox), 210071 (V Cox), 210076 (V Cox), 210386 (M Cookson), 210404 (M Cookson), 210405 (M Cookson), 210406 (M Cookson), 210409 (M Cookson), 210421 (O Barnes), 410422 (O Barnes), 210426 (O Barnes), 210436 (R Wells), 210483 (E Lambourne), 210490 (C Gill), 210655 (S Zmigrod), 210657 (S Zmigrod), 210658 (S Zmigrod), 210677 (G Saunders), 210685 (G Saunders), 210700 (G Saunders), 210702 (G Saunders), 201703 (G Saunders), 210794 (D Marns), 210795 (D Marns), 210806 (A Marns), 210807 (A Marns), 210810 (A Marns), 210818 (C Newgreen), 210819 (C Newgreen), 210823 (C Paton), 210827 (R Barnes), 211018 (R Froment), 211028 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211648 (G King), 211649 (G King), 211650 (G King), 211697 (J Dowling), 211702 (J Dowling), 2116703(J Dowling), 211704 (J

evidence base. PE feel there is insufficient work undertaken to be certain over deliverability and until work has been undertaken, we think it is premature to conclude that a segregated connection is the right solution taking account of deliverability and viability. PE have commissioned KMC Transport Planning to prepare a transport strategy for the project, and a key focus will be on the options for achieving integration with CSET. • PE support principle of effective integration of new community with proposed Cambridge South East Transport busway. Integration with CSET is supported, having potential to provide frequent, high quality connections into CBC and city. Feel that insufficient work undertaken to date to be certain over deliverability. We think it is premature to conclude that only a segregated connection (i.e. bridge link) is the right solution taking account of deliverability and viability. Alternative systems and integrations may provide same benefits, and these should also be explored. • PE wish to suggest rewording as follows: "Ensure transport and junction modelling is be undertaken to assess and confirm all possible points of vehicular access into the site and the necessary road and junction enhancements required to satisfy the Highways Authority and National Highways." • Have commissioned work to explore potential for direct access/egress from the A11 in north west corner of site, utilising the existing slip road serving the Total Energies filling station and materials recycling facility. We feel that this has a	Dowling), 211705 (J Dowling), 211705 (J Dowling), 211713 (J Dowling), 211726 (P Seddon), 211729 (P Seddon), 211730 (P Seddon), **Other bodies:** 201391 (Babraham PC), 201556 (Stapleford PC), 201610 (Great Abington Parish Council), 201669 (Linton PC), 202029 (Weston Colville PC), 202039 (Weston Colville PC), 202040 (Weston Colville PC), 202333 (Granta Land Ltd), 202540 (Granta Land Ltd), 202656 (Granta Land Ltd), 202670 (Granta Land Ltd), 203060 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 203604 (British Horse Society), 204684 (East Cambridgeshire DC), 204948 (Robinson College), 205241 (Axis Land Partnerships Ltd), 206219 (Granta Land Ltd), 207383 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207384 (Cambridge Past, Present

potentially important role to play, and KMC Transport Planning are assessing potential options to provide additional access / egress to the A11. There would be a number of potential benefits if this can be achieved, including separate access/egress for construction traffic, and potential separation of heavy traffic from other road users. We accept that these arrangements would need to be agreed with National Highways as highway authority for the SRN. • PE support principle of a trip budget and welcome opportunity to negotiate this with local planning authority. We feel strongly that it would be premature for policy to seek to fix trip budget, which should be product of detailed assessment of appropriate development mix and transport strategy, taking account of local highway capacity constraints and wider strategy to deliver public transport and active travel connections. • In line with development of a masterplan, PE support development of strategic and local transport mitigation plan, which would form basis of a Transport Assessment in due course. • PE support aspiration that walking, cycling, and public transport will be primary modes - however, greater recognition required to confirm that cars will continue to play a significant role. We would like to see amendments to policy to support integration with CSET without specifying how this is achieved until further work has been completed. • PE support the broad ambitions for a Travel Plan.	and Future), 207385 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 207741 (Whittlesford Parish Council), 207742 (Whittlesford Parish Council), 208038 (Railfuture East Anglia), 208116 (Sawston Parish Council), 208117 (Sawston Parish Council), 208156 (Great Abington Parish Council), 208158 (Great Abington Parish Council), 208217 (Pigeon Land & LIH), 208322 (PX Land Let), 208586 (Little Abington Parish Council), 208781 (Axis Land Partnerships Ltd), 208947 (CPRE Cambridgeshire and Peterborough), 209255 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209698 (CEG Land Promotions Ltd), 209965 (Granta Land Ltd), 208167 (National Highways), 210515 / 210518 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 210519 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 210760 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210763 (Pampisford Estate

	Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210764 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210765 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210766 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210780 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210781 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 211593 (Places for People)
Impact on Abingtons and Hildersham • Facilities in Grange Farm could undermine the economic viability of local Abington facilities. • Crime rate will increase. • forcing people to consider moving to get away from it. • Loss of identity. • Coalescence with village.	201031 (R Smith), 201281 (C Wolverson), 201311 (M Donovan), 201330 (J Sharman), 201357 (K Battom), 201358 (R Parkin), 201360 (V Hefford), 201368 (J Lawrence), 201434 (G Moore), 201482 (A Cameron), 201467 (R Wells), 201494 (J Tharby), 201450 (C Feenan), 201518 (J Jackson), 201529 (M Cooper), 210539 (A Patterson Lee), 201584

• Noise, dust and heavy vehicle movement impacts during construction. • Unsettling for residents. • Abington has already absorbed Granta Park with zero benefit to residents. • Fails to protect the character and setting of Abington. • Does not provide clear benefits for current residents, leading to long-term uncertainty and potential negative impacts on traffic, infrastructure, and quality of life. • Is asynchronous with the village and extremely unsightly. • Residents will not interact with the village facilities. • Impact ion property values. • Will jeopardise house prices and cause emotional and financial harm to current residents. There is economic strain, threat to wellbeing and a deterioration in quality of life. • Should complement neighbouring villages rather than overpower and overshadow them. • Greater emphasis should be given to mitigating effect of any development on character of the historic Abingtons. • Bigger buffer zone north of the A1307 to protect Little Abington. • Proposed retail and postal facilities at Grange Farm could undermine existing village services.	(E Scott), 201635 (J Shaw), 201665 (K Hefford), 201690 (J Kelly), 201691 (C Randle), 201696 (S Tossi), 201747 (B Seddon), 201753 (L Dav), 201772 (H Howe), 201785 (G Farrant), 201788 (H Cornwell), 201802 (R Cornwell), 201803 (S Fryer), 201804 (R Zimmern), 201805 (J Dowling), 201821 (Y Arkwright), 201883 (A Quinn), 201892 (R Berry), 201898 (R Pargeter), 201919 (G Menzies), 201943 (J Dowling), 201996 (S Fordham), 202034 (D Reed), 202047 (M Tiplady), 202055 (P Snow), 202067 (D Milns), 202092 (R Harman), 202142 (M Turner), 202162 (L Crisp), 202175 (C Newgreen), 202296 (R Barnes), 202299 (R Barnes), 202337 (S James), 202359 (A-M Melloy), 202568 (K Deeming), 202571 (R Haining), 202608 (C Cameron), 202616 (I Smith), 202699 (K Russell), 202701 (K Russell), 202731 (J Barnes), 202737 (A&L Pepperell), 202915 (A Batty), 202992 (R

• Should include a specific policy safeguard that retail provision at Grange Farm is limited in scale and does not include a supermarket or competing postal facility, in order to protect existing village services. • Any retained allocation must include a clearly defined, policy-protected buffer providing genuine physical and visual separation between new development and the existing villages. • Public spaces in Little Abington and Great Abington would be negatively affected by increased noise, traffic, pollution and loss of rural views. • "Strategic Enhancement Area" too vague. Must explicitly define a minimum buffer width (e.g., 500m) between development edge and Abingtons to genuinely prevent coalescence and preserve village character. • The buffer area between the development and village needs to be widened along its southern edge. • Has been no assessment of crime impact. • Would undermine community cohesion. • It would create a contiguous development and entirely subsume, and therefore destroy, existing villages. • To achieve meaningful separation, plan should reflect historic settlement pattern of South Cambridgeshire. Sawston, Pampisford, Babraham, the Abingtons, Hildersham, Linton, and Great Chesterford have average separation of 3.3 km.	Gilmour), 203123 (J Searle), 203141 (V Jury), 203187 (M Jury), 203407 (P Allum), 203512 (R Tovey), 203516 (M Howes), 203529 (O Barnes), 203652 (T Randle), 203680 (S Jarvis-Dott), 203683 (D Simmons), 203803 (J Cutting), 203807 (S Solomonides), 203839 (T Solomonides), 203868 (M Broadhurst), 203911 (E Lambourne), 203934 (L Donahue), 204586 (R Elston-Green), 204635 (M Starr), 204682 (E Lane), 204783 (R Smith), 204807 (P Munns), 204810 (E McKeown), 204821 (Abington Stores and Post Office), 204871 (V Valge-Archer), 204879 (J Dowling), 204891 (D Newgreen), 205092 (M Whittaker), 205164 (T Stone), 205193 (V Siley), 205271 (P Dsantos), 205425 (S McDonald), 205482 (M Brattesani), 205487 (G Minhas), 205512 (S Somerville), 205635 (M Furlow), 205636 (M Furlow), 205661 (R Berry), 205728 (W Bailey), 205735 (J Wingfield), 205817 (E Scott), 206034 (J Dowling), 206151 (R Livermore), 206152 (R

Grange Farm site cannot meet this standard except by restricting development to the northernmost portion. • PE strongly support objective to avoid convergence of settlements and note that this has been a particularly strong point raised through initial community responses on project. Would suggest that policy wording could be sufficient to ensure settlements do not coalesce, without prejudging the appropriate way of achieving this. Committed to working with GCSP to devise appropriate design solutions to ensure that Little Abington and Great Abington (in particular) retain their own distinct identity. • Policy too vague on protections for existing residents at southern and southeastern boundary. • Policy limb should read “maintain the distinction between the Grange Farm development and neighbouring villages, in terms of character and physical separation.” Note also there are inconsistencies here with land being referred to as “Grange Farm” rather than “Land adjacent to A11/A1307”. Should be a consistent naming convention adopted for clarity.	Livermore), 206165 (C Newgreen), 206167 (C Newgreen), 206194 (R Barnes), 206200 R Barnes), 206250 (P Brown), 206318 (G King), 206324 (C Cameron), 206325 (C Cameron), 206596 (A Butchart), 207069 (L Cookson), 207181 (S Bowen), 207388 (W Dott), 207523 (R Charles), 207543 (R Allum), 207557 (G Smith), 207591 (D Stephen), 207598 (R King), 207599 (P Brunning), 207659 (P Lester), 207678 (T Collett), 207976 (G Brown), 208540 (D Simmons), 208547 (D Fraser), 208548 (D Fraser), 208549 (D Fraser), 208550 (D Fraser), 208551 (D Fraser), 208552 (D Fraser), 208602 (M Appleton), 208603 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 208664 (E Taylor), 208737 (F Orgee), 209729 (J Barnes), 210073 (V Cox), 210388 (M Cookson), 210398 (M Cookson), 210409 (M Cookson), 210415 (M Cookson), 210433 (P Mc), 210491 (C Gill), 210644 (S Zmigrod),

	210663 (J Snell), 210689 (G Saunders), 210821 (C Newgreen), 211021 (M Hardinge), **Other bodies:** 201608 (Great Abington Parish Council), 202029 (Weston Colville PC), 204948 (Robinson College), 208589 (Little Abington PC), 208590 (Little Abington PC), 209274 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210731 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust),
Wider area: • Fails to consider the wider impacts on surrounding settlements. • Two planned developments (Policy S/GF: Land Adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm and Policy S/CE Cambridge East) are expected to impact upon West Suffolk given its proximity and the functioning of the surrounding towns of Newmarket and Haverhill.	208540 (D Simmons), **Other bodies:** 204784 (West Suffolk Council),

• Will require collaborative working with West Suffolk and a full assessment through the preparation of the local plan evidence base. • Nature of proposed connections is not clear and whether they will link to the towns of Haverhill and Newmarket within West Suffolk. • West Suffolk Council would welcome opportunity to work collaboratively and co-operatively to understand the detail of these proposals.	
Design Matters • Object to high density. • Scale is overwhelming. • Will be a disconnected, poor place to live. • Speaks of "high quality and well-designed buildings" but is very short on details - including room sizes, which remain below European standards. • Will have to build dense ugly properties to facilitate the level of development suggested inc probable high rise. • More appropriate design criteria should be applied that respect the rural character of South Cambridgeshire. • Concerns about the proposed housing density of 50/55 per hectare, questioning the fairness compared to the allocation of 12 pitches per hectare for travellers.	200994 (M Logan), 201443 (T Randle), 201459 (T Stone), 201591 (L Menzies), 201651 (M Mannassi), 201696 (S Tossi), 201747 (B Seddon), 201803 (S Fryer), 202067 (D Milns), 202092 (R Harman), 202568 (K Deeming), 202632 (J Doncaster), 202696 (S Roberts), 202876 (C Pippen), 202915 (A Batty), 203141 (V Jury), 203512 (R Tovey), 203931 (A Ross), 204586 (R Elston-Green), 204635 (M Starr), 205487 (G Minhas), 205544 (G Minhas), 205743 (R Lee), 205744 (R Lee), 205752 (C Feenan), 205952 (S Zmigrod), 205953 (S Zmigrod), 205956 (S Zmigrod), 205957 (S Zmigrod), 205958 (S

• Need for housing designs that are appropriate for a village setting, rather than those suited for urban environments. • Make the houses eco-friendly and well insulated. • “green areas” provided by these developments are not used or maintained and they are just paying lip-service to your “holistic” views to keep within planning guidelines. • Ensure the height of the buildings does not overshadow in any way the local area and designs architecturally blend into the local rural landscape. • Infrastructure-intensive uses should be prioritised near the A11 corridor to minimise impacts on agricultural land and maintain a coherent settlement structure. • Strategic enhancement area will be too small to meet strategic green infrastructure needs on-site. Even if the development provided significant financial contributions for strategic green infrastructure, it is highly unlikely that providers would be able to acquire the land required in the right places, as land assembly for strategic green infrastructure on the edge of Cambridge will ultimately depend on the landowners getting at least part of their own development aspirations in return for providing the land for strategic green infrastructure. • Introduce binding and enforceable limits on building height, density and massing to protect skyline views, heritage assets and village setting.	Zmigrod), 206195 (R Barnes), 206195 (R Barnes), 206201 (R Barnes), 207959 (S Zmigrod), 207557 (G Smith), 205818 (E Scott), 205916 (M Rusted), 206166 (C Newgreen), 207580 (J Weston), 207677 (T Collett), 208014 (J Logan), 208570 (A Ross), 208597 (M Appleton),), 208629 (G Jones), 208749 (T Orgee), 209047 (J Darrell), 209723 (A Spicer), 209730 (J Barnes), 209742 (J Barnes), 209744 (J Barnes), 210399 (M Cookson), 210401 (M Cookson), 210402 (M Cookson), 210407 (M Cookson), 210417 (O Barnes), 210424 (O Barnes), 210645 (S Zmigrod), 210646 (S Zmigrod), 210647 (S Zmigrod), 210648 (S Zmigrod), 210651 (S Zmigrod), 210652 (S Zmigrod), 210653 (S Zmigrod), 210659 (S Zmigrod), 210682 (G Saunders), 210683 (G Saunders), 210684 (G Saunders), 210886 (G Saunders), 210687 (G Saunders), 210688 (G Saunders), 210692 (G Saunders), 210693 (G Saunders), 210694 (G

• Advance planting as a pre‑commencement condition • Must include explicit building height limits (e.g., maximum 2 storeys) to ensure development does not visually dominate skyline or Cam valley. Must be specific prohibition on vertical landmarks or industrial structures that would break horizon when viewed from Gog Magogs or Roman Road. • Add mandatory requirement for "Dark Skies" compliant lighting strategy to prevent light spill from this elevated site into the surrounding open countryside. • Lack of detail regarding the sustainability of homes, specifically the inclusion of solar panels and grey water systems. • Tall buildings, skyline impact and failure to impose binding height controls. Policy S/GF does not define what constitutes a tall building, does not prohibit tall or landmark buildings, and does not impose binding height limits across the site. • Site Allocations Topic Paper expects a density around of around 50-55 dwellings per hectare – however, when taking into account site also includes a town centre, warehouses, offices, schools, shops, open and park spaces, and other facilities and amenities, this density may be higher still. In contrast, customary density for even a suburban development of houses would be around 35 dwellings per hectare. • Inclusion of energy efficient homes is essential and should be a stipulation of any new build contract given.	Saunders), 210695 (G Saunders), 210696 (G Saunders), 210697 (G Saunders), 210698 (G Saunders), 210699 (G Saunders), 210704 (G Saunders), 210804 (A Marns), 211029 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211030 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211032 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211707 (J Dowling), 211711 (J Dowling), 211733 (P Seddon), **Other bodies:** 201607 (Great Abington Parish Council), 201669 (Linton PC), 209258, 209269, 209270, 209275 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 203001 (Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust), 210723, 210725, 210726, 210732, 210733, 210734, 210735, 210736, 210737, 210738, 210740, 210741, 210742, 210743, 210744, 210745, 210746, 210747, 210748, 210749, 210750, 210751, 210752, 210753, 210754, 210755,

• Design ethos does not accord with character of South Cambridgeshire, which is principally small villages, that radiate from Cambridge. Proposal will create an urban environment, not sympathetic to the setting in its locality or the county context. • Create a continuous landscape buffer along the south‑eastern boundary to provide year‑round visual and acoustic separation, protected as a non‑built zone. • Ensure perpetual ownership and funded management of the buffer. • Design public‑space routes and lighting to minimise spill, glare and intrusion into existing dwellings. • Apply stepped‑down building heights and densities toward the boundary, with low‑rise, low‑intensity forms, frontages that face the buffer and privacy safeguards to prevent overlooking. • Any lighting near the boundary including for walking and cycling routes should be designed specifically to prevent glare and light spill into nearby homes and the countryside, using shielding and appropriate controls. • Descriptions provided regarding landscaping are a token gesture to appease. • Illustrations suggest four storey structures in close proximity create dense urban spaces, with architectural features not part of the South Cambridgeshire vernacular. Proposals are out of character in terms of local vernacular, scale, massing, architectural features and proportions synonymous of an ‘any place	210756, 210757, 210758, 210759, 210761, 210767, 210768, 210770, 210772, 210774, 210779 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust),

anywhere' developer lead approach leading to band, poor quality development and architecture. • Implement a movement strategy that prevents rat□running through Little and Great Abington. • High-impact, noise-generating and HGV-intensive uses should be located away from south-eastern boundary and should not be located at, within, or operate immediately adjacent to south-eastern boundary where allocation meets existing homes at Ley Rectory Farm Barns. • Single Masterplan implies a single phase, uniform development inconsistent with character of South Cambridgeshire villages, which evolved organically around historic centres such as river crossings and manor houses. Create small initial village core, then allow local developers, architects, and individual homeowners to build incrementally in response to demand. • Designs by John Simpson Architects are subjective and fail to safeguard local character. Illustrations suggest dense, four-storey development with architectural features alien to South Cambridgeshire. Comparable nearby towns such as Saffron Walden, Cambridge and Newmarket do not exhibit the proposed forms or styles. The approach is generic and developer-led, lacking local distinctiveness. • Large national housebuilders typically produce uniform, low quality designs that do not reflect local character. • Examine potential for community heating schemes.	

• Public routes and spaces along south-eastern boundary should be designed to respect privacy and minimise disturbance • Could be interpreted that the SF has already determine most appropriate design solutions and mitigation. PE have commissioned full multi-disciplinary team to explore these issues in detail, and to develop a robust masterplan framework for site, which identifies and respects site's ecological and heritage constraints/opportunities. • PE support desire for high quality design, and whilst we share the ambition for an exemplar approach, greater clarity is required on interpretation of what this means. We very much welcome the opportunity to develop a robust masterplan framework and to test the approach to a range of matters to reach common ground with GCSP on these points. • Request clarity on what is referred to by "the landscape within its rural setting". May be interpreted in different ways and therefore would welcome a discussion about what is intended here. • Should include clear spatial principle for south-eastern boundary where the allocation meets Ley Rectory Farm Barns to function as a low-intensity, quiet edge. • Masterplan and design code should be required to demonstrate, with appropriate assessment, that location and operation of non-residential uses and servicing activity will not create unacceptable noise, disturbance, vibration, odour or light	

impacts at existing homes at south-eastern boundary (Ley Rectory Farm Barns interface). • Policy requires “separation” but does not define, secure or prioritise it at south-eastern boundary where rural homes sit directly opposite the proposed allocation. Boundary alignment creates particularly tight interface with existing dwelling and garden, so any ambiguity around “separation” is especially problematic. • Incorporate defined south□eastern boundary buffer, a quiet□edge principle, a sensitive built□form transition, early delivery of screening, dark□sky lighting controls, construction controls and infrastructure/phasing triggers that halt later phases if key transport mitigations are delayed. • Masterplan and design code should be required to demonstrate, with appropriate assessment, that location and operation of non-residential uses and servicing activity will not create unacceptable noise, disturbance, vibration, odour or light impacts at existing homes at the south-eastern boundary (Ley Rectory Farm Barns interface). • Fully supportive of design led approach, and development of comprehensive site masterplan, and (later in the process) design codes, to ensure each development phase comes forward in accordance with overall masterplan vision. • Further work required to understand constraints, the development proposals and appropriate mitigation through set back, design/landscaping or management, in consultation with the relevant consultees.	

• PE support desire to develop high quality buildings that respond to surrounding context with appropriate massing, building heights and densities, as well as building form. Committed to design quality as set out in our vision for the project in our previous Local Plan submission. • PE support principle of town and neighbourhood centres; further work required to establish how many centres and what facilities can be supported by proposed 6,000 homes. Great care will be required to consider appropriate number of centres, their make up, scale and mix of uses, to ensure the objective of a vibrant, walkable new community is achieved. This may require decisions which weigh up the merits of fewer, larger “centres” vs a dispersed approach to amenity provision. This should be design led and not pre-judged by the policy. • PE consider that an average density of 50-55 dwellings per hectare is likely to be too dense in this location. We propose to test a number of scenarios as we begin to set a masterplan framework for project, and propose to test matters raised in the policy and believe at this point a slightly lower density is likely to prove more appropriate to the rural landscape setting. The policy should not need to define a target density until further work has been undertaken. • Further work required to understand constraints and opportunities, development proposals and appropriate mitigation through set back, design/landscaping or management. Consider this is likely to require a review of proposed boundaries of	

the Spatial Framework diagram both in respect of development area, and SEA ahead of the Regulation 19 consultation. • PE support, and are passionate, about need for high quality public realm. Our client's vision is that this development is different and something community is proud to call home. The layout and quality of the public realm will be critical to realising this ambition. • PE support provision of open space – more work needed to establish scale of provision as part of overall land use budget. This is being tested through our masterplan framework. • PE support effective integration of green and blue infrastructure. • PE support preservation and enhancement of significant ecological heritage and natural environment – suggest requirements will inform both extent of built development and scale, location and approach to delivering Strategic Enhancement Area. • PE support principle of maximising opportunities for ecological enhancement and building on special qualities of site. • PE support need to respond to designated historic and ecological sites – but note that further work is required to establish most appropriate design led approach to accommodating and respecting these important features as part of comprehensive approach to masterplanning.	

• PE support minimising recreational disturbance on ecology at the SSSI, but this needs to be looked at in a holistic way, as it may be that additional habitat of equivalent or better quality may be created as part of the scheme. • PE support creating dark ecological corridors. • PE support preservation of existing range of watercourses off-site and intend to develop a landscape led masterplan, with integrated green and blue infrastructure, SUDs and with careful consideration of all aspects of water cycle to ensure scheme sensitively integrates into the area. • PE support creation of clearly defined green buffers between development and established settlements. Role, purpose, extent and definition of SEA is an important consideration here. Welcome discussions with GCSP, and in due course with community, about how we best achieve this objective. • It is not viewpoints that are to be preserved, rather it is important to understand what it is about key views that is important. With a development of this scale, key views and character will change, so it is important to identify and understand what is important to consider and what it is we are trying to “preserve”. We would very much welcome a discussion with landscape officers about the key views that we should be giving particular attention. • PE support protection of existing landscape features, wherever possible and allowing for the most appropriate scheme as a whole. It should be noted that there may be elements of existing landscape features which do need to be removed	

(e.g. hedgerows) to accommodate site infrastructure or development, where justified. • As long term, locally resident landowners for generations, PE have been instrumental in establishing the strong planted treeline buffers around site. Dendrology is a particular passion of the family. We support desire to strengthen planting and enhancement of site boundary but suggest that further work is required to establish appropriate location for such boundary planting. We believe that there is a case for further screening to ensure visual containment and separation from adjoining communities. • PE support need for full ecology survey and biodiversity implementation and management plans throughout development of scheme. Early input from specialist ecologists is being sought to ensure biodiversity is a priority in development of the masterplan. • PE support need for positive management of ecological buffers, and are committed to a strong stewardship model to ensure proactive management and maintenance of all aspects of scheme. • PE are strongly supportive of broad ambitions for a strong connectivity and movement network across site and beyond, for all modes of travel. • PE strongly support need for walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport movements. Streets must be well designed and accord with best practice and guidance.	

• PE agree we should prioritise exploration of opportunities to enhance walking and cycling connectivity to key local employment destinations and public transport hubs. Further work will be required to establish how best to overcome local severance from A1307 and A11. PE is committed to working with local authority partners to achieve ambitions in area to ensure deliverable solutions. • PE feel that further work is required to understand distinctive and important features of Roman Road, and to determine the most appropriate design response. The policy should not seek to pre-judge the approach to Roman Road until a more detailed heritage assessment and design led approach to sensitively integrated development into local area. • PE support principle of promoting active travel connections. For reasons given in our comments on policy limb 13 (d), appropriate design solution should be derived from more detailed assessment and engagement with Cambridgeshire County Council as highway authority. • PE are concerned that policy as drafted pre-determines most appropriate design solution for project. Therefore, suggest alternative wording: “To reduce private vehicle usage from the outset of the development and to improve placemaking, alternative car parking and storage options should be explored at the edge of parcels or plots as part of a strategy of more remote parking solutions.” This does not set this as an absolute requirement, but requires this to be considered in the	

round as part of a robust transport strategy (necessarily with careful controls on car parking). • PE support Council's objective to consider low-carbon energy infrastructure, circular economy principles, and sustainable water management. Including an Integrated Water Management plan and Water Cycle Strategy. We have already commissioned work in these areas from a suitably qualified expert. • PE support need for any development to need to come forward in accordance with an agreed phasing plan. Expect this to be submitted indicatively as part of any outline application, with updates provided in support of each Reserved Matters application. This can be conditioned appropriately. • Whilst we support principle of development, PE wish to object to Spatial Framework diagram as drawn. Further work is required to consider a range of characteristics which we anticipate will give rise to changes. These may include such matters as: Scale, location and extent of the development boundary. Scale, location, purpose/definition and extent of Strategic Enhancement area. Site access points. Location of any on site Waste Water Recycling Centre. Approach to integration with CSET. Location of the "centre" or "centres". Set of distances and proposed design mitigation for any sensitive receptors (e.g. Roman Road SAM and SSSI). Edge treatments to secure separation from the Abingtons. integration of farming activities on residual land holdings.	

• PEe support the principle of a Spatial Framework for Grange Farm (Figure 81) but stress that it needs further work to test that it reflects the optimal / evidenced approach to the allocation. •	
Housing • Presence of site for travellers nearby may exacerbate existing issues in the village. • Insufficient detail on long-term management and integration of travellers' site. • Object to travellers' site. • Question need for travellers' site • Include social housing. • Local youngsters help/incentives to get on the housing ladder. 1,2,3, 4 bed houses and bungalows. • No more than 500 homes for the older generation and young first buyers. • Afraid travellers site will not remain at 12 pitches • How can we possibly need this many houses? • Reduce the number of houses. • Stop building expensive housing which locals cannot afford. • Unlikely that the affordable housing will ever materialise, usually disappear at some point.	201031 (R Smith), 201330 (J Sharman), 201340 (G Broad), 201696 (S Tossi), 201726 (J Mayes), 201802 (R Cornwell), 201846 (E Goodyear), 201889 (W Cooper), 201921 (E Crutchington), 201952 (J Hann), 203512 (R Tovey), 203653 (S Appleton), 203797 (R Nagasaki), 205032 (A Spicer), 205432 (N Marshman), 205482 (M Brattesani), 205608 (S Goodhart), 207606 (V Jury), 207667 (K Brown), 207682 (T Collett), 208629 (G Jones), 208749 (T Orgee), 209722 (A Spicer), 206040 (J Dowling), 210072 (V Cox), 210076 (V Cox), (210391) M Cookson), 210392 (M Cookson), 211019 (R Froment), 211036 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211714 (J Dowling),

• More work needs to be done to establish sort of housing employees of sites of this type want - do they want to live in a new settlement at all? • Remove traveller sites, reduce the overall amount of housing. • Traveller sites appear inappropriate due to recent issues in the village • Housing trajectory expects delivery of completed dwellings to start within 8 years of adoption of the new Local Plan. Drawing on experience from other new allocations in the region, this would not appear to be realistic. • Allocation should be removed or the trajectory should be reduced and pushed back. • Welcomes the inclusion of key worker housing to serve the surrounding life□science cluster. • Long lead□in time means homes may not be delivered until the late 2030s, creating a mismatch with the immediate workforce needs of Granta Park. Clear delivery mechanisms, early phasing and safeguards are required to ensure key worker housing is provided promptly, tied directly to major R&D campuses, and protected over time. • Allocation is unnecessary, with an overprovision of over 3,000 dwellings compared to the identified housing need of 10,330 homes by 2045. • Have housing developments locally that still have unsold properties after several years.	**Other bodies:** 201391 (Babraham PC), 201606 (Great Abington Parish Council), 208590 (Little Abington PC), 209260 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209261 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210410 (M Cookson), 211022 (L Cookson), 202333 (Granta Land Ltd), 202540 (Granta Land Ltd), 202656 (Granta Land Ltd), 202670 (Granta Land Ltd), 203371 (BMR Granta Park Propco Limited), 210739 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust),

• Unlikely to be affordable for local young people, benefiting only landlords or those on benefits. • Colleagues on BRC campus do not recall being asked if they would be interested in buying housing closer to the site. Most were clear that house prices locally are prohibitively high and they would not look to relocate. This either suggests that site will be too expensive or cause a price crash locally, both of which would be terrible for both builders and local area. • With majority of a local science park employees being high earners it can be assumed that they would not wish to live in high-density housing developments such as at Grange Farm. • Housing numbers and mix of housing typologies and tenure needs to be developed based on further work on character, acceptable building heights, and housing needs (by typology and tenure). Concerned with the suggestion that 10% of dwellings should be specialist accommodation. For a scheme of this scale this will generate a very significant number of these homes, and this should be a product of up to date assessments of need (over time), rather than a policy requirement. • First phase should include both accommodation for young families and for mature and retired residents who will use the community space and shop. • Do not feel that Council has prepared a robust justification for requiring the provision of Gypsy and traveller pitches on site. This is a point that we wish to	

explore further with GCSP. Our reading of Council's own evidence is that it signposts a number of other solutions as being sequentially preferred, with allocations on new development as a last resort. The approach to siting of any G&T site would require great care to ensure effective integration with wider community. • Accept need for affordable housing for Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Biomedical campus. Many existing Addenbrooke's workers currently live in or around Haverhill as it is more affordable. Many argue affordable housing on Grange Farm site would aid Biomedical campus etc which may be true, but would need to be offset by all those workers who would leave because of increased journey times. • Average salary across Granta Park, Babraham Research Campus, and Hinxton Hall is approximately £35,000–£55,000, compared with national median of £37,600. This suggests that the primary housing demand is not for traditional "affordable housing" but for market rate homes suitable for skilled workers. • Assumption that nearby housing will support science campuses requires evidence. • PE support the policy expectation of homes that are adaptable. • Siting of any gypsy and traveller pitches should be a material distance from existing settlement community of Little Abington (and significantly more than is the case in the Proposed Grange Farm Development).	

Employment • Assertion that jobs will be created, aside from infrastructure roles, seems illogical. • No guarantee those moving in would want to work at the Welcome or Babraham Institute. • Accessibility to London may attract commuters rather than local workers. • Capacity issues at nearby science parks. • People who already have jobs will move here & commute. • Most people in Abington would love to work locally but can't find jobs in the two local business parks. • Must be local significant employment opportunity factored into the scheme. • Where will people work? • May be attractive for those working further afield. • Will there be sufficient local employment? • What is Class B2 General Industrial provision? • Asserted proximity to "future jobs" in Granta Park, Babraham and Hinxton is not substantiated beyond current expectations, with multiple major buildings currently vacant at Granta Park. • Logistics hubs appear unnecessary. • If logistics buildings are included, strict controls on height, massing, and traffic impact are essential.	201031 (R Smith), 201360 (V Hefford), 201518 (J Jackson), 201706 (R James), 201748 (M Radcliffe), 201772 (H Howe), 201890 (K Cooper), 201898 (R Pargeter), 202020 (J Rivers), 202067 (D Milns), 202092 (R Harman), 204759 (M Huntsman), 205618 (S Lee), 205881 (C Randle), 205944 (R Barker), 205973 (R Randle), 206037 (J Dowling), 206038 (J Dowling), 206039 (J Dowling), 206321 (G King), 206893 (I Sainsbury), 207560 (L Sainsbury), 207659 (P Lester), 207682 (T Collett), 207787 (P Williams), 208427 (N Brown), 208481 (G Crowe), 208531 (C Alda), 208580 (J Bowen), 208600 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 208753, (T Ogree), 209726 (E Jones), 209738 (J Barnes), 210393 (M Cookson), 210410 (M Cookson), 210423 (O Barnes), 210690 (G Saunders), 210691 (G Saunders), 211035 (T & A Bradford & Jedrzejewski), 211698 (J Dowling),

• Large warehouses would harm the landscape and increase vehicle movements. Furthermore, emerging technologies such as autonomous aerial vehicles (UAVs) may reduce the need for traditional logistics infrastructure, making large warehouses an outdated solution. • Growth forecasts of greater Cambridge area and particularly in the biomedical research hubs and at Addenbrookes hospital have not taken into account the growing impact of AI. • Little hard evidence for future expansion and development of Granta Park, Babraham and Hinxton Campus • Business / biomedical sites around Cambridge have vacant units and have been reducing staff numbers including Addenbrookes hospital which made over 200 persons redundant in last 6 months with further reductions due in 2026. • No forecast or impact on travel-to- work outcomes. • No allowance made for development to attract London workers. • The immediately proximate research parks at Granta Park and Babraham Research Campus together total no more than 4,800 employees at present. Babraham Research Campus has proposed additional development of 23,000m2 of R&D capacity on-site, however Granta Park is currently advertising for tenants in at least five buildings on-site indicating no requirement for additional site capacity.	211712 (J Dowling), 211731 (P Seddon), **Other bodies:** 202040 (Weston Colville PC), 208595 (Little Abington PC), 209262 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 209263 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210140 (Historic England), 209762 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust),

• Proposed development is of a scale wholly disproportionate and unnecessary to any such purported requirements. • Please provide concrete and specific evidence that this development will definitely make a major contribution to employment and economic benefit both to residents of the proposed Grange Farm development and those of other villages in the locality. • False assumption that Life Sciences will continue to grow. Companies are moving their HQs to mainland Europe. • Proposed warehouse far larger than a last mile facility and unless all the major carriers agreed to share the facility this would be of little benefit of reducing trips, and is anyway not the model operated by many. • Class B2 General Industrial provision - what exactly is this and where is it situated. • Retail and Office space again deliveries, and staff travel not considered and again majority forced onto the A1307. • Grange Farm is 8-10 km south-east of CBC, located in the Wider Catchment (lowest-priority) category pf CBC Housing Study. Remove allocation. If retained, reduce to contingency only and require explicit housing reservation for CBC workers. • PE wish to promote notion that a range of employment uses will be needed on site to create a mixed and balanced new community and also recognising relationship	

of site to nearby science parks in southern cluster. We do not feel that policy at this stage should be overly prescriptive, pending further work on appropriate scale and mix of employment uses. Whilst we are supportive of desire to promote local last-mile logistics hub / warehousing, wording infers that this is only purpose of any employment, which could serve to restrict the market (and prevent delivery). • PE support E(g)(i) office uses appropriate. Question need to be so specific about Use Classes Order. What is the intention here? Consideration should be given to increasing amount of floor space to create a sustainable community – further evidence / justification required to determine appropriate scale/ mix. • Have some concerns about location of particularly B8 uses on this site given the potential scale of development. • Support potential role that site can provide in terms of employment within last mile logistics we wish to encourage GCSP to encourage a wider definition of the employment offer until such time as further work has been undertaken on appropriate mix and quantum of employment to support new community. • Also support inclusion of community concierge as part of community provision in the area but wish to ensure the ambition for a last mile movement hub does not seek to limit the types of employment that development may accommodate more broadly.	

Other • Consider long-term environmental, infrastructural, and social impacts of proposal and conduct thorough scrutiny before proceeding. • Lacks detail and appears rushed. • Ill thought out and wholly inappropriate. • Think long and hard before allowing the planning to be passed. • Just another money making venture with very little thought for the surrounding area and inhabitants. • Living in a town, even one where you plan to give people green spaces, is not healthy or safe. • Prematurity and Planning Policy Conflict. • Conflicts with key principles of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. • The 'town' will need a focus to become a known centre for growth and new industry. • The planning team need to be more open and inform residents and businesses in a large surrounding area of Little Abington. • Every chance that the character of this area will be so altered that more development will quickly follow. • Until the evolution of the currently unsustainable Cambridge Green belt has been agreed, including the future of the 6	201312 (M Cookson), 201323 (H Biggs), 201408 (R Lee), 201684 (S Bowen), 201697 (H Ward), 201726 (J Mayes), 201747 (B Seddon), 201753 (L Dav), 201756 (G Sharman), 201772 (H Howe), 201848 (R Allum), 201887 (K Lander), 201915 (G Battom), 202082 (D Palmer), 202571 (R Haining), 202632 (J Doncaster), 202675 (N Fraser), 202696 (S Roberts), 202728 (I Goodhart), 203010 (J Wallace), 203187 (M Jury), 203359 (B Garnish), 203653 (S Appleton), 203677 (E Randle), 203730 (K Auckland), 203931 (A Ross), 204619 (J Fairs), 204783 (R Smith), 204891 (D Newgreen), 205543 (G Minhas), 205605 (S Goodhart), 205761 (R Wells), 205765 (J Sneddon), 205883 (C Randle),205975 (R Randle), 206147 (R Livermore), 206148 (R Livermore), 206313 (G King), 206894 (I Sainsbury), 207183 (S Bowen), 207659 (P Lester), 207676 (T Collett), 207683 (T Collett), 207684

• Current settlement projects (including Shelford and Six Mile bottom), allowing this to proceed will just add yet more, • Unnecessary, damaging, seepage outwards from Cambridge. • The plan needs more accurate and clear diagrams, where are the houses, shops, warehouses etc, the A1307 isn't clearly marked. • Compliance with duty to co-operate is not proven and cross-boundary aspects are high-risk • Concerns about the spatial structure and deliverability of draft policy. • Contains inconsistencies and contradictions throughout indicating that it is a cut and paste of generic planning statements rather than a carefully considered plan for the local area. e.g. access to roman road is sited as an advantage in the same doc that states access will be restricted to protect heritage. • The document does not give details about the actual developments that may or may not arise. • Need for the council to remain open and communicative regarding uncertainties surrounding the project. • Land was identified by landowner not planners so question legality • If a new town is needed then start process by building the case for a new town which is presented to the Council/Region/Secretary of State.	(T Collett), 207926 (H Sutton), 207965 S Trueman), 208477 (D Pimblett), 208545 (K Auckland), 208569 (A Ross), 208574 (A Ross), 208576 (A Ross), 208606 (M Appleton), 208629 (G Jones), 208630 (G Jones), 208631 (G Jones), 208632 (G Jones), 208633 (G Jones), 210400 (M Cookson), 210408 (M Cookson), 210409 (M Cookson), 210435 (C Feenan), 210438 (R Wells), 210493 (C Gill), 210494 (C Gill), 210656 (S Zmigrod), 210701 (G Saunders), 210798 (D Marns), 210800 (D Marns), 210825 (C Paton), 211646 (G King), Other bodies: 208593 (Little Abington PC), 208111 (Sawston Parish Council), 209253 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210084 (Historic England), 210773 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will

• Identify site options with a viable programme for delivery and a clear understanding of costs and risks including a consultation process across possible effected communities. • Fails the tests of soundness, being neither positively prepared nor justified, and conflicts with national policy. • Require transparency by publishing the full site selection evidence base and ensuring assessments are demonstrably independent of landowner funding. • Site scores 'Red' in the HELAA, with significant landscape, transport and environmental constraints, yet is promoted for a development of up to 8,000 homes, far exceeding assessed capacity. • When read alongside Council's own published evidence, including 1st December 2025's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and Greater Cambridge Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, Pell Frischman Flood Risk Assessment and 'Grange Farm Promotion Document', Policy S/GF allocates a site assessed as highly constrained, acknowledges the likelihood of irreversible harm, promotes development at a scale that exceeds assessed capacity, and relies too heavily on future mitigation rather than demonstrable deliverability. • Amend the Plan to ensure consultation and engagement processes are accessible, consistent throughout the consultation period, and not reliant on digital-only submission methods.	Trust), 210775 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210776 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210777 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210778 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust), 210782 (Pampisford Estate Farms Limited and the Trustees of the James Binney Will Trust),

• Sketch plan only gives a vague idea of what is proposed. • Should be phased, with enforceable triggers ensuring that infrastructure, environmental protections, and transport measures are delivered before housing occupations occur. • Insufficient time for consultation. • Please clarify what land you are proposing to develop and on what timeframes. • Choice of appropriate site should not as appears in this case to be driven by the landowner Pampisford Estates and desire of Council to re-site main Cambridge sewage plant to the Abingtons to free up more valuable land for housing on the edge of the City. • What has occurred to now make Grange Farm acceptable for development, especially of this size, given it was turned down for good reasons only 4 years ago. • Similar developments at Waterbeach, Northstowe and Cambourne have proven not to have delivered the benefits originally proposed. What makes proposals for Grange Farm likely to result in anything different. • Title of development misleading. While it is described as “Grange Farm” development, the proposal in fact extends beyond Grange Farm and includes neighbouring land at Ley Rectory Farm.	

• Appears to be conflict of interest between vendor of the land and GCSP as former seems to be paying for some of the developments costs viz the memorandum of understanding. This is disturbing and contrary to acceptable practice. • Don't think any of the 'new towns' have been a success. Many New Towns are now at best 'ok' after decades of being lacking. • Prioritises housing numbers over environmental capacity, relies heavily on mitigation rather than avoidance, and greatly underestimates the sensitivity of chalk-influenced rural environments. • Talk of a quality development which I suspect is what every such proposal has promised in the past – the evidence of recent new builds in the locality is that quality is not at the forefront when building starts. • If HELAA red-rated site is to be allocated, Plan must clearly explain why and demonstrate how harm will be avoided. Policy S/GF fundamentally fails to do this. • Policy includes no formal review points, no pause mechanisms, and no ability to reduce scale if impacts exceed predictions. • Consultation Platform was difficult to use and changed halfway through the process to become much more complex. It should have been clearer how to submit a comment via post or email. • Conflicts of interest. Clear that a commercially-driven relationship exists between GCSP and The Pampisford Estate evidenced by memorandum of understanding	

dated 9 September 2025 between GCSP and The Pampisford Estate. Clear and demonstrable conflict of interest in respect of models and assessments commissioned by GCSP, which arises due to the funding of such purportedly independent verification of the development coming from those who stand to benefit from it. • New settlement at Abington was proposed in development of 2003 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan. The proposal was evaluated in the South Cambridgeshire District Council New Settlement Report of Oct 2001 and subsequently rejected. The reasons for rejection have not changed in the intervening years. • In the past Uttlesford District Council proposed land near Great Chesterford as the site of a major new settlement: "North Uttlesford Garden Community" within three miles of Grange Farm. Planning Inspectorate concluded that the proposal was insufficiently justified and it would perform least well against required Garden Community principles. Same should apply to Grange Farm. • Policy written in terms that indicate that development is pre-ordained and consistent with GCSP having already decided that the proposal is to go ahead and is staging a "consultation" merely because one is required, not because any notice will be taken of evidence or mere objections by members of the public. • Smaller, phased, organic approach aligned with South Cambridgeshire's historic growth patterns would be more appropriate.	

• There are three or four houses with gardens on the north side of the A1307. It is not clear from the present plans whether these will be protected from the urban development. • Unclear what site allocation boundary is. • Grange Farm is not part of the broader UK “new town” list. • Goes against every principle of self-determination to develop and impose an urbanised setting upon citizens who had decided, by definition, not to live in or near such a setting. • Developers of existing sites should be encouraged to build according to their original plans. • The requirement for a single “applicant” is concerning. • Must be fully costed. • Development of this scale should only be brought forward following a rigorous and open evaluation of multiple sites, regardless of land ownership, against clear and consistent criteria. • Policy contains numerous open-ended requirements for future studies and mitigation, which indicates that key impacts have not yet been fully understood or resolved.	

• Having not met the Wednesbury standard, the decision to include the Proposed Grange Farm Development in the Draft Plan is open to being struck out on such grounds. • Other new settlements are widely regarded to have failed to deliver amenities, services or social infrastructure benefits. People clearly do not want to live in these developments. Similarly, there is no credible evidence that such new settlements have delivered on-site economic jobs and prosperity. • Policies Map has been drawn such that Grange Farm is outside of “defined development extent” of Little Abington. • Authority already managing growth of three new rural settlements within its area posing the question of whether it has capacity to manage a fourth on an isolated rural site. • Suggest careful consideration is given to term “new town”. Terminology is important and new towns might create an association in people’s minds with some of the larger London overspill towns such as Milton Keynes or Stevenage, which are very much different to our ambition for this proposal. • Figure 9: The symbol for Grange Farm is shown in different locations on the online version and a PDF version of this diagram. • Must require robust Construction Traffic and Environmental Management Plans.	

• Cannot be persuaded that many people will want to live there in the early stages of development. • Cumulative impacts of this and other developments should be assessed. • Existence of memorandum of understanding between planning authority and landowner, including arrangements for landowner-funded verification of evidence, gives rise to concerns about appearance of bias. • PE support indicative list of documents to accompany any outline planning permission. We are not sure these are worthy of listing separately in each strategic allocation, as they would be expected of all major projects and could be covered elsewhere in the Local Plan for succinctness. • PE support inclusion of policy (as a principle) to provide a framework for consideration of future planning applications. As set out in our representations, the policy itself, accompanying evidence base and resulting Spatial Framework will require some further refinement. • PE support need for long term, management and maintenance of development and are committed to developing a leading stewardship model with direct landowner involvement. • Proposed Grange Farm Development would represent a material overhang to the saleability and value of properties in existing settlements of Little Abington and Great Abington – both while under consideration and, notwithstanding the material	

issues set out in this response which clearly demonstrate that such development should not proceed, should such development move forward. Such material detriment where development was subject to demonstrable, grounded objections but proceeded regardless by GCSP and the relevant local authorities would result in legal claims against the foregoing for the detriment suffered – and open the relevant Councils open to financial liability as a result. • Possible additional future development at Ley Rectory Farm would only exacerbate all issues identified. • Despite initial approval being granted for low-rise development at Granta Park which would blend with rural landscape, and which would not dominate rural skyline, permission has subsequently been granted for up to 4 storey buildings, violating the original concept. This raises serious issue of 'trust' between residents and the Planning Authority. • Consultation responses must inform revisions, and evidence shows misalignment with policies on climate resilience and heritage safeguarding.	

Summaries of Representations: Sites Rural Southern Cluster

The Rural Southern Cluster Introduction

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Concerns raised about the cumulative impacts of surrounding areas and criticisms about the strategy to selecting these sites. In particular the impact on transport and traffic, services, water and wastewater. Other comments highlighted infrastructure needs, and the need to invest in rural services and facilities. Whittlesford Parkway Station needed to be properly planned as a strategic transport hub and consider local impacts. It was also questioned why Duxford was not clarified as being in the rural southern cluster given the AV tech opportunities.

Support was expressed for removal of Hinton Way and Mingle Lane as a site allocation between the First Proposals and the Draft Plan stage. Concern about the location and scale of the new community at the A11 and A1307 (Grange Farm). Other comments objected to the non-inclusion of development proposals in a variety of villages. Reasons sites included the relative sustainability of the locations, the opportunities to support services and facilities. A number of comments where sites are in the green belt

considered their site was grey belt, and the plan should have identified grey belt opportunities. Many proposals challenged the findings of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and proposed changes to the scoring.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Comments have been noted and considered.

The development strategy has been informed by evidence which sets out that the impact of larger sites rather than incremental development has less carbon impacts and reduces impacts on villages across Greater Cambridge. This model also supports the focused delivery of infrastructure. Transport impacts and mitigation measures have been considered working with the Local Highways and Local Transport Authorities. Water infrastructure issues have been considered with the Cambridge Water Scarcity Group, which has brought together relevant agencies to ensure issues are properly planed for, including in order to protect the chalk streams.

At Whittlesford Bridge, the policy map incorrectly includes the former scrapyard site and the veterinary surgery car park but omits the demolition site at 39a Station Road West and the re-numbered property at 40 Station Road West, risking mis-allocation of development rights.

Support is noted for removal of Hinton Way and Mingle Lane as a site allocation. The position remains that it is not considered that there are exceptional circumstances for green belt release to meet general needs.

Proposals for alternative site shave been considered though an update to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment where they fit within the broad emerging strategy of the local plan. New evidence submitted has been considered, and where

considered appropriate scoring has been amended. Comments related to strategy choices have also been considered, particularly under the development strategy policies. The deliverability of the plan has been tested through evidence including the Housing Delivery Study. The strategy focusing on other broad locations is considered to be sound. It is not proposed to add additional village sites to the proposed submission local plan. An update to the Green Belt Study has been carried out to consider which areas would meet he governments definition of being grey belt. Whilst some site may meet the definition, exceptional circumstances is still required for green belt release, and the Councils do not consider that exists in light of alternatives available.

Table of representations:

General Comments

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The combined effects of the proposed new settlement, existing committed development, employment growth at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and development pressures at and around the Imperial War Museum Duxford site are not properly assessed in the round. This is a significant omission, as these impacts will not fall evenly across the wider area but will be concentrated on specific transport corridors and villages, including Whittlesford, Thriplow, Heathfield and Newton. The Plan therefore risks underestimating impacts on transport infrastructure, water supply, wastewater capacity and local services.	211070 (Cllr R Williams)
The Parish Council remains concerned about the cumulative impact of multiple large-scale allocations within the Rural Southern Cluster. Taken together, these proposals will place significant pressure on strategic roads, village streets, health services and water resources. The Plan’s objective to reduce	207748 (Whittlesford PC)

reliance on the private car must be grounded in realistic alternatives and infrastructure delivered in advance of development. Water availability should be treated as a fundamental constraint on growth rather than an assumed future solution. The PC urges the GCSP to strengthen the Local Plan by aligning development scale and phasing with deliverable transport and water infrastructure, addressing cumulative impacts across the Rural Southern Cluster, ensuring that Whittlesford Parkway Station is properly planned as a strategic transport hub, and securing tangible public benefits through site-specific policies.	
I support the new proposed plan	202019 (H Campbell)
The strategy recognises the economic importance of the southern cluster, but its emphasis on business growth and strategic housing sites risks overlooking the needs of existing rural communities. While some villages are described as well connected, there is limited evidence on service capacity, school places, healthcare access or local transport frequency. Growth could increase pressure on small rural roads and village infrastructure. Stronger rural proofing would ensure investment in local services, safe cycling and walking links between villages and employment sites, and active involvement of parish councils in planning and mitigation.	203162 (Cambridgeshire ACRE)
Concerns were raised about the impact of new housing on local infrastructure, particularly regarding the lack of public transport and walking/cycling routes, which could exacerbate traffic problems. The respondent highlighted the apparent absence of health, education, and leisure provision, suggesting that residents would need to travel by car, increasing pressure on local amenities. A recommendation was made for the development of a cycle and walking route to connect Stapleford, Great Shelford,	203624 (S Berridge)

Whittlesford Parkway, and Duxford. Concerns were expressed about the loss of greenbelt land due to development at the Babraham Research campus, with a call to preserve and enhance the remaining greenbelt area for its beauty and biodiversity.	
Site allocations lacking explicit requirements for on-site health facilities should include wording that mandates financial contributions for health and infrastructure mitigation, aligning with the IDP approach. The respondent appreciates early engagement with Council Officers in plan preparation and the opportunity to contribute to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. An additional assessment by the ICB during Stage 2 of the IDP process will provide targeted evaluations of key site allocations and health infrastructure needs, offering more detail for each site allocation.	205097 (NHS Property Services Ltd)
The new and expanded satellite industrial / commercial sites within parks and gardens of listed country houses (e.g. Babraham, Hinxton and Granta Park in the Southern Cluster) are not sufficiently robust to show the landscape, townscape, light pollution and heritage implications have been properly considered in principle and that the proposals will be achievable within the environmental thread of sustainability.	210992 (C Newell)
Ickleton PC is pleased that none of the 4 sites in the Parish emerging from the HELAA process are to be taken forward. Regarding Site ID 115965 you were advised at the First Proposals stage that it was unsuitable for the proposed development in the PC's view. The PC agrees that all the plots associated with the refused Agri-Tech Park are not suitable for development.	203453 (Ickleton PC)
These various car dependent sites are completely unsustainable, being far from where most people who might work on them live (i.e. Cambridge city) and relying on already super congested roads to get there. This sort of bioscience development should be focused on the biomedical campus. Create a	203588 (H Thomas)

single super-centre of bioscience rather than dispersed across places meaning that people cannot get from one to another.	
There are serious concerns in communities along the A1301 corridor, of a process of urbanisation from Stapleford to Saffron Walden. Major planning applications have been considered on a standalone basis, with scant consideration for cumulative or incremental impacts on landscape and existing settlements. Cross-border liaison under Duty to Cooperate is required.	203312 (Ickleton PC)
Whittlesford Parkway Station Policy Area, Whittlesford Bridge The policy map incorrectly includes the former scrapyard site and the veterinary surgery car park but omits the demolition site at 39a Station Road West and the re-numbered property at 40 Station Road West, risking mis-allocation of development rights. We are concerned that the proposed development could have a detrimental effect on our lives and the character of the area. Agencies are not working together effectively; representatives from SRW and SRE must be included in the planning process.	207891 207902 207903 (N Denham)
Draft Plan recognises IWM Duxford as being in an “area of major change”, but it raises a question why it is not also included as part of the Rural Southern Cluster, which recognises the associated need for housing, and which could be delivered around Duxford Village to support the sustainable growth of AvTech and the village. Continued investment in AvTech will also play an important role in diversifying the Rural Southern Cluster in South Cambridgeshire, providing some resilience if investment in biotech and life sciences slows.	211424 (Gonville & Caius College)

Comments on Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane Great Shelford

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane Great Shelford Support the decision to retain the land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane within the Cambridge Green Belt. This aligns with the Plan's overall strategy, Policy S/GB, national Green Belt policy, the protection of local landscape, the conservation areas and the clearly expressed wishes of the local community. Housing needs are already met by major allocations at Cambourne North, Grange Farm, edge-of-Cambridge sites and new Rural Southern Cluster sites including Spicer's, Hinxton and Babraham, so there is no planning justification for allocating this land for development. I oppose building on Mingle Lane due to concerns about merging Stapleford and Shelford, harming the greenbelt, increasing traffic, and negatively impacting the rural parishes	200989 (A Phillips), 200996 (D Sanders), 201036 (A Kennedy), 201258 (S Ali), 201288 (K Lockhart), 201299 (N Campbell), 201673 (H White), 203166 (D Morgan), 201780 (M Vigouroux), 201808 (V Morgan), 202281 (A Lockhart), 202923 (C Bendelack), 203159 (C Schofield) 201780 (M Vigouroux), 201808 (V Morgan), 203159 (C Schofield), 203565 (N Hilliard) 207532 (S Berridge)

Comments addressing Land Adjacent to A11 and A1307 (Grange Farm)

The respondent expresses concern about the additional housing planned for the edge of Little Abington, citing the existing large development at Hinxton. They highlight that increased traffic from these developments will impact the already busy A505 road. The respondent notes that the planned developments lack access to public transport, even with a potential new park and ride near Babraham. They point out that South Cambs faces significant traffic issues, which will worsen without access to reliable train and bus services. The respondent raises concerns about the reliability of bus services, which are affected by current traffic levels. They conclude that unless strong management solutions are proposed, both sites are considered untenable.	201274 (S OFarrell)
The proposed new settlement does not meet development needs within environmental and infrastructure limits on a number of counts and is not consistent with national and regional policies. The Plan has not shown that reasonable alternatives (brownfield, intensification …) are inferior. Policy S/GF (Grange Farm) should be deleted and removed from the policies map	205360 (M G Hardinge)
Vastly reduce the number of houses. Remove the traveller pitches. Relocate the planned development to an area in need of investment.	201917 (J Coutts)

Comments proposing allocations

Whittlesford: The Walled Garden Whittlesford is right at the heart of the southern cluster (but seemingly left alone). You have a little cluster At Whittlesford Parkway station. However, i don’t think you have added enough housing for all the people that are moving in to the area for these new jobs. We have a small piece of land right beside	204789 (C Forbes-Cable)

the salt works at Whittlesford by the stream that would make a good addition and allow an extension. Please extend to add it in plus re-add an infill development site in Whittlesford:	
Land at Mill Lane in Sawston (HELAA Site Reference 40052) It is requested that land is identified as an additional allocation in Policy S/RSC: Rural Southern Cluster.	204424 (Hill Residential (Great Abington Site))
Land off Cabbage Moor in Great Shelford (Site Reference 40529) It is requested that land is identified as an additional allocation in the Rural Southern Cluster.	201973 (Shelford Investments)
Land off Hinton Way in Stapleford (Site Reference. 40369) It is requested that the development strategy for the Rural Southern Cluster includes an additional residential allocation.	202575 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance)
Land North of Mill Lane, Sawston, (HELAA SITE ID: 115896) Whilst we do not object to the principle of allocating large new housing developments, we object strongly to the failure to balance this approach with a more diverse approach to housing delivery across Greater Cambridge in the emerging Local Plan. Allocating sites for housing developments in sustainable locations such as Sawston.	203083 (Northwest Biotherapeutics Capital Limited)
Land North of Mingle Lane and East of Hinton Way, Stapleford (HELAA Reference 40369 Site ID: 115763) Proposed development strategy misguided, over reliance on strategic sites. directly adjoins the previous Draft Allocation at Mingle Lane (site reference: S/RSC site HW). Near to Station, CBC, should be identified as grey belt. Comments on HELAA provided.	203092 (Granta Land Ltd)
Land at Mill Lane in Sawston (Site Reference 40052) It is requested that land is identified as an additional allocation in Policy S/RSC: Rural Southern Cluster.	203950 (Hill Residential (Sawston Site))

Land at Bury Farm, Haverhill Road, Stapleford. Proposes the Site for residential development, aiming to cater to local housing needs and complement Stapleford's existing settlement. Near CSETS, grey belt, well related to Shelford rail station.	205344, 210478 (Corpus Christi College)
Land at Whittlesford Walled Garden, Church Lane, Whittlesford The focus on large strategic sites raises concerns about uncertain infrastructure delivery timelines and unrealistic housing delivery rates, impacting affordable housing provision. housing and affordable housing needs would not be met by development strategy based and would not meet the homes strategic priority. Does not support the residents or services and facilities in those villages. Will not deliver the necessary green infrastructure.	208766 208767 208768 208769 (The CLC Trust)
Land to the North of A505, Duxford Allocate Duxford Hub Employment site. site. Responds to HELAA comments.	209703 (B Homent, J Tree & R Smith)
Land to the East of M11 in Duxford, CB22 4RE (HELAA Reference 40095 / Site ID 115180) would meet employment and housing needs both locally and for Greater Cambridge, deliver a sustainable future for Duxford village, and facilitate more sustainable journeys encouraging more walking and cycling from Whittlesford Parkway through Duxford and onto IWM Duxford.	211428 (Gonville & Caius College)
The preferred housing target and development strategy in the draft GCLP are unlikely to achieve the identified strategic priorities related to climate change, biodiversity, and social inclusion. The housing requirement does not align with job growth, potentially increasing car commuting into Cambridge, which contradicts climate change priorities.	202434 (The CLC Trust)

Policy S/WGC: Wellcome Genome Campus

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by local residents with regard to concerns about selection of sites for development, impacts on local transport networks, a potential reduction in affordable housing. Some local residents have also supported the requirement for housing to go to campus workers. One local resident also raised the issue of leisure facilities and ensuring these are sufficient for local demand.

Historic England seek to correct references to the location of Hinxton Hall, and policy should reference requirement for a more detailed heritage assessment.

Concerns were raised by Uttlesford District Council about transport modelling and impacts on the road network in the Uttlesford District. Historic England raised concerns about the accuracy of some of the details of the heritage assets.

Further responses were received from Cambridgeshire Constabulary about contributions to emergency services.

Concerns were raised by the Environment Agency about the need for a sequential approach to flood risk and an FRA.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- In response to representations about the selection of this site for further expansion over Grange Farm, through the HELAA, the sites suitable for redevelopment for housing and employment uses have been identified and assessed for their acceptability for redevelopment. Grange Farm as a self-contained new settlement can provide residential units in close proximity to good public transport links and connect to existing networks, therefore Grange Farm has been identified for development.
- In response to concerns about impacts on transport, further transport assessments will be completed to support planning applications, and this will assess the impact on congestion. The policy wording encourages active travel within the expansion land, to neighbouring settlements and the main Wellcome Genome Campus which will help to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. The policy area and site allocation for the Wellcome Genome Campus proposes a mix of uses to support a mostly self-contained settlement with co-located jobs and homes to reduce the impact on wider transport networks.
- In response to concerns about reduction of affordable housing, the delivery of 1,500 residential dwellings on the expansion land for campus workers will contribute to the provision of housing for campus workers which ensures that the growth in this area in employment is supported by housing provision and therefore fulfils an identified housing need reflective of the context, even though it does not explicitly deliver affordable housing using conventional routes of delivery.
- In response to concerns about the provision of leisure facilities, the site allocation supports the delivery of leisure uses to support a residential-led mixed use development to co-locate employment, housing and amenities.
- In response to Uttlesford District Council's and Wellcome Genome Campus' concerns about transport. For the impacts on transport networks in Uttlesford and connections to Whittlesford Parkway Station and Great Chesterford Station, the policy area has included a requirement for a transport assessment including modelling impacts on the Uttlesford District Council road network, including Stump Cross junction (A11/B184). The wider modelling requirements have been written into the policy area and the lifespan section of the site allocation to set out what is needed to support further transport mitigations.

- In response to the Cambridgeshire Constabulary, the contributions made to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision and funding is covered by the IDP and not specifically in each site allocation.
- In response to Historic England, the comments are noted and the policy wording has been amended to reflect Hinxton Hall is within the site and a more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment has been required in the wording.
- In response to David Lock Associates on behalf of the Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd, the ambitions for the campus have been reflected in the new policy area to support the growth of the Wellcome Genome Campus. In terms of the amendments to the site allocation wording, the changes relating to accuracy have been made to reflect the planning permission, and allow for wider changes, and local context.
- In response to the Environment Agency, suggested amends have been made.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
To prevent fragmenting the landscape, the land adjacent to (and north) of the Wellcome expansion would provide a more suitable and sustainable location for new development instead of Grange Farm, Little Abington.	200982 (M&S Bishop)
Concerns about traffic congestion onto A505 and M11 junction 9 and need for more direct access to Wellcome Genome Campus from M11.	201535 (A Smith), 201557 (Stapleford PC),
Concerns raised about not contributing to affordable housing supply.	201557 (Stapleford PC) 210907 (Great Shelford PC)

Concerns raised about pressure on existing biodiversity sites nearby.	201557 (Stapleford PC), 210909 (Great Shelford PC
Development is too small to be sustainable and is not adequately plugged into the public transport network to overcome this without reliance on private cars.	210908 (Great Shelford PC)
Support the occupancy of residential properties being restricted to campus workers.	203066 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 203397 (Ickleton PC),
A new Parish Council should be created to serve the Wellcome Genome Campus.	203397 (Ickleton PC)
Leisure facilities are required at the Wellcome Genome Campus.	203788 (A Carpen)
Suggestion that light rail connectivity is needed for Wellcome Genome Campus.	203788 (A Carpen)
Transport modelling is requested to understand implications on Uttlesford road network.	204975 (Uttlesford DC)
Public transport connections should be enhanced, specifically to Saffron Walden, and Great Chesterford.	204975 (Uttlesford DC)
The site allocation should refer to Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding.	207516 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Services, 207485 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)
The policy and the vision should reflect the ambition and substantial scale of development now underway at the Wellcome Genome Campus. The focus is on a ‘one campus’ agenda. The plan needs to be permissive to growth and change and should be redrafted broadly to cover the vision, open	211228 (David Lock Associates on behalf of Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)

connectivity, intensification, enrichment of science ecosystem, exceptional environment and experience, land use, spatial framework, built form, the setting and sustainability.	
In parts, the evidence base remains a little behind the curve on the importance of the Campus within the Southern Cluster. For example, Figure 3.3 in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which identifies growth locations does not include Hinxton. WGCL has commissioned a science and technology advisory group, with an external chair and members, to work with it (and major occupiers at the Campus) on a forward-looking 'Science Strategy' which will be shared with stakeholders over the coming months and in advance of the Regulation 19 Consultation.	211229 (David Lock Associates on behalf of Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)
We suggest land-use and design guidance that sustains research, revitalises the conference centre, provides utilities, allows secondary uses, delivers 1 500 residential units for Campus workers (with scope for more) and protects heritage and biodiversity.	209115 (David Lock Associates on behalf of Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)
The policy for the campus should be clearer between the expansion land and the modernisation of the existing campus. The quantum and uses expressed are solely on the expansion land, and the policy should recognise the uses on the expansion land and separately the uses supported more generally. The policy wording should recognise the potential of the existing campus and future intensification. The wording around the masterplan requirement should be clearer how it relates to the approved Strategic Design Guide.	209113 (David Lock Associates on behalf of Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)
WGCL fully support the identification and recognition of the Southern Cluster along with the clear statement of intent with regard to the Campus. This strategy commitment is welcomed. The Plan recognises the potential for the evolved Campus to function as a place with homes, jobs and services,	209112 (David Locke Associates on behalf of

that might underpin classification in the settlement hierarchy in the future (as stated in Policy S/SH). The Campus will increasingly have the characteristics of a small town and WGCL are formulating a compelling Vision for this further evolution.	Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)
The site includes the Grade II* Hinxton Hall, game larder, stables and North Lodge all listed at grade II as well as Hinxton Conservation Area. St Johns Church, the Old Manor House and The Oak House all listed at grade II* as well as numerous GII listed lie within the wider Conservation Area. To the north of the site lies Hinxton Grange and Stables, both listed at grade II. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of an HIA for this site. We welcome the criterion 10 and 11. Criterion 10a should be amended as Hinxton Hall lies within the site not to the north of the site (that is Hinxton Grange). Similarly, parts of the Conservation Area lie within the site. Therefore, the wording needs to be amended to more accurately reflect on site and nearby heritage assets.	210144 (Historic England)
The planning permission (S/439/18/OL) is for the expansion land only and it is worded in a way that is restrictive in places and does not reflect the planning permission's wording. Specifically, around campus housing, sales and letting system, temporary and meanwhile uses, public open space.	211227 (David Lock Associates on behalf of Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)
The scope of the sciences supported onsite is too narrow and needs to be reviewed.	211226 (David Lock Associates on behalf of Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)

We propose a flexible policy framework that defines clear boundaries for “Hinxton Campus” and “Hinxton Village”, encourages mixed-use ground floors, phased redevelopment and aligns with national growth corridors.	209114 (David Lock Associates on behalf of Wellcome Genome Campus Ltd)
Restrictions on intended tied housing for Campus workers should be rigorously applied. Governance issue should be examined at an early stage to avoid swamping of existing Hinxton community by an expanded Genome Campus. For instance, by creation of a new Parish Council serving the area of the Wellcome Genome Campus.	203379 (Ickleton PC)
The issues in this policy are largely covered by the existing S106 provisions of the outline permission granted under S/4329/18/OL. The education requirements may however have been under estimated. Whilst accepting that the demographic of the resident population on this site may not be typical of development elsewhere in South Cambridgeshire. Department of Education pupil yields suggests that for 1,500 homes, 540 primary and 255 secondary school places would be required. This would imply a need for a second primary school at some stage and allowance should be made for this in the masterplan. The provision of secondary education should also be reviewed as nearby schools are oversubscribed.	208104 (Sawston PC)
Hinxton. The proposal for the New Town at Hinxton is problematic and provision is not sufficiently robust, currently being a dominant satellite to be attached to the very small village of Hinxton. It is directly opposite Wellcome Genome Site also identified for expansion (S/AMC/GP) on a narrow but busy route which is already congested at peak periods.	211924, 211925, 210990 (C Newell)

The Plan proposals include very limited infrastructure (a piece of land for a school), which ensures that there will be undue pressure on Hinxton, one of the smallest of the South Cambridgeshire villages. 1.57 The Genome Spa al Framework drawing needs clarity and revision informed by a robust and accurate assessment of all the relevant constraints and appropriate mi ga on for this locality. The proposed uses also need to be clearly defined and robustly justified. The proposal also needs the provision of infrastructure to be increased to be proportionate to the scale of the development site.	
The sites needs to take a sequential approach to flood risk and prepare an FRA.	211180 (Environment Agency)

Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Stapleford Parish Council to support the SEA and paragraphs 2.4.25 and 2.4.26. However, the Parish Council raised an issue about the CSET route going through the SEA.

Cambridge Past, Present and Future suggested some editorial amendments to the site allocation.

Babraham Research Campus Ltd support the allocation of the site and highlight some editorial changes to reflect the planning application. They also raise that there is unmet need for further employment and residential development on the campus.

Camcycle asked for more ambition regarding transport measures. Concerns were raised by the Brish Horse Society that the policy does not explicitly address public rights of way or equestrian access.

Historic England raised concerns that the HIA needed to be reflected including in Criterion 8 Replacing ‘or’ with ‘and’, and the need to retain The Lodge.

The Environment Agency commented about flood risk and the need for water compatible development only in Flood Zone 3.

Further responses were received from Sport England who supports the policy and recommends explicit reference to Active Design.

Another comment questioned the impact of change to the SEA area on heritage assets.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- In response to Babraham Research Campus Ltd, with regards to the site boundary, the amendments have been made to the boundary to reflect the land ownership and latest proposals for the site.
- The SEA boundary has not been extended because it is felt that this area may be used for infrastructure works to support the road network and therefore the SEA may impede on that. The SEA as existing is designed to protect and enhance the landscape.
- Homes have not been ringfenced for occupation by campus workers because it is felt that the scale of development proposed here and the proportion of units delivered onsite, it would be disproportionate to request this.
- In response to Babraham Research Ltd, the policy has been worded as approximately, to allow for further
- In response to Stapleford Parish Council, the CSET route does not go through the SEA. The Spatial Framework has been corrected to reflect this change.
- In response to Historic England, the suggested amendments have been made to the wording.
- In response to the Environment Agency, the suggested amendments have been made to the wording.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Supports the need for improvements to environmental quality and accessibility in the SEA due to loss of greenbelt.	201558 (Stapleford PC)

Concerns that the plans by the Greater Cambridge Partnership to construct a busway through the Strategic Enhancement Area are in stark contrast to the goals of improving biodiversity and environmental quality.	201558 (Stapleford PC) 210910 (Great Shelford PC
With the loss of Green Belt that expansion of the Babraham Research Campus will involve, we strongly support the need for substantial compensatory improvements to the environmental quality of, and accessibility to, the proposed SEA. Development at the Campus must also maintain key views, enhance existing tree coverage, relate sensitively to its surroundings, and maintain and enhance the wider landscape	210910 (Great Shelford PC)
Units should be safeguarded for campus workers.	203095 (Cambridge, Past, Present and Future)
Greater consideration in policy is needed for local heritage assets and local views.	203095 (Cambridge, Past, Present and Future), 201558 (Stapleford PC), 207393 (Cambridge Paste, Present and Future)
Improved public transport connectivity is required to support the allocation.	203095 (Cambridge, Past, Present and Future), 207394 (Cambridge Past, Present and Past)
Existing rights of way should be protected and integrated into the site layout.	203611 (British Horse Society)

Amendments to the spatial framework are suggested including site boundary, removal of landscape buffer, commercial led development blocks, local nature reserve, and CSET.	203943 (Bidwells on behalf of Babraham Research Campus Ltd)
Suggestions to the policy wording to reflect the live planning application.	203943 (Bidwells on behalf of Babraham Research Campus Ltd)
BRC supports the continued allocation of Babraham Research Campus under Policy S/BRC for mixed-use development to meet the Campus's future needs to address unmet need for further residential and non-residential development.	203966 (Bidwells on behalf of Babraham Research Campus Ltd)
The site includes the grade I listed Church of St Peters and grade II listed Babraham Hall as well as part of Babraham Conservation Area. There are a number of other listed buildings nearby in the village of Babraham. In addition, there is a series of scheduled monuments on the higher land to the north and north west of the site including a long barrow, bowl barrow at Copley Hill, Wormwood Hill Tumulus, Causewayed enclosure and bowl barrow at Little Tree Hill and Wandlebury Camp a multivallate hillfort, earlier univallate hillfort, Iron Age cemetery and 17th century formal garden remains. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of an HIA for this site. The Policy states that Babraham Hall is grade II*. However, our records show this is listed at grade II. Please check and amend if necessary. We broadly welcome criterion 4 – 9 and 11.	210145 (Historic England)

Criterion 4 Add reference to the Babraham Conservation Area which covers part of the site. We welcome the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment. We would suggest referring to a '…more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment…' given that an HIA has already been undertaken. Add in the need to retain The Lodge, as recommended in the HIA. Criterion 8 Replace 'or' with 'and' to read 'Retain or and, where possible, supplement…	
: Sport England supports the policy and recommends explicit reference to Active Design.	209227 (Sport England)
We support the inclusion of point 10, which requires the development to 'apply the sequential approach to flood risk within the site, ensuring any development is subject to appropriate mitigation and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.' We recommend that this is expanded to clarify that only 'water compatible' development should be located within Flood Zone 3, and a site-specific FRA will need to include further assessment of the potential for groundwater flooding to inform the need for appropriate mitigation measures. Consideration should be given to the potential for the adjacent SEA to offer opportunities to reduce flood risk through nature-based solutions.	211178 (Environment Agency)
Expansion of the Biomedical Campus is understandable given its regional and national importance. However, the Local Plan does not yet set out a sufficiently robust spatial strategy to accompany this growth. The policy should: ● Require genuinely mixed-use development at a meaningful scale within and adjacent to the Biomedical Campus, including high-density housing with low car ownership, to reduce the need for long-distance commuting ● Avoid token residential provision and explicitly link employment growth to housing delivery in a walking or cycling distance to the campus	211770, 211771 (Camcycle)

Ensure that boundary treatments associated with Green Belt release do not create long-term physical or spatial barriers to movement, future connections or neighbouring communities ● Identify the active travel connections over the railway line as critical infrastructure and explicitly acknowledge the need for improvement ● Secure firm commitments to upgrade the key walking and cycling corridors serving the campus, including Trumpington Road, Long Road and the busway path with delivery tied to development phasing.	
Proposed Spatial Framework for Babraham Hall provides a very large SEA which is likely to change the countryside designation to residential and/or commercial. The impact in principle on heritage assets, the setting of Babraham Hall and curtilage structures has not been assessed and the reason for change of use of such a large area is not justified. Its removal from the Babraham Hall Framework Plan will not affect the delivery of housing in the Plan as that is shown provided closer to the existing village street.	211920 (C. Newell)

Policy S/RSC: Other site allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by developers about the nomination of sites. A variety of reasons were suggested, including the need for homes, the additional sites in the rural area, and in some cases, sites being grey belt.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Proposals for alternative site shave been considered though an update to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment where they fit within the broad emerging strategy of the local plan. New evidence submitted has been considered, and where considered appropriate scoring has been amended. Comments related to strategy choices have also been considered, particularly under the development strategy policies. The deliverability of the plan has been tested through evidence including the Housing Delivery Study. The strategy focusing on other broad locations is considered to be sound. It is not proposed to add additional village sites to the proposed submission local plan. An update to the Green Belt Study has been carried out to consider which areas would meet he governments definition of being grey belt. Whilst some site may meet the definition, exceptional circumstances is still required for green belt release, and the Councils do not consider that exists in light of alternatives available.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at Whittlesford Walled Garden Concerns raised in relation to the promotion of Land at Whittlesford Walled Garden for housing. Upward adjustments to the housing target are necessary, with a development strategy focusing on sustainable villages and exceptional circumstances for Green Belt land release.	202371 (Carter Jonas on behalf of the CLC Trust)
Land r/o No.1 Wren Park Whittlesford Cambridge (HELAA reference 52726) Disagreement with decision to categorise this site as Greenfield. Allocate land for development. Detailed comments are provided on the HELAA assessment.	207087 (R Arbon)
Foster's Field Hill Farm Road Whittlesford Cambridge (HELAA reference 52694) Allocate Foster's Field, Hill Farm Road, Whittlesford, Cambridge for development. Detailed comments are provided on the HELAA assessment.	207092 (R Arbon)
Land North of Mingle Lane and East of Hinton Way, Stapleford, Cambridgeshire (HELAA Reference 40369 (Site ID: 115763) and HELAA Reference 200771 (Site ID: 115189) Requested Change – Allocation of land for residential development	209968 (Pegasus Group on behalf of Granta Land Ltd)
Land North of Mill Lane, Sawston, CB22 3BY (HELAA Reference 40341) Allocate for development. Site evidence has bene provided. Reasons include need for additional allocations, site is considered grey belt,	210299 (Bidwells on behalf of Northwest Biotherapeutics Capital Limited)

Land at Dernford Reservoir (HELAA Reference 200751) Allocate for development. For the development of a data centre. Dernford Reservoir has a reservation for 450MW of power and can connect to one of three major substations within a 20-mile radius – a pivotal feature.	210309 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Rusell Smith Farms)
Land off Back Road, Linton (Site Reference 40343) Allocate for residential development. Comments provide a range of reasons including the need for additional allocations, over reliance on larger sites, and the sustainability the location.	210667 (Gladman Developments)
Land off Balsham Road, Linton (Site Ref. 40336) Allocate land for residential development. Comments provide a range of reasons including the need for additional allocations, over reliance on larger sites, and the sustainability the location.	210669 (Gladman Developments)
Land opposite Brewery Field, Duxford (site reference 115069) Despite acknowledgment of the presence of existing research parks and sustainable transport opportunities, there is one allocation within Duxford (a Group Village) for 60 homes and a carried over allocation from the 2018 adopted Plan for 280 homes in Sawston (a Rural Centre). We consider that further sustainable opportunities for growth have been overlooked in this area, including land within Duxford.	211271 (Mr & Mrs Smith)

Policy S/RSC/MF: Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road Duxford

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support from Historic England for the allocation of this site. Historic England confirmed that there are no designated heritage assets onsite.

Comments were made by local residents with regard to concerns to walkability and whether Whittlesford Parkway was in walking distance to the site.

Concerns were raised by local residents in terms of development pressures in Duxford.

Further responses were received from site promoters with similar sites and were challenging the allocation of this site over other sites.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- Support is noted from Historic England.
- Site allocations are selected in line with the development strategy for Greater Cambridge in locations where there is accessible to public transport and local amenity and infrastructure provision. The sites are assessed through the HELAA to assess their suitability for development and any constraints. Duxford is a group village and can therefore support 60 new homes.

- The HELAA assessment has concluded that in terms of accessibility, there is adequate accessibility to key local services, transport, and employment opportunities. Proposed development would not require delivery of accompanying key services.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Concerns raised about considerations of active travel including connections to Whittlesford Parkway.	201155 (T Clarke)
Support for the allocation.	204310 (KWA Architects on behalf of Waterbeach Instruments Ltd)
Concerns raised about similar site proposed for inclusion in the Local Plan where this site has been rated Green in the HELAA for ecology and the other site has been rated Amber.	204310 (KWA Architects on behalf of Waterbeach Instruments Ltd)
More amenities are needed to support additional development in Duxford.	202541 (R Genillard)
There are no designated heritage assets on this site and whilst the Duxford Conservation Area lies to the south-east of the site it is separated from the site by development and a playing field. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome the references to heritage assets and building heights in the policy.	210146 (Historic England)

Policy S/RSC/BR: Land south of Babraham Road Sawston

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There was broad support from Historic England. Historic England confirmed that there are no designated heritage assets onsite. But the policy should

Comments were made by Great Stapleford to support clause 1c and amend the policy to reflect improve greenways and cycling and pedestrian access.

Concerns were raised by emergency services to include in the policy wording financial contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities.

Further responses were received from Waterbeach Instruments Ltd to challenge the allocation of this site over a similar site.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- In response to Waterbeach Instruments Ltd, site allocations are selected in line with the development strategy for Greater Cambridge in locations where there is accessible to public transport and local amenity and infrastructure provision. The sites are assessed through the HELAA to assess their suitability for development and any constraints. The HELAA assessment has concluded that this site is suitable for allocation.
- In response to cycle access, it is felt that the wording in the policy is sufficient to support these connections.

- In response to Historic England, the support is noted and the policy has been amended to include landscaping on the southern boundary and reference to the Sawston Hall Registered Park and Garden.
- In response to Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Cambridge Fire and Rescue Services, the funding for emergency services is set out in the IDP as a planning obligation and does not need to be repeated in every site allocation.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Concerns raised about allocation of this site over a similar site proposed with similar characteristics.	204481 (KWA Architects on behalf of Waterbeach Instruments)
The site allocation should refer to Contributions to fire & rescue, police and ambulance facilities provision/ funding.	207486 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary), 207517 (Cambridge Fire and Rescue Service),
There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. However, Sawston Hall a grade II Registered Park and Garden, lies to the south-west of the site. Development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through development within its setting. There does not appear to be an HIA for this site. However, we appreciate that this site is largely built out.	210147 (Historic England)

The policy should reference Sawston Hall RPG and the need for landscaping along the southern part of the site.	
Agree with clause 1c.	210911 (Great Shelford PC)
Support for greenway access to link Stapleford / Great Shelford to Whittlesford Parkway Station. Including pedestrian and cycling access to the Former Spicers Site.	210911 (Great Shelford PC)

Policy S/RSC/FSS: Former Spicers Site, Sawston Business Park, Sawston

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Whittlesford Parish Council to support the principle of the policy framework but raises concerns about walking and cycling infrastructure and connectivity to Whittlesford Parkway Station. Cllr R Williams considered the policy underplays the exceptional environmental, recreational and active travel opportunities presented by this site and should be strengthened.

Concerns were raised that there are environmental, recreational and active travel opportunities that should be focused on more, although the site allocation itself and specific clauses are supported. Comments set out that development was conditional on a path from Whittlesford to Shelford.

Concerns were raised about the impact on Green Belt, chalk downland and the Borough Hill Scheduled Monument and connectivity to other local villages.

Further responses were received from Historic England to require the HIA recommendations to be included in policy, and to require a more detailed Heritage Assessment, an Archaeological Management Plan, a Conservation Management Plan and to prevent development from occurring on the Borough Hill Scheduled Monument.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- Landscaped buffers have been included in the policy to offset any harm to the Green Belt and the surrounding landscape.
- The 2020 Planning Permission was not conditional of a cycle path explicitly from Whittlesford to Shelford, but with a cycle path to the A1301. The wording amendments in the policy to support connections to wider cycle networks should address this point and comments raised in relation to active travel connections.
- Wording has been included in the policy to improve pedestrian and cycle connections.
- The changes requested by Historic England have been made including the figure showing the developable area around the Scheduled Monument and the requirements for an Archaeological Management Plan and a Conservation Management Plan.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Respondents noted that the council should refer to the original plans by Huawei, which included a pathway along the river and through the woods, providing amenity space for walkers from Sawston and Whittlesford.	201272 (M Meredith)
A previous planning permission in 2020 for a research facility on this site was made conditional on building a new cycle path along the river Cam, connecting the 'blue bridge' on footpath 1 in Whittlesford to Shelford Road. There is currently no good cycle path from Whittlesford to Shelford, limiting opportunities for active travel. If this development goes ahead, it should include a cycle path from Whittlesford to Shelford.	201534 (A Smith)

The respondent is concerned about the lack of mention of community access and biodiversity plans in the new outline for development proposals.	201272 (M Meredith)
The respondent highlights that recent planning permission for the Babraham campus was granted due to biodiversity enhancement plans, contrasting it with the poor management of the land surrounding Spicers.	201272 (M Meredith)
Any development of this site should offset its harm to the Green Belt and in particular seek to improve the quality of the chalk downland between the Borough Hill scheduled monument on this site and the Wandlebury site on the same range of chalk hills.	201309 (M Foote)
Support for requirement for development to contribute to public transport provision.	201559 (Stapleford PC)
Active travel routes should be maintained and improved throughout the site including to Sawston and Shelford, Whittlesford to Shelford, and the Sawston Greenway Network.	201559 (Stapleford PC), 201534 (A Smith),
The site contains part of the scheduled monument. The scheduled monument known as 'Borough Hill' is a large multivallate (multi- ditched) iron age fort. This is an exceptional pre-historic site, of which there are less than a handful of surviving examples around the country. It is also on our heritage at risk register. We have previously raised concerns about the impact of the development on the significance of the designated asset. Our primary concern is the impact of the development upon the significance of the scheduled monument through a development within it setting. The closeness, scale and massing of the new development will significantly increase the quantum of the development in the area immediately adjacent to the monument. The setting of the monument will be irrevocably changed, and the significance of the asset will therefore be eroded and diminished. This development would therefore	210148 (Historic England)

result in harm to this significance. We recognise that the Spicers site is a brownfield site and that some form of redevelopment of this site would be acceptable in principle. However, development will need to be very sensitive to the monument adhering to the recommendations of the HIA. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. Two of the recommendations from the HIA are not reflected in the policy. These are: 1. Archaeological investigation should be undertaken in areas previously not subject to archaeological works. 2. Development should be limited to the area previously subject to development to avoid impacts on potentially significant archaeology associated with the monument. These recommendations should be included in the policy. It is sometimes beneficial to consider including the monument within the site boundary in order that appropriate mitigation and enhancements for the monument can be secured. We would suggest that this is an instance where such an approach could be useful. At the present time, only part of the monument is included within the site boundary. It is our view therefore that the whole of the scheduled monument should be included in the site allocation area.	
Whittlesford Parish Council supports the principle of a policy framework for the Former Spicers Site but considers that it should be strengthened to deliver clear public benefits and to reflect the site's relationship with Whittlesford, Sawston and Shelford. The policy refers to access to the A1301 but does not adequately address access to Whittlesford Road. The Council strongly supports the inclusion of high-quality walking and cycling infrastructure. The policy should explicitly require safe and direct routes connecting the site to Whittlesford village, Whittlesford Parkway Station, and a dedicated cycleway along Shelford-Whittlesford Roads, connecting the site to Little Shelford and improving active travel	207746 (Whittlesford PC)

connectivity between Whittlesford and Shelford. The policy should encourage public access across the wider site for walking, cycling and informal recreation, where compatible with development, to ensure that the site is integrated with surrounding communities rather than functioning as an isolated enclave.	
I welcome the inclusion of a site-specific policy for the Former Spicers Site within the draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan and support the principle of a coordinated policy framework for the site. However, I consider that the current draft policy underplays the exceptional environmental, recreational and active travel opportunities presented by this site and should be strengthened accordingly and need to be strengthened to secure health and active travel benefits in accordance with NPPF policies.	204138 (Cllr R Williams)

Policy S/RSC/CC: Comfort Café, Fourwentways Little Abington

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the allocation from Historic England.

Concerns were raised about the oversupply of employment floorspace where there are lots of unoccupied employment floorspace units.

Further responses were received from Cambridge Past, Present and Future to specify that development 'must' not have any unacceptable adverse impacts on heritage assets.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- In terms of employment floorspace, Greater Cambridge maintains a high level of employment land availability as recommended in the Employment Land Review and the Greater Cambridge EHEU 2023 is a recognisable scenario for Greater Cambridge. The area has historically carried an oversupply of employment land, that is allocated or with planning permission, when compared to the amount of floorspace completed on an annual basis, however strong the economy has been. In planning positively for growth, the plan can continue to reflect the previous trends that have underpinned the successful expansion of the Greater Cambridge economy by providing an ongoing flexible supply of employment land.
- The suggested edits from Cambridge Past, Present and Future have been included within the policy.

- Support is noted from Historic England.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Concerns raised about the need to protect heritage assets.	203099 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
There are concerns about the proposal for small R&D and start-up businesses due to the proximity of Granta Park and existing empty buildings, raising the risk of oversupply.	203131 (G Dalton), 204470 (J Searle)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on site, there is a grade II listed building, the Temple café and restaurant, to the south of the site. Development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through development within its setting. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion 1a,1b 1e and 1f.	210149 (Historic England)

Policy S/SCP: Policy Areas in the Rural Southern Cluster

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Broad support for the allocation from Historic England.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- Support from Historic England is noted.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
We note that the policy for the Babraham Strategic Enhancement Area is within the main policy for Babraham Research Campus, criterion 15.	210150 (Historic England)

Policy S/PA/LN: South of A1307, Linton

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Concerns were raised about light rail connections.

Historic England broadly support this policy area.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- At this stage, it is not appropriate to make reference to a potential Linton Station.
- Support from Historic England is noted.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Make provision for a possible Linton Station / light rail link as per Cambridge Connect.	203789 (A Carpen)
Support for policy.	210151 (Historic England)

Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change in the Rural Southern Cluster

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Broad support for the allocation from Historic England.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Support from Historic England is noted.

The Land east of M11 at Duxford proposal has been considered through the Housing and Economic Land Availability assessment process, and proposals in relation to the aviation sectors have also been considered. The Councils consider that the Avtech aviation related employment uses could be complementary to the existing Imperial War Museum, being a major tourist / visitor attraction, educational, commercial and aviation facility and an important employment site for aviation. The boundary of Policy S/AMC/IWM: Imperial War Museum was expanded to include the Avtech 1 site (the western parcel), to enable proposals to come forward via a policy compliant detailed planning application, if a firm proposal was developed. However, the Councils consider that the proposed aviation technology cluster is extremely nascent and it is not considered that there is a sufficiently strong economic case to allocate Avtech 2 land which lies to the east of the M11.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
We welcome the reference to heritage in criterion 1d.	210152 (Historic England)
Land east of M11 at Duxford (Site Reference: 40095) The draft Plan now recognises IWM Duxford as being in an “area of major change”, but it raises a question why it is not also included as part of the Rural Southern Cluster, which recognises the associated need for housing, and which could be delivered around Duxford Village to support the sustainable growth of AvTech and the village. In this regard, we note at Policy S/AMC/WHD: Whittlesford Parkway Station Policy Area is both within the AMC and RSC. Continued investment in AvTech will also play an important role in diversifying the Rural Southern Cluster in South Cambridgeshire, providing some resilience if investment in biotech and life sciences slows.	211424 (Gonville & Caius College)

Policy S/AMC/GP: Granta Park

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Concerns were raised by local residents with concerns about light pollution and visibility of Granta Park from key viewpoints around the local area. Inconsistency regarding approach to building height was questioned.

Concerns were raised about some minor amendments to the policy area to reflect the ambition and the planning permission at Granta Park by the site owner.

Concerns were raised about Grange Farm not being able to meet the urgent accommodation needs of Granta Park.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- Point 1d has been amended to set out that development should respond positively to the tree line to minimise the impact on the landscape in response to comments.
- The boundary has been amended in response to comments from BMR Granta Park Propco Limited.
- The uses section has been amended in response to comments from BMR Granta Park Propco Limited.
- All new sites of a strategic scale are held back until 2032 in the draft plan to ensure that there is sufficient water supply. Smaller windfall sites are able to come forward to meet urgent needs, this does not require a site allocation. The site allocations for residential use in this location have been allocated in line with the strategy for the Local Plan which minimises carbon emissions through the selection of well-connected sites. This is set out in the HELAA assessment.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Recent buildings on this, notably Site 1 (21/03822/FUL), have been very intrusive to the landscape including light pollution.	203112 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
BioMed Realty is concerned that relying on key worker housing at Grange Farm will not meet the urgent accommodation needs of Granta Park.	203553 (Carter Jonas on behalf of BMR Granta Park Propco Limited)
Support for the site allocation.	203553 (Carter Jonas on behalf of BMR Granta Park Propco Limited)
A more flexible approach to housing delivery is needed to deliver more housing to meet the needs of the expanding campus.	203553 (Carter Jonas on behalf of BMR Granta Park Propco Limited)
The planning permission should be better reflected in policy, including the site plan.	203348 (Carter Jonas on behalf of BMR Granta Park Propco Limited)
R&D floorspace should remain the dominant use, with flexibility for enabling facilities that strengthen the life-science ecosystem.	203350 (Carter Jonas on behalf of BMR Granta Park Propco Limited)

Open-space policy should recognise usability, function and operational needs, not just visual or ecological value.	203350 (Carter Jonas on behalf of BMR Granta Park Propco Limited)
The policy should be revised to include clause on delivery of essential infrastructure.	203350 (Carter Jonas on behalf of BMR Granta Park Propco Limited)
Discrepancy in the approach to Granta Park continues regarding ‘townscape’ character of this rural park and the rural villages of Great and Little Abington each side of it. The predominate scale is of 1½ to 2 storeys, even at Granta Park, not 4 storeys. There is an exception building outside the village at Granta park roundabout, at 4 storeys, but that building does not comply with the extant Local Plan.	211921 (C Newell)

Policy S/AMC/WHD: Whittlesford Parkway Station Policy Area, Whittlesford Bridge

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the area of major change from CLC Trust, Great Shelford Parish Council, Imperial War Museum, Stapleford Parish Council, and Cambridgeshire County Council.

Concerns were raised by local residents with concerns about light pollution and visibility of Granta Park from key viewpoints around the local area. Concerns were raised about overdevelopment of the site, traffic congestion and connectivity. Concerns were raised about Grange Farm not being able to meet the urgent accommodation needs of Granta Park.

Detailed feedback was provided by a member of the public on their experiences using the Whittlesford Parkway, and the transport issues apparent in the village.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- The purpose of a policy area is to set the vision for an area, and to set out considerations or high level mitigations for any development proposals in this location. The detail of any mitigations or interventions will develop through the development of a masterplan and the development management process, with the support of statutory consultees and expertise of GCSP to minimise impacts on transport, landscape, heritage and the environment.

- In response to concerns impact on landscape, wording has been added to the policy to set out that development must positively respond to the treeline, to minimise impacts on the landscape.
- In response to traffic and connectivity concerns, a transport assessment will be required for any development for this site. National Highways will be consulted on any significant applications to manage the impacts on the road network. The policy wording reflect the need for cycle routes and improvement to connectivity to Whittlesford Parkway.
- In response to safety concerns and suggestions for traffic management and improvements for pedestrians, GCSP is not the highways authority, and it is the responsibility of the highways authority and national highways to manage these issues. The wording has been revised to set out the safety, and the needs of pedestrians needs to be priority.
- In response to concerns about overdevelopment, this allocation as it is a policy area does not have a capacity, however the policy area is masterplan-led and through the development of a masterplan development can be managed more effectively so it is of a sustainable scale.
- In response to Historic England, the suggested amends have been made.
- In response to KLW Planning, the proposal is a policy area not a site allocation to set out the vision for the area, where there is not sufficient detail on a developed proposal suitable for the site and where a site may be in multiple land ownerships. The area around the station has the potential for higher density development and must align with the delivery of a multi-modal travel hub.
- As a policy area, the site does not need to come through the Call for Sites process.
- In response to concerns about the underestimation of future demand.
- The extension of the policy area to include the site under HELAA reference 115874 / 40097, the land is designated as Green Belt and therefore is not included within the boundary for redevelopment.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Concerns raised over need to be more specific in the policy wording to recognise local context.	200997 (I Beeby) 207899 (N Denham)

Safety concerns raised about active travel routes between Pampisford and Sawston to Whittlesford Parkway.	201504 (J Harvey-Bowman), 204354 (N Denham)
Safety concerns at the A505 roundabout crossing, and pedestrian routes and the impact of lorry parking.	205788 (J Harvey-Bowman), 205789 (J Harvey-Bowman), 205787 (J Harvey-Bowman)
The pedestrian and cycle route between Whittlesford Parkway and Unity Campus feels unsafe and dangerous. Safety concerns of commuting by train, other Campus members opt to travel by car, further increasing demand for safe and sustainable travel options.	205786 (J Harvey-Bowman)
Safety concerns for pedestrians and the need for more public transport and a bus service from Sawston to Whittlesford Parkway.	205793 (J Harvey-Bownman), 205792 (J Harvey-Bowman), 205791 (J Harvey-Bowman), 205790 (J Harvey-Bowman),
Residents and members of the Unity Campus proposed a range of potential solutions including lighting, widening of paths, speed limits, signal control for pedestrians.	205794 (J Harvey-Bowman)
Support for the designation but concerned about underestimation of future demand.	206692 (Cllr R Williams)
The policy should include explicit requirements to secure step-free access and lift provision, improved bus and active travel connectivity, and the use of Section 106 obligations arising from development elsewhere in the Rural Southern Cluster to fund these improvements. The plan policy should also recognise and support local communities in dealing with the impacts of transport hubs.	206693 (Cllr R Williams)

The station design needs reviewing to be more effective. Improved connectivity between the station platforms is needed.	201536 (A Smith), 202607 (R Barrett)
Support for clauses 1 and 2 in the policy.	201560 (Stapleford PC), 210912 (Great Shelford PC)
Support for policy.	202117 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 207531 (Carter Jonas on behalf of the CLC Trust)
Support for cleaning up of the area but concerns about overdevelopment.	204354 (N Denham)
Concerns over nomination of the whole policy area as a policy area if it has not come through the call for sites process.	204912, 211677 (Lichfields on behalf of Smithson Hill)
The respondent notes the need for further site allocations in Whittlesford.	207531 (Carter Jonas on behalf of the CLC Trust)
Land east of M11 at Duxford Site Reference: 40095 Caius would be keen to work in partnership with all relevant bodies and local communities in preparing and adopting a masterplan led approach to the comprehensive development of the policy area. We consider such a policy lead approach would give the GCLP additional flexibility up to an including Examination in Public to demonstrate the Plan has the capacity to meet all objectively assessed needs. It would also offer a partnership approach allowing local communities early stage engagement in the plan making process.	211425 (Gonville & Caius College)

Policy S/AMC/WHD seeks a masterplan approach to bring forward a multi-modal travel hub at Whittlesford Parkway. Broad support is given to the policy as part of the wider strategic infrastructure strategy for the area. Development beyond Whittlesford Parkway should be able to come forward independently.	211455 (Henry Boot Development Ltd)
The Chapel of Hospital of St John the Baptist is a scheduled monument and listed at grade II*. The Red lion Hotel is listed at grade II. Whilst we welcome the reference to the assets on criterion 2, the policy should mention the type and grade of the assets. The policy should include a requirement for a heritage impact assessment.	210153 (Historic England)
We question whether, in view of alternative transport initiatives serving this area, in particular CSET Phase 2, significant further development on this very constrained site, beyond access improvements, is appropriate.	208105 (Sawston PC)
The policy appears to be based heavily on the 'Whittlesford Station Masterplan Stage One, Baseline Report, Final' from 2018 which is out of date. Many of its key proposals were shown to be either unfeasible or not cost-effective. The only potentially available site within the policy area, Land North of 39A Station Road (West), was recently given permission for a residential estate of 48 dwellings (23/01150/FUL). Future use of land which might become potentially available to increase parking provision is likely to be in conflict with the proposed revised NPPF Policy Change 2 – 'Building homes around stations'.	208106 (Sawston PC)
Access from the A505 to both Station Roads East and West is already addressed in the Royston to Granta Park Strategic Transport Study, (Strategic Outline Case, 2025).	208107 (Sawston PC)

A number of the assumptions around the future importance of Whittlesford as a transport interchange have been overtaken by changes in local development policies and the CSET Phase2 proposals for a travel hub at the Fourwentways A1307/A11 junction. Significant drivers for growth in usage of Whittlesford is cited in the 2018 Masterplan report. The Uttlesford Local Plan was withdrawn during the EIP and the Garden Village proposal dropped. The current Uttlesford emerging plan proposes no major development in the North of the District and this aspect of the Local Plan has been considered generally sound. It is noted that the GCP is no longer funding the Whittlesford Station Transport Infrastructure Strategy.	208108 (Sawston PC)
CSET Phase 2 will also offer direct and rapid access to Cambridge and Cambridge South stations and faster, frequent journeys to Kings Cross and Liverpool Street Stations. It will also offer direct access to the East Coast mainline at Hitchin and eventually to Cambourne and Oxford via EWR. Depending on the patterns of service operated by the rail and bus companies, it is likely that if CSET Phase 2 proceeds, Cambridge and Cambridge South will become the stations of choice for users in the South East of the District.	208109 (Sawston PC)
If it is still considered that a major rail-based transport hub is needed in this area, consideration should be given to the relocation of Whittlesford Parkway to a new site adjacent to the entrance to the former Spicers' Site on the A1301 Sawston Bypass. This site is better located to serve both Whittlesford and Sawston to both of which it is well connected by active travel routes. It has better access, is less constrained and would also serve as a major stimulus for the re-development of the former industrial site. Since it would involve a specific green belt release, land acquisition costs would be substantially less than within the proposed policy.	208110 (Sawston PC)

Whittlesford Parkway is a mainline station serving Cambridge, London and Stansted and is a key transport asset for the Rural Southern Cluster. Whittlesford Parish Council supports the designation of a policy area but considers that the policy significantly underestimates future demand and, as currently drafted, failed to recognise the reality of the policy area.	207744 (Whittlesford PC)
Parking pressure already impacts Station Road East, which is both a residential road and the location of industrial units. Policy does not provide a clear strategy for managing increased parking demand or for addressing constrained access at Station Road East, West Royston Road and Moorfield Road. The policy should recognise the residential element of Station Road East and that vehicular access to houses for residents is maintained and resident parking facilities enhanced. Whittlesford Parish Council requests that the policy explicitly commits to step-free access to the station, improved platform connectivity via a lift, enhanced cycle links to local villages, a deliverable commitment to increasing public transport links to the station and village, a clear parking and access strategy that protects residential amenity, and measures to address flooding and highway safety, all developed in consultation with the local community.	207745 (Whittlesford PC) 207900 (N Denham)
The development of Whittlesford Parkway as a travel hub together with employment and housing is wholly supported by IWM. The introduction of a bus turning circle is vital and a fundamental part of making Whittlesford station an effective travel hub to enable any significant mode shift to sustainable travel for IWM visitors and staff, being the nearest rail station.	208283 (Turley on behalf of the Imperial War Museum)
Land west of Duxford Road Whittlesford (HELAA Reference 59397) Inclusion of the station area as a policy area rather than as a formal allocation is not positive planning; the Plan should proactively allocate Whittlesford Parkway station for a range of accessibility and	204262 (KLW Planning)

infrastructure improvements and should allocate sites for residential and employment development around the station area, including Land west of Duxford Road. Croudace Homes should be involved in discussions regarding sustainable development around the station, alongside other willing landowners. A delivery plan with clear timelines for improvements at Whittlesford Railway Station is requested to ensure effective implementation. The recent Government consultation supports residential development near well-connected train stations in the top 60 TTWA, of which Whittlesford Parkway is one. The site meets the criteria for a well-connected station, with services exceeding the required frequency, connecting it to London and Cambridge. The GCP Masterplan highlights the need for improved bus services and cycling infrastructure, which could be supported by residential development around the station. Residential development would also complement planned employment provision. The GCP report suggests potential for a new car park to support station accessibility, which could be supported by appropriate contributions from Croudace Homes. The Plan should develop GCP's work to identify residential and employment allocations within 800m of the station to align with government proposals for development near well-connected stations. We attach a transport appraisal and our vision document for Land west of Duxford Road, both of which demonstrate that the site lies within 800m of Whittlesford Parkway railway station, and that the site is highly accessible to this well connected station, with potential to improve footpath and cycle path connections, to the benefit of existing residents of Whittlesford and new residents of the proposed development.	

The site should be proactively allocated as a site allocation not a policy area. Development is supported near stations in the NPPF.	204262 (KLW Planning)
Land North East of Whittlesford Parkway (HELAA Reference 40097) is located immediately adjacent to the 'Area of Major Change' (Draft Policy S/AMC/WHD), which proposes a comprehensive, masterplan-led redevelopment of the Whittlesford Parkway Station. By incorporating this additional land, the Council can include the wider land holding and fully optimise the opportunity to develop the Area of Change. The site offers an opportunity for immediate, high-density well-connected development, optimising land use to support the viability of the transport interchange and Area of Change. The site could also accommodate community uses as a supported in the Whittlesford Neighbourhood plan.	211097 (No6 Developments on behalf of the James Binney Will Trust)
The policy map incorrectly includes the former scrapyard site and the veterinary surgery car park but omits the demolition site at 39a Station Road West and the re-numbered property at 40 Station Road West, risking mis-allocation of development rights. The map fails to include Nr 40 SWR which was recently converted from the garage to Nr 38. We are concerned that the proposed development could have a detrimental effect on our lives and the character of the area. Agencies are not working together effectively; representatives from SRW and SRE must be included in the planning process.	204354, 207891, 207892, 207893, (N Denham)
The A505 is a very dangerous road. Regarding the junction between Moorfield Road and the A505, it is now far too dangerous to do a right-hand turn towards Duxford due the volume of traffic. This will have to be signalled even if it means standing traffic back to Four Wentways and Royston	207894
• The steps up and down make it extremely difficult for cyclists to get from one side to the other, obviously lifts would be ideal for this and disabled people to use the trains more from this station rather than Cambridge of Audley End.	207895, 207896, 207897, 207898, 207899, 207900, 207901, 207902, 207903,

• Cycles they have to weave in and out of the potholes and parked cars, there is no safe crossing point for cyclists at the bottom of Station Road West • Needs to be considered is the reduction of the speed limit to 20 mph • Bus turning circle requirement not clear. • Notices at the station saying there are no bus services etc. • Major unlawful parking in the area. • Narrow pavements, in some places only on one side. Cars have damages path areas, not well lit. • new entrance road to the proposed housing will make pedestrian access worse • agencies involved have not worked well together in the past and continue to do so. • Need better signage • Flooding due to blockages in railway drains	211877, 211878, 211880, (N Denham)
Agree that it must protect and enhance the Duxford Chapel and Red Lion Hotel heritage assets and their settings	211879, (N Denham)
There is strong, consistent, and well-evidenced demand for a safe, continuous, and well-lit pedestrian and cycle route between Sawston, Pampisford, Duxford, Unity Campus, and Whittlesford Parkway Station. The current route actively discourages sustainable travel, forces residents and workers into cars, and presents unacceptable safety risks. With Unity Campus continuing to grow, the need for improvements is both urgent and strategic. Unity Campus strongly encourage the Council to prioritise this route within the Local Plan and Active Travel programmes, and to work with local stakeholders to deliver meaningful, timely improvements.	210439 (J Harvey-Bowman)

Summaries of Representations: Sites Rest of the Rural Area

Rest of the Rural Area Introduction

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments raised concerns regarding sites on the A1307/A14 corridor for logistics. The largest number of these objected to the Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth site north of the A14 services, siting concerns including the size of buildings, relationship with nearby villages, traffic and safety. Newlands respond to comments, stating that their site has transport access benefits over other sites. A smaller number of sites referenced proposals in that area more generally, or other proposals specifically. Historic England asked for more information, in particular on the Slate Hall Farm site identified in the draft plan.

General comments from Parish Councils included Papworth Everard supporting the non-allocation of sites submitted through the call for sites. Little Gransden wanted to ensure if sites were added they addressed highway adoption issues. Great Wilbraham said development in the village was needed to support improvement to services and facilities. Swavesey PC expressed concern about the cumulative impact of development, and the need for it to be assessed.

Other comments included support for removing proposals at the draft plan stage to release of green belt and allocation of development at Mingle Lane in Great Shelford. One comment highlighted concern about protecting villages were not being applied equally to Cambridge. A comment expressed concern about the impact of development at Cambourne on surrounding villages. Another focused on protecting the countryside east of Cambridge.

The majority of comments to this introduction section objected to the non-inclusion of development proposals in a variety of villages. Reasons sites included the relative sustainability of the locations, the opportunities to support services and facilities, the need for the plan to allocate more smaller sites, over reliance on large strategic sites to deliver the numbers required, and the plan simply not allocating enough homes to respond to local needs or national proprieties. A number of comments where sites are in the green belt considered their site was grey belt, and the plan should have identified grey belt opportunities. Many proposals challenged the findings of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and proposed changes to the scoring.

East West Rail advise that some sites promoted are where they are exploring provision of a light maintenance depot.

Response to main issues raised in representations:

Having identified a need for logistics space, the draft plan identified sites at the A14 Services and Slate Hall Farm to respond to that need. There are two other proposals in this area that were not selected. Further evidence has explored transport and heritage impacts and other issues. Having explored issues further, including considering comments made in representations, the two sites selected in the draft plan continue to be the preferred allocations. It should be noted however that promoters of all four sites have indicated an intention to submit planning applications ahead of submission of the local plan.

Proposals for alternative sites have been considered though an update to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment where they fit within the broad emerging strategy of the local plan. New evidence submitted has been considered, and where considered appropriate scoring has been amended. Comments related to strategy choices have also been considered, particularly under the development strategy policies. The deliverability of the plan has been tested through evidence including the Housing Delivery Study. The strategy focusing on other broad locations is considered to be sound. It is not proposed to add additional village sites to the proposed submission local plan. An update to the Green Belt Study has been carried out to consider which areas would meet he governments definition of being grey belt. Whilst some site may meet the definition, exceptional circumstances is still required for green belt release, and the Councils do not consider that exists in light of alternatives available.

The representation regarding the Defined Development Extent has been addressed under Policy S/DE: Defined development extents.

Table of representations:

Comments focused on A1037/ A14 corridor Logistics Proposals

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth, (Newlands) (Site reference: 47353, 115237) Concerns expressed: • I have grave concerns regarding Newlands, as yet not proposed site, north of Boxworth at Cambridge services. Access to site, amount of lorries and other vehicles on an already busy flyover and roundabout system. The size of proposed enormous buildings not compatible with Buckingway B P or proposed Jaynic site to the south. Lack of water to site a problem. Amount	201308 (S Hoyland), 201455 (C O'Connor), 201456 (S O'Connor), 201488 (E and J King), 201758 (P Safranek),

of traffic through small villages and roads to get to it. Proximity to housing at Grapevine. I sincerely hope this is turned down at all planning stage • I am very concerned about the proposed Newlands development which is to the west of the road between Boxworth and the A14 services. The proposal is far too close the village of Boxworth, and the site is far too large. Already the traffic around the three roundabouts in this area are very congested and this will make it significantly worse. On many occasions the A14 service area is completely overloaded, the roundabouts at a standstill with lorries parking for the night on the roundabout itself. Finally, this development is not required for local needs but rather national and regional. • The Swavesey South Roundabout is poorly designed and lacks sufficient space, particularly for lorries, to manoeuvre safely; I have personally witnessed many accidents there. If Newlands proceeds, the additional traffic, especially juggernauts, will make the situation untenable. Furthermore, the proposed warehouses are enormous, of an inappropriate scale and height, and would dwarf our village and its beautiful medieval church • We object to the visual impact of huge buildings. Traffic access to such a large site is problematic as local roads are already inadequate, with no cycle path and no pavement. We are concerned that such a large site will put great strain on water supplies, sewage and drainage. In this region there are many empty warehouses, so the need for this site is not established • The proposed scale of the site and particularly the buildings are not in keeping with rural setting or current restrictions placed on Buckingway site. These will be 24m high boxes. Newlands state this is to serve national and regional needs not local as stated in this plan. Traffic is of great concern, both from lorries and employee traffic. • There is no route through from A428 except through local villages. Roads are very narrow, few pavements and are unfit • for increased traffic. Routes to and from A14 cannot take the traffic	201760 (N Safranek), 202756 (L Turton), 204089 (N Turton), 204184 (Histon and Impington PC) 201789 (J Benninson)

• Size and scale massive, will dominate local rural environment totally inappropriate so close to Boxworth where I live Buildings too high should be max 10m Huge increase in traffic going through Boxworth 24/7 will ruin quality of our quiet village life and increase accident risks Serves national not local needs Concerned Newlands will bypass planning objections by not being included in Local Plan and then will appeal	
A1307 should not be used as an access road to/from a development park. It was provided for local access, to keep local traffic off the A14 and allow a safer route for local residents.	207725 (Swavesey PC)
I agree with the sentiment of the local plan however, I cannot agree or disagree with the proposal as there are many unanswered questions. The plan especially around warehousing looks in isolation and not co-ordinated with the other multiple developments. There are questions on impact of traffic capacity, flooding / drainage and also landscaping with local villages. I am also aware of a warehouse proposal (Newlands) which will be put forward. From what I have seen, there are serious questions on scale and height of the units and traffic management through villages and sustainable commuting which is one of your priorities.	203743 (E McKerrecher)
Land to north west of Cambridge services. Likely access from Boxworth road will greatly impact an already congested roundabout at entrance to services, where traffic at times already tails back onto A14. Coupled with the other proposed development at the services would cause likely gridlock at busy times (early am and evening). The size of warehouses are disproportionate for the area and will greatly impact on visual landscapes. Local roads not suitable, and Boxworth residents in particular concerned about not being able to access a14 at busy times	201261 (C Howlett)
I am most concerned about the plans to develop four logistics, storage and business development sites along the A14 near Bar Hill. The increase in traffic will reduce air quality in the area. There is	205019 (A Bradford), 204477 (Cllr T Bygott),

only one entry and access road to Bar Hill and the siting of the access point to Tritax will exacerbate the already busy and at times congested A14, the roundabout and feeder roads. There will be a significant and detrimental effect on the local landscape. In sum, there are too many developments concentrated in too small an area with significant negative impacts and few benefits. The Newlands (land to the south of J24 of the A14) development is not included in the Draft Local Plan however we wish to make it clear that the proposed development does not meet the policy requirements relating to providing support for Greater Cambridge, the implied restrictions on the size and scale of rural developments (Appendix H) and paragraph 7 of this policy.	203701 (G Chamberlain), 202770 (Boxworth Parish Meeting)
The sheer size and scale of this development is inappropriate with these mega sheds having such an overwhelming and negative impact on the surrounding area. Am estimated extra 4500 daily traffic movements from this site would put severe strain on the local roads especially the A1307	201446 (S Pink)
My concerns against this are to do with: 1. Inappropriate scale and height proposed for the structure 2. The development needs to meet local needs, not be structured to serve regional and national needs 3. Traffic management is a significant concern—roads are too small, would be extremely disruptive to wildlife and would make living here less safe for humans and animals.	201498 (V Lebedeva)
The large commercial developments proposed near Cambridge services seem to ignore the many alternative sites closer to Cambridge including around the relatively newly built Bar Hill which has less natural biodiversity and the housing has less Historic significance. As above the road network through Boxworth already struggles with large lorries inappropriately using and parking on the roads and this will only worsen.	207177 (W Parker)

We appreciate that the introduction of B8 uses (albeit for local use) is something of a departure from previous employment policy in the Cambridge area. This potentially brings additional impacts on the historic environment, given the typical scale and massing of such development. We have some concerns about the employment allocations along the A14, particularly in respect of impacts on some of the churches on the elevated land above the relatively open, flat landscape. The HIA for Slate Farm for example doesn't address this matter, given the assets are at times over 500m, and yet there may still be some wider setting impacts. We need this issue to be explored further by you so that we may be clearer about the potential impacts for these employment sites. In order to do this, we would request revisiting the HIAs, and to explore this matter further so that we may have sufficient information to reach a more informed position. This should also include further evidence in relation to heights and mass informed by some visualisations.	210301 (Historic England)
Site allocation S/RRA/SCS (Land South of A14 Services), would require extensive numbers of HGVs to pass a further 750m through the Junctions to the south of the A14 that link to Boxworth Road and the entrance to the A14 Cambridge Services. The journey time for HGVs to access the westbound A14 Strategic Road Network is therefore over 4 times that of Newlands Park Cambridge (HELAA Reference 47353) and double the time to the eastbound carriageway. The journey times for Slate Hall Farm are significantly longer still. The traffic implications of this additional time/distance travelled by HGV's, upon a congested stretch of road, flagged vehemently in objections to Newlands previous proposal from Boxworth residents, does not appear to have been given due consideration, nor is it evidenced.	211688 (Newlands (Cambridge) Limited)

General Comments from Parish Councils

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Papworth Everard Papworth Everard Parish Council understands that none of the sites submitted by land owners or other interested parties that went on to be assessed in the HELAA in and around Papworth Everard have been brought forward by GCP for the new Local Plan. The Parish Council supports GCP in not bringing forward these sites for the reasons set out in the HELAA assessment.	205476 (Papworth Everard PC)
Little Gransden If the local planning authority is minded to include either or both of the areas adjacent to Primrose Walk, Lt Gransden within the next local plan then we would like the inclusion to be conditioned upon the developers upgrading Primrose Walk to such a standard that it would be adopted by the highways authority.	201420 (Little Gransden PC)
Great Wilbraham The Plan unfairly disadvantages Group and Infill villages like Great Wilbraham and leading to these villages decline. It goes against the Cambridgeshire Corporate Plan because it intentionally restricts who already suffer from loss of local amenities, lack of public transport, no safe cycle routes and pressure on the many social and sporting activities that are maintained, not by the Council, but by hard-working volunteers. Great Wilbraham has changed in recent years with regard to village	206559 (Great Wilbraham PC)

population, a change in housing needs, and almost non-existent public transport. Our community needs an economically diverse population, spread of age groups, primary school, shop, public house, church, access to healthcare, access to social and cultural space and high quality green space.	
Major new housing at Cambourne North, Bourn and continued development of Northstowe will impact both highway and water infrastructure around the Swavesey area. Cumulative impact needs to be a consideration of each individual development site. Site assessments contain general statements that developers would be required to produce traffic management plans or flood risk management plans but there is no point at which these plans are consolidated and their overall effects assessed. We believe this to be a significant shortfall in the Draft Local Plan and needs to be addressed before the next round of consultation	207728 (Swavesey PC)

Other Comments

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
This comment relates to the Site Allocations section and its reliance on the Policies Map and inset maps to define development boundaries. In the area between Northstowe, Oakington and Longstanton, allocated sites and adjacent land are not clearly distinguished from areas intended to remain undeveloped. Several areas appear shaded or labelled in a way that is visually similar to allocated land, creating uncertainty about their intended status. This ambiguity risks unintended coalescence between settlements. The Plan should ensure that allocation boundaries are	204404 Cllr Thomas Bygott

unambiguous and that land intended to function as permanent separation is clearly identified and protected.	
Mingle Lane Great Shelford Support the decision to remove the formerly proposed Mingle Lane development from the plan. concerns over increased traffic. Current traffic on Mingle Lane is already heavy, exacerbated by potholes and parking on both sides, making driving dangerous, especially with church traffic. Local dental and GP surgeries, as well as primary and secondary schools, are at full capacity. Poor drainage system, which is compromised by tree roots protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).	201182 (A Waters) 208184 (J Coppendale)
You care about the aesthetics of these small villages. You don't care at all at what is being done to Cambridge itself. It will be literally unrecognisable, all because the councils get more council tax/business tax? Is it all just about money for you? You are betraying the existing population. Cambridge is going to be a horrible place and the residents have absolutely no way of stopping it happen.	201239 (S Williams),
The proposed housing development linked to the new East/West rail would create a ‘rat run’ through Knapwell, providing insufficient buffering and exposing the village’s protected church, woodland and listed cottages to heavily increased traffic, with speeds over 50 mph and a fatal accident already occurring. There is currently insufficient buffering to protect the village from the massively increased traffic flow. One proposal would be a bypass, which could include Elsworth and Papworth and Knapwell. This has been done locally for some smaller villages. Or a much larger buffer with trees and a separate route which doesn't come through Knapwell at all.	201599, 201600, 201601 (C Grainger)

Site allocations lacking explicit on-site health facility requirements should reference the need for financial contributions towards health and infrastructure mitigation, aligning with the IDP approach. Engagement with Council Officers during early plan preparation and input into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is welcomed. An additional assessment by the ICB in Stage 2 of the IDP process will provide targeted evaluations of key site allocations and health infrastructure needs.	205102 NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board
The countryside east of Cambridge is not empty land waiting for development. It offers critical public rights of way, beautiful, ancient open landscapes, dark skies, important historical sites, and ecological connectivity. These resources support health, recreation, heritage, biodiversity, and climate resilience. Policies must be strengthened to stop speculative, large-scale developments and ensure all external proposals align with Cambridge's strategic plans. Without stronger protections, growth could damage rural landscapes and communities beyond the Green Belt. Developers see our countryside as easy pickings. NSIPs such as Kingsway Solar demonstrate how easily local planning frameworks can be bypassed, leaving our community to fight well-resourced external interests with little support. Villages like Weston Colville contribute to Cambridge's identity, food security, jobs and environmental goals but currently bear disproportionate development pressure without receiving benefits.	209246, 209247, 209250 (D Hepworth)
Windfall sites north east and south east of the village of Linton are problematic developments approved due to lack of a 5-year housing supply. They are shown incomplete on the village inset map and have incomplete boundaries. They therefore do not comply with the Plan criteria under Policy S/7 Page 11 Paragraph 30 and should not have been included in the defined development	211929 (C Newell)

extent. These are the Land at Bartlow Road development, and The Land at Horseheath Road development.	

Comments Seeking Additional Allocation sin the Rest of the Rural Area

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Land east of Cambridge Road in Hardwick (Site Reference 40414) It is requested that the is identified as an additional allocation. Comments address HELAA issues.	204203 (Hill Residential)
Land Adjacent to St Georges Way and Woodcock Close, Impington (HELAA Site Id: 115090) Comments made addressing HELAA issues. Site should be identified as grey belt and allocated.	201859 (Chivers Farms Limited),
Land at Branch Road and Long Road, Comberton (HELAA Site reference: 40261 Site ID ref: 115627) Supports the principle of sustainable development locations but concern about the feasibility of delivering homes in these areas due to potential site-specific issues. Need greater flexibility in the Local Plan to accommodate interim growth needs, particularly in Minor Rural Centres, to avoid failing to meet housing demands. Without a balanced approach between strategic and medium-sized sites, the Councils may struggle to maintain a sufficient supply of new homes. Response to HELAA comments provided.	204721 (Beechwood Estates Ltd)
Land west of Duxford Road Whittlesford Development in close proximity to services and facilities, would enhance the viability and vitality of local services and community facilities. Primary school has a capacity of 210 and currently has 185 pupils, so there is some available capacity for any children who would live in the new homes.	204281 (Croudace Homes)

The Walled Garden, Whittlesford Perfect site that could accommodate small houses for those aged 65+ with their needs being met in an infill central village position with specific facilities for their age while being able to enjoy village facilities. Should not be in the green built as it is village central and surrounded by houses, has been taken out of this latest plan having been in earlier stages.	205509, 204628 (C Forbes-Cable)
Land to the South side of West End Road , Whittlesford Include for development as it would be in keeping with the village remaining neat while adding a considerable amount of houses	205510 (C Forbes-Cable)
Crow's Nest Farm (HELAA Site Ref: 48096 and HELAA Site Ref: 208867) Represents a sustainable, deliverable and flexible opportunity for residential development which is capable of contributing positively to the housing supply over the plan period.	207044 (Mac Mic Land)
Ashwell and Morden Highlight the value of the Plan recognising the potential for additional development in the form of railway station growth within the plan period, and the importance of the Plan creating a flexible and positive policy framework that responds positively to the locational opportunities for station related development in Greater Cambridge within the Plan period. I AMLC are commencing a process of exploring the feasibility of such a project over the coming months and therefore a Call for Sites submission has not been made through the current consultation. Whilst the Local Plan will be assessed for soundness under the December 2024 version of the Framework and therefore need to be demonstrated to be consistent with the existing Framework, the Plan has the challenge of also needing to be consistent with the decision making policies of the new version of the Framework. if	208253, 208254, 208256, 211073 (Ashwell and Morden Landowner Consortium)

the land does prove to be available, suitable and viable for a railway station development, the AMLC and its prospective future development partner would welcome the opportunity to engage with GCPS during the Plan process.	
Swavesey In respect of our client's sites in Swavesey these are located adjacent to a sustainable settlement situated on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway within the A14 corridor. They are suitable, available and could be developed relatively quickly without the need for any major infrastructure improvements. There are not any site-specific constraints for which mitigation cannot be delivered. Therefore, in our opinion these sites, and similar sites in the other sustainable rural villages, should be allocated in the plan to help deliver the growth ambitions for Greater Cambridge in a timely and effective way. We wish to stress the site owners desire to work collaboratively with the Council in respect of their proposed site allocations, and to emphasise the flexibility that exists in respect of this land, to respond to potential local development needs.	208399 (Ceres Property on behalf of land owner at Freisland Farm)
Land South of Horseheath Road Linton Endurance Estates objects to the proposed inset map for Linton on the grounds that it does not allocate Land South of Horseheath Road for residential development.	209752, 209753, 209754, 209755 (Endurance Estates)
Land West of Malton Road, Orwell The draft strategy is flawed due to the over reliance on the delivery of larger complicated sites. The estimated build out rates look to be unachievable based on the need to deliver major infrastructure to unlock these sites, coupled with expected market absorption rates. Growth agenda for Cambridge is likely to see the need for a higher number of houses then currently being projected in the Plan	203079 (Cemex UK Properties)

period. A more balanced delivery approach is required which also meets the requirements of the emerging NPPF which requires authorities plan for a diverse mix of sites across the Local Plan region. Site for 75 dwellings at Orwell has no constraints.	
Land at Long Lane, Fowlmere (HELAA Reference 59408) The Draft Plan's aim to sustain rural villages is supported, but it should proactively allocate growth to village locations. Transportation mode is important but should not be the sole consideration; bus services and the rise of electric vehicles should be acknowledged. The proposed development of around 65 homes in Fowlmere can enhance the village and support local services and infrastructure. The Greater Cambridge Local Plan should ensure proportional housing allocation for rural settlements to promote sustainable growth. This proposal reduces the size of the site and the quantum of development of approximately 65 dwellings.	204734, 210412 (Croudace Homes)
Land south of High Street and west of M11, Hauxton (HELAA site 40283) Redrow objects to Policy S/RRA, plan fails to allocate sufficient land within the rural area to meet the uplifted housing needs. Policy does not provide a mechanism for including additional sustainable village edge sites such as land east of Hauxton. Overall housing requirement should be increased, greater emphasis should be placed on distributing growth to the most sustainable villages, and the Plan should release appropriate areas of Green Belt, including “grey belt” land.	204539 (Redrow South Midlands)
Bedlam Farm, Impington (HELAA site reference 115413) Site can meet the identified need for warehouse development in the emerging Local Plan across a range of potential occupiers. Concerns with the HELAA scoring on the Site, and several elements have been rescored to demonstrate the site scores better.	201982 206046 (Bidwells)

Grange Farm, Girton (HELAA site reference 115388). Site represents a good opportunity for a range of employment uses, including the identified need for warehousing development, across the plan period. In particular, as a result of its location close to the strategic road network and Cambridge fringe. Concerns with the HELAA scoring on the Site.	201983, 206049 (Hardwick Farming Company)
Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington (HELAA site reference 40539) Objects to HELAA scoring on the Site. It adjoins the settlement boundary and represents a highly sustainable location, with local services within 500m and excellent access to major employment hubs south of Cambridge via public transport and active travel routes. The Site is not constrained by Green Belt, flood risk, heritage or ecological designations and is suitable, available and achievable within five years. A landscape-led design can enhance the site's integration with the existing village. The site should be reconsidered for allocation in the Local Plan to support growth and maintain the vitality of Great Abington.	204149 (The Trustees of the C Y Nutt Deceased Will Trust)
Land north and south of A428 - Kingsfields (HELAA site reference 51668). Site is capable of delivering circa 3,000 homes and approximately 83 hectares of employment land and would form a logical and well-connected expansion of Cambourne, consistent with the emerging spatial strategy and opportunities for enhanced connectivity. The northern parcel of Kingsfields presents an employment opportunity with a small mixed-use area south of the proposed EWR line and renewable energy to the north. The Southern parcel presents a residential led scheme with a primary and secondary school.	208275, 208276, 208278 (The Church Commissioners for England)
Land east of Balsham Road in Fulbourn (Site Reference 40271)	203899 (Hill Residential)

Identify as an additional allocation 40 dwellings, including affordable housing. The eastern part of the site to be used for an extension to the existing recreation ground or allotments. Upward adjustments are required to the housing target, the development strategy should direct development to the more sustainable villages, and there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt. Would help to maintain a sufficient housing land supply in Greater Cambridge until the larger strategic sites start to deliver	
Land South of Lower Cambourne (HELAA Site ID (40447) Site ID 115601) The plan requires amendments to ensure that the level of growth and housing allocations reflect the Vision for Greater Cambridge as set out in the DLP. Expansion to the south of Cambourne should be planned for, either as a stand-alone extension to the settlement, or in combination with development in another direction. Presents a viable option for immediate development, requiring less infrastructure and allowing for short to medium-term growth.	204096 (Richborough)
Land at Six Mile Bottom (HELAA Site Reference 40078).) The Local Plan's evidence base should focus more on the eastern subregion, particularly the growth corridors along the A14/A11/M11, including the Cambridge to Norwich Tech Corridor and London-Cambridge Innovation Corridor. The potential dualling of the Newmarket line and the Cambridge East Transport Strategy are crucial for improving access and promoting sustainable travel in the region. Locations like Six Mile Bottom have significant potential to meet long-term economic and housing needs, addressing the growth and economic opportunity imbalance in the subregion.	204627 (Urban and Civic and Hill Residential)
Land off Bannold Road, Waterbeach (HEELA Site Reference: 115482)	204238 (Bellway Strategic Land)

The proposed site (HEELA Site ID: 115482) offers an opportunity for early delivery of housing and infrastructure, benefiting from proximity to existing and planned services. The allocation of the site would support the expansion of Waterbeach, providing much-needed housing and contributing to biodiversity net gain. Site is grey belt.	
Land East of Bridge Road, Impington (HELAA Site reference 200829) Benefits from strong public-transport and cycling links which will help reduce in-commuting and aligns with the Development Strategy's connectivity objectives. All other planning matters, including landscape / visual effects, can be satisfactorily addressed. Sustainable Grey Belt village sites need to be allocated as part of a blended development strategy to ensure that dwellings are delivered throughout the Plan period to meet all needs.	207906 (Barratt Redrow)
Site located to the east of Shepreth adjacent to the A10 Provides a significant opportunity for employment development. The Site is approximately 24ha and is currently in agricultural use. Unlike many sites in and around Cambridge the Site here is located outside of the Green Belt. Site is in a strategic and well connected location which is particularly suited for providing employment opportunities. The intention is to develop the Site for mid tech uses. The Site is to include a mix of offices, manufacturing and tech facilities to create an all-encompassing holistic location for new and existing businesses to grow.	208173 (Orchestra Land)
Land to the south-east of Cambridge Road, Foxton (HELAA Reference 40408) Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton (HELAA Reference 40412)	211093 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Concerns about the deliverability of the strategy for growth, and the location of new developments, primarily focused on the north and west of Cambridge, which may not align with employment growth along the A10 corridor. Need for a higher growth scenario in the emerging Local Plan. Call for more ambitious targets to meet government's growth objectives through additional site allocations such as our client's sites at Foxton.	
The following sites should be considered for allocation for development in the Local Plan: • Histon and Impington - NIAB Park Farm, Villa Road, Histon (HELAA 208851) • Girton - Land East of Redgate Road (HELAA 40241) • Histon and Impington - Land West of South Road (HELAA 40232) • Histon and Impington - Land North-East of Villa Road (HELAA 40236) • Histon and Impington - Barn 3, Park Farm (HELAA 200772)	211096 (NIAB Trust)
Land at Broad Lane, Cottenham (site reference 115451.) Committed developments at Cottenham, located off Rampton Road will contribute towards establishing a developed context for the promoted site that will assist in containing the landscape impact of any future development delivered on the promoted site. These committed developments also assist in establishing a direction of growth for future development at Cottenham, establishing a precedent for the further expansion of the settlement to the north. Comments address issues raised in HELAA.	211430 (Woolsington One Ltd)
Land East of Bush Close, Comberton ((HELAA reference 40501) A strategy that includes a particular focus, and reliance, on strategic sites in Greater Cambridge is logical and supported in principle. The current buffer of 6.5% is insufficient and fails to recognise the	211438 (Hopkins Homes)

delivery challenges which have historically held back early delivery on the large-scale strategic sites and should be certainly over 10%, circa 15-20%. As part of a robust sustainable housing supply to meet the needs of all, it is clear that medium sized sites, including sustainable Grey Belt sites, are needed as part of a blended development strategy to ensure that dwellings are delivered throughout the Plan period to meet all needs.	
Land to the South of Station Road, Harston (HELAA reference 115742) Object to Policy S/RRA due to insufficient housing and employment allocations in rural areas, which threatens village vitality and local services. The principle of sustainable development in rural areas is outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which promotes housing that enhances rural community vitality. The Draft Local Plan's limited rural allocations could lead to an imbalance in housing supply, increasing reliance on strategic sites and undermining village growth. The approach of directing some growth to the villages should also take account of existing and proposed public transport improvements.	203428 (Jesus College)
Land East of Ridgeway and Old Pinewood Way, Papworth Everard (Site Ref. 40439) Land should be allocated.	211617 (Bloor Homes Eastern)
Land at Croxton Garden Village Croxton (HELAA Reference 40288) A new Garden Village in this location would have a highly functional relationship with Cambourne and would look to this expanded settlement to provide a wider range of goods and services. Importantly, the proximity of Croxton Garden Village to Cambourne would also allow for viable transport connections by active modes.	211625 (Vistry group)

Fulbourn area EWR Co is also exploring the opportunity for a light maintenance depot (LMD) to be located alongside the Newmarket Line in the Fulbourn area. EWR Co is aware of the promotion of a potential new housing development to the north of the Newmarket Line in the Fulbourn area and notes the potential for it to be served by a new station. These proposals do not currently form part of the draft Local Plan. EWR Co notes that, in principle it has no objections to exploring the opportunity for a new station to serve a potential development in this location.	211888 (East West Rail Company)
Land off Home End in Fulbourn (Site Ref. 40523) Remove from the Green Belt and identify as an additional allocation.	201951(KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)
Land at Court Meadows House off Fulbourn Road in Fulbourn (Site Ref. 40522) Identify as an additional allocation.	201954 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)
Land between A428 and St Neots Road, Hardwick (HELAA Reference 40550; Site ID: 115093). The respondent does not object to the wording of policy S/RRA specifically but raises concerns about the omission of their site on St Neots Road HELAA has incorrectly scored the site on various matters, including landscape and biodiversity, and believes it should be scored more favourably. The respondent argues that the site, previously promoted for E(g) employment uses, is also suitable for B2 and B8 uses to meet the identified need for warehouse space.	201590 (Paragon Land & Estates Limited)
Land off Ditton Lane in Fen Ditton Identify as an additional allocation in the Rest of Rural Area.	202091 (J Francis)

land east of Glebe Way Histon Identify as an additional allocation in the Rest of the Rural Area	202195 (Cambridgeshire County Council (Strategic Assets))
Land off Glebe Road in Waterbeach (Site Ref. 40372) Identify as an additional allocation in the Rest of the Rural Area.	202578 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance)
land south of Fulbourn Old Drift, Fulbourn (Site Ref. 40355) identify as an additional allocation for employment uses in the Rest of the Rural Area.	202579 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance)
Land south of Cambridge Road and north of Shelford Road in Fulbourn (Site Ref. 40354) Identify as an additional allocation in the Rest of the Rural Area.	202580(Ely Diocesan Board of Finance)
Land off High Street in Landbeach (Site Ref. 40361) Identify as an additional allocation in the Rest of the Rural Area.	202581 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance)
Oakington Road, Cottenham (HELAA site 115443) Development of the Site would provide significant social, economic, and environmental benefits, including affordable housing, enhanced biodiversity, and support for local facilities and businesses. The Site is positioned as a sustainable extension to Cottenham, integrating with existing residential developments and contributing to the area's housing needs. Site should be identified as Grey Belt.	203134 (Christ's College, Cambridge)
Land off Station Road in Willingham (Site Ref. 40527) Identify as an additional allocation in the Rest of the Rural Area.	203320 (J Manning)
Land off Butt Lane in Milton (HELAA Reference 40365) Identify as an additional employment-led allocation in the Rest of the Rural Area.	203392 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance)

Land at Ermine Street, Caxton (Site ID 115596) It is considered that the sustainability of Caxton (due to its proximity to Cambourne where there are a range of services/facilities) warrants the consideration of site allocations at the settlement. Represents a suitable location for sustainable rural housing growth. Part of the site benefits from outline planning consent for up to 9x self/custom-build dwellings, and so the principle of development on the site has already been established.	204339 (LVA (Mr Matthew McShane, Associate Partner))
Land east of Boxworth End in Swavesey (Site Ref. 40042) Identify as an additional allocation in the Rest of the Rural Area.	204580 (Axis Land Partnerships and Executors of Norman Winfrid Moore)
Land at Crow's Nest Farm (HELAA Site Ref: 48096 and HELAA Site Ref: 208867) Land at Crow's Nest Farm continues to represent a viable and deliverable opportunity to support wider growth, benefiting from its strategic location near Cambourne and its strong connectivity with the proposed EWR Oxford–Cambridge link.	205464 (Mac Mic Land)
Land west of London Road, Fowlmere (HELAA reference: 40116). The site's location within Fowlmere provides a location with access to key amenities such as a Primary School and Bus Services, whilst nearby towns and villages such as Shepreth, Melbourn and Royston provide a full range of required jobs, services, leisure and cultural facilities.	211037 (Wates Developments)
Land to the East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA: 47757) Melbourn has access to a good range of facilities and services, including public transport as noted below and reflected in its identification as a Minor Rural Centre, able to accommodate additional housing growth	211050 (Wates Developments)

Policy S/SHF: Land north of the A1307, Bar Hill (Slate Hall Farm)

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Concerns were raised around increased traffic and congestion, creating safer cycling routes including a cycle path along Dry Drayton Road into Oakington.

Comments were made to suggest this location is most suitable for a distribution centre.

Comments were made by Huntingdonshire District Council and West Suffolk Council to work together to meet the demand for logistics and delivery.

Concerns were raised about flood risk, impact on landscape with the site being in open countryside, foul water, and that S106 contributions are used for attenuation ponds, water storage and other water infrastructure.

Comments were made to use is restricted to sub-regional logistics and does not become a national facility.

Concerns were raised around clarity around the Mobility Hub and its design, location and transport links.

Further comments were raised by the Environment Agency to support point 19 of the policy, and suggested requirements for FRA modelling to include Oakington Brook and set out that no development should be located within 8m of Oakington Brook apart from permitted access.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The issue of cross boundary management of logistics and delivery will be picked up in the Statement of Common Ground.
- Evidence regarding the transport impacts and required mitigations for the A14 allocations proposed within the plan is being prepared to inform the Proposed Submission Plan, including drawing on transport modelling and, where relevant, on site promoter material. The transport measures required to enable delivery of each site are set out in the relevant allocation policies and within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Highways Authority at Cambridgeshire County Council have commissioned additional evidence to understand the implications of logistics on traffic congestion and the road network in the A14 corridor.
- In response to concerns about traffic and congestion, and to respond to National Highways comments, a requirement for a Monitor and Manage Approach and a suitable mitigation package to be agreed by National Highways and Highways Authority.
- The policy wording set out requirements for active travel and a mobility hub to support connections to local villages, the policy has been amended to include Oakington.
- Part of the site lies with Flood Zone 3, and this area is proposed to be retained to manage flood risk and utilise for green infrastructure. The site will be subject to a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment to mitigate against any potential flood risk issues.
- The management of water and foul water is set out in the wider Integrated Water Management Strategy for Greater Cambridge. Specific requirements for the site will be set out in development management Policy CC/IW: Integrated water management, sustainable drainage and water quality
- A HIA has been prepared to ensure that mitigations are suggested for the most design of the development in this location. A landscape buffer has been added to the Spatial Framework to mitigate impacts on landscape. In addition, wording around management of heights by scaling down to the edges and not creating a block effect, and the use of screening has been added to the policy wording.
- In response to Historic England the wording suggestions have been amended in the policy in line with comments. The HIA has been revised to take into account the potential impact on the historic environment of the Listed Building and has confirmed that Slate Hall Farm is a potential non-designated heritage asset and should be retained. This has been reflected in the policy wording.

- The Councils have a separate and agreed process for the consideration of Non-Designed Heritage Assets. Should this particular NDHA be nominated for consideration, the councils would then consider the historic merits of the property in line with this agreed process.
- A Mobility Hub is now defined in the glossary and the requirements for its delivery is set out in policy I/TH Travel Hub Facilities which has been renamed to mobility hub to align with the wider national approach.
- Suggested amends have been included to address comments from the Environment Agency.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Concerns raised about cycle routes to Dry Drayton and Oakington for people commuting.	201214 (G Tregonning)
This prominent site in the countryside is being released to meet the shortfall in Greater Cambridge for industrial and warehousing. The policy needs to ensure that it's use is restricted to sub-regional logistics and does not become a national facility.	201451 (C Barnard), 203115 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
Whilst this is development of a Greenfield site it is well placed for the A14 and for local employment. Low-carbon employee commuting could be easily facilitated from Bar Hill and Northstowe. If a distribution centre is required in the area, then this is the most sensible option.	201451 (C Barnard)
Concerns raised about traffic impacts the local road network.	201787 (J Bennison), 202549 (L Miller), 203096 (Swavesey PC)
Huntingdonshire District Council seeks to work with GCSP on masterplanning to ensure the sites offer complementary opportunities rather than create competition.	201658 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Concerns raised over surface water flood risk and runoff risks, water supply and waste water.	203096 (Swavesey PC), 203300 (A Dennis),
S106 funds should be spent on local attenuation projects.	203300 (A Dennis), 203299 (A Dennis)
Encourage bicycle last mile delivery services onsite.	203873 (J Prince)
Object to policy S/SHF due to its heavy reliance on a single strategic site for delivering 220,000 sqm of B2 and B8 commercial floorspace. The capacity of the site should be higher.	204224 (Bidwells on behalf of Tritax Big Box Developments)
Concerns are raised about Slate Hall Farm's access routes and the developer's lack of experience in delivering large-scale logistics developments, and Green Belt assessment completed by the Council.	204224 (Bidwells on behalf of Tritax Big Box Developments)
GCSP should work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to meet logistics need.	204772 (West Suffolk Council)
Support for the site allocation.	205014 (Lichfields on behalf of Lolworth Developments Ltd)
Policy S/SHF should reflect the 240,000 sq.m of B2/B8 provision identified in policy S/DS and identify that the site’s capacity is to be refined through a landscape-led masterplanning process. Figure errors should be fixed.	205014 (Lichfields on behalf of Lolworth Developments Ltd)

Concerns raised that limitation to small-medium scale units is unnecessary and overly prescriptive.	205014 (Lichfields on behalf of Lolworth Developments Ltd)
Additional information submitted relevant to the HELAA for the site.	211090 (Lichfields on behalf of Lolworth Developments Ltd)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the grade II milestone is located nearby. The grade II * All Saints Church at Lolworth and the Grange (grade II) lie to the west of the site on slightly elevated ground. Whitehall Farmhouse lies to the north eats of the site at the edge of Oakington. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. However, the HIA does not consider Lolworth Church, the Grange and Whitehall Farmhouse. Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding this. The policy should also refer to these other heritage assets. The Plan should be clear as to whether Slate Hall Farm is a NDHA or not. We welcome the emphasis on landscape context. Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding the potential impact on the historic environment of this employment allocation. The HIA should be reviewed prior to Regulation 19 to consider these other assets. This should also include further evidence in relation to heights and mass informed by some visualisations. We need to be able to establish whether there is likely to be an impact on these assets and, if so, what mitigation may be needed.	210154 (Historic England)

This policy allows for an extensive development. Oakington and Westwick is a semi-rural community which has recently seen extensive development from the neighbouring town of Northstowe. The building and commercial operation of yet another, extensive business area will further damage the community and bring few, if any, benefits, but will create significantly more traffic and erode the wildlife and countryside area.	208082 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
We welcome Refs: Heading Vision statements 3 and 5, and Heading Built Form, statement 10; however, the land on which the development is to be built is flat and, as noted earlier, the development will contain extensive B8 storage and distribution buildings B8 storage units can be more than 15 metres high. Clearer guidance is needed within the Local Plan on maximum heights of buildings. In particular, the development should not be visible from Oakington	208083 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
Heading Context statement 11 and Heading Resources statement 19, we welcome the statements regarding the water management from the site but call for a much stronger statement than simply “opportunities for betterment” of water management for Oakington Brook. The Plan should include a requirement that the water management of the site should significantly reduce the risk of flooding in Oakington and Westwick.	208084 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
We support the policy statements regarding Traffic Management, Active Travel and Public Transport. However, as in our comments on Flood Mitigation and Building Heights above, we are of the opinion that the policy statements 2 and 15 a, b tend to be aspirational rather than specific and compulsory.	208085 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
Dry Drayton Road (marked in yellow on Figure 107 below) running from Oakington and providing access to both the site and 1307, is an unclassified road which is already suffering from overuse by vehicles cutting through to the A14/Northstowe from central Cambridge. It will also become an access	208086 (Oakington & Westwick PC)

road to Northstowe and is already to be the subject of various traffic management procedures related to this. What is required is a complete upgrading, restructuring and widening of Dry Drayton Road to include dedicated, safe cycle and pedestrian paths, as well as speed reduction measures. A related ban on heavy lorry travel through Oakington and Westwick also needs to be introduced.	
Policy Statement 15a also refers to a “Mobility Hub”. There is no definition of the term in the document, nor details provided, nor an indication of its location. Currently no buses serve the proposed site and no proposals are made in the draft Local Plan. Dry Drayton Rd in its current state would not support a regular bus service. Therefore, we suggest greater clarity over the design, location and transport links to any Mobility Hub should be included in the document and further, we refer to our earlier point that Dry Drayton Rd must be significantly improved with the inclusion of cycle and pedestrian paths.	210843 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
The proposed allocation is situated adjacent to the A14, providing good access to the SRN. The proposed development capacity for approximately 220,000 sqm and is anticipated to support a range of logistics and industrial uses. Similar approach as to other proposals, suggests that the site could operate with a trip budget. This approach, although in principle is acceptable to National Highways, needs to be subject to a full operational junction assessment of the A14/ A1307 junction to ensure that the trip budget can be accommodated without severely impacting the SRN. This area is known to experience congestion during peak times. The proposed development may need to provide suitable mitigation package, potentially requiring physical mitigation works to the junction to accommodate the planned growth. In addition, the Monitor and Manage approach, along with any mitigation package needs to be approved and agreed with the relevant highway authorities.	209010 (National Highways)

Drainage: The applicant for one of these sites attended a meeting of our planning committee, and it became clear that the official government “Flood map for planning” does not account for the flood protection measures provided for Longstanton during the Northstowe development (aka the Hatton Road ponds). It is essential and mandatory for any developments upstream of this to be designed and considered only against accurate and up-to-date hydrological information.	210842 (Northstowe TC)
Support for policy point 19 and include requirement that the FRA must including modelling of Oakington Brook. No development should be located within 8m of Oakington Brook apart from permitted access.	211179 (Environment Agency)
Part 3 of the Draft Plan sets out the proposed site allocations, and vision for the ‘rest of the rural area’. Section 3.5.1 of the Draft Plan establishes that the Councils are seeking to support the vitality of the rural settlements in the region, however that there is an aspiration to ensure that ‘lots of new homes’ are not delivered in locations where car travel is the easiest or only way to travel such that development within the rural area is proposed to be concentrated in and around the villages that benefit from good transport links and other services.	211279 (Woolsington One Ltd)

Policy S/RRA: Other site allocations in the rest of the rural area

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

One comment supported the allocation in the draft local pan - Land west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (Policy S/RRA/CR).

The majority of comments to this introduction section objected to the non-inclusion of development proposals in a variety of villages. Reasons sites included the relative sustainability of the locations, the opportunities to support services and facilities, the need for the plan to allocate more smaller sites, over reliance on large strategic sites to deliver the numbers required, and the plan simply not allocating enough homes to respond to local needs or national proprieties. A number of comments where sites are in the green belt considered their site was grey belt, and the plan should have identified grey belt opportunities. Many proposals challenged the findings of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and proposed changes to the scoring.

Comments raised concerns regarding the Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth site north of the A14 services, siting concerns including the size of buildings, traffic and access.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Proposals for alternative sites have been considered though an update to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment where they fit within the broad emerging strategy of the local plan. New evidence submitted has been considered, and where

considered appropriate scoring has been amended. Comments related to strategy choices have also been considered, particularly under the development strategy policies. The deliverability of the plan has been tested through evidence including the Housing Delivery Study. The strategy focusing on other broad locations is considered to be sound. It is not proposed to add additional village sites to the proposed submission local plan. An update to the Green Belt Study has been carried out to consider which areas would meet he governments definition of being grey belt. Whilst some site may meet the definition, exceptional circumstances is still required for green belt release, and the Councils do not consider that exists in light of alternatives available.

Having identified a need for logistics space, the draft plan identified sites at the A14 Services and Slate Hall Farm to respond to that need. There are two other proposals in this area that were not selected. Further evidence has explored transport and heritage impacts and other issues. Having explored issues further, including considering comments made in representations, the two sites selected in the draft plan continue to be the preferred allocations. It should be noted however that promoters of all four sites have indicated an intention to submit planning applications ahead of submission of the local plan.

Table of representations

Comments supporting a draft plan allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (Policy S/RRA/CR)	204645 (Vistry at Bidwells)

Vistry supports Draft Policy S/RRA (Site allocations in the rest of the rural area) in as far as it includes the allocation of Land west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (Policy S/RRA/CR) as a well-located, sustainable and deliverable site	

Comment proposing additional or alternative allocations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Land south west of Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site ID 40232) Support HELAA conclusions of the site which rates overall suitability of the site as Red. No need for Green Belt release. Site proposal is deeply flawed.	201015 (M Colville)
Valley Farm, Meldreth Additional allocations in rural areas are required to make the plan sound. The site at is sustainable, located close to public transport links, active travel routes and a range of services. It is immediately available and deliverable, without the need for major infrastructure, in early stages of the plan period. It would therefore contribute to the objectives of the Local Plan. 2.7.3 The site could provide 198-266 dwellings. Landscape and heritage impacts can be mitigated. Safe highway access can be provided. 2.7.4 The site meets the requirements of the new draft NPPF for development close to railway	206220 (Lanpro Services at Granta Land ltd)
Land South of Horseheath Road Linton (HELAA Reference 40554) Housing allocations in rural areas are insufficient to meet local needs, particularly in villages. The respondent strongly objects to Draft Policy S/RRA for omitting several proposed site allocations in	205114 (Endurance Estates)

Linton, Balsham, Bassingbourn, and Orwell. Linton is highlighted as a sustainable settlement with adequate services and infrastructure, warranting allocation.	
Land at Hillside in Orwell (HELAA Reference 40496) Housing allocations in rural areas are insufficient to meet local needs, particularly in villages. The respondent strongly objects to Draft Policy S/RRA for omitting several proposed site allocations in Linton, Balsham, Bassingbourn, and Orwell. The respondent argues for the allocation of Land at Hillside in Orwell (HELAA Reference 40496) to support the village's essential services and maintain its vitality.	206834, 206840, 206841, 206842 (Endurance Estates)
Land at Beach Road, Cottenham (Site Ref. 40251) Upward adjustments are required to the housing target, the development strategy should direct development to the more sustainable villages, and there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt.	211249 (Manor Oak Homes)
land south of Hauxton Road in Little Shelford (Site Refs. 52732 & 200769) Upward adjustments are required to the housing target, the development strategy should direct development to the more sustainable villages, and there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt. All these factors indicate that additional allocations should be made in draft GCLP to meet development needs. Detailed comments provided on HELAA scoring.	211256 (R Harvey)
The Boundary, High Street, Horningsea (Site ID 59410) The HELAA assessment contains factual and procedural inaccuracies that have prevented proper consideration of a sustainable small site. The site was incorrectly assigned a “Red” access rating based on a constrained interpretation of the submitted red-line plan. Infill villages should not be excluded.	202046 (M Asplin)
Valley Farm, Meldreth [130982]]	202335 (Granta Land)

The site at Valley Farm, Meldreth is sustainable, located close to public transport links, active travel routes and a range of services. It is immediately available and deliverable, without the need for major infrastructure, in early stages of the plan period. It would therefore contribute to the objectives of the Local Plan. The site could provide 198-266 dwellings. Landscape and heritage impacts can be mitigated. Safe highway access can be provided. The site meets the requirements of the new draft NPPF for development close to railway stations.	
Land West of Station Road, Meldreth (Site ID: 115017 Additional allocations in rural areas are required to make the plan sound. The site at) is sustainable, located close to public transport links, active travel routes and a range of services. It is immediately available and deliverable, without the need for major infrastructure, in early stages of the plan period. It would therefore contribute to the objectives of the Local Plan. The site could provide 198-266 dwellings. Landscape and heritage impacts can be mitigated. Safe highway access can be provided. The site meets the requirements of the new draft NPPF for development close to railway stations.	202544 (Granta Land)
Land at Sheene Farm, Meldreth [131267]] Additional allocations in rural areas are required to make the plan sound. The site at Sheene Farm, Meldreth is sustainable, located close to public transport links, active travel routes and a range of services. It is immediately available and deliverable, without the need for major infrastructure, in early stages of the plan period. It would therefore contribute to the objectives of the Local Plan. The site could provide 365-521 dwellings. Landscape and heritage impacts can be mitigated. Safe highway access can be provided. The site meets the requirements of the new draft NPPF for development close to railway stations.	202657 (Granta Land)

Land East of Station Road, Meldreth (Site ID: 115143) Additional allocations in rural areas are required to make the plan sound. The site at is sustainable, located close to public transport links, active travel routes and a range of services. It is immediately available and deliverable, without the need for major infrastructure, in early stages of the plan period. It would therefore contribute to the objectives of the Local Plan. The site could provide 198-266 dwellings. Landscape and heritage impacts can be mitigated. Safe highway access can be provided. The site meets the requirements of the new draft NPPF for development close to railway stations.	202671 (Granta Land)
land at Silverdale Close, Coton (HELAA Reference 40079). Comments are made in the attached comprehensive document setting out the planning benefits for the development of 80 dwellings on The site boundary has been amended following comments within the HELAA and should be reassessed accordingly. The site meets the criteria for grey belt as set out in national policy, and the Errata Sheet confirms Green Belt release of parcel CT12 would have a 'negligible impact' on Green Belt land. The site should be considered again for allocation, particularly given the clear benefits set out in the attached.	202772 (Martin Grant Land Limited)
Whilst we do not object to the principle of allocating large new housing developments, we object strongly to the failure to balance this approach with a more diverse approach to housing delivery across Greater Cambridge in the emerging local plan. Allocating sites for housing developments in sustainable location such as Willingham would: • Deliver homes more quickly and in the first half of the plan period; • Provide certainty to smaller housebuilders; • Support the vitality of the rural area; • Delivery affordable housing in areas with pressing need; and • Offer greater flexibility for house buyers. The draft plan is currently placing a lot of risk for housing delivery in a limited number of very large pots, and in particular	202793 (Peter Norman)

the proposed large new allocations at Cambourne North and Grange Farm require the delivery of infrastructure at scale which is likely to delay their delivery. These delays have been experienced across many of the large strategic sites in Greater Cambridge in recent decades. Instead, we suggest a more blended approach, with a more rational approach to sustainable rural development is considered.	
Land West of Malton Road, Orwell (HELAA Reference 40324) Additional information for the site we are promoting.	203383 (Cemex UK Properties)
Land to the south of Rectory Farm, Harston (HEELA 2025 site ID: 115184) Jesus College object to Policy S/RRA due to insufficient housing and employment allocations in rural areas, which threatens village vitality and local services. The principle of sustainable development in rural areas is outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which promotes housing that enhances rural community vitality. The Draft Local Plan's limited rural allocations could lead to an imbalance in housing supply, increasing reliance on strategic sites and undermining village growth. The approach of directing some growth to the villages should also take account of existing and proposed public transport improvements. With reference to Harston, whilst it is a relatively small village, it benefits from being within the A10 corridor, plus close proximity to further facilities and services available in nearby villages.	203399 (Jesus College)
The rural area policies lack sufficient housing and care home allocations, with only 20 homes at Melbourn, 65 at Caldecote, 200 at Fulbourn, and 120 at Melbourn, totalling less than 1% of the overall housing need in Greater Cambridgeshire as per Policy S/JH. The current allocations are contrary to NPPF paragraph 83, potentially leaving settlements like Girton and Over without meaningful housing	203402 (Abbey Properties)

supply during the plan period. There is a discrepancy with Appendix D of the Plan, which identifies a housing requirement of 90 new homes for Girton's neighbourhood plan, yet no new housing is included in the Local Plan.	
Land to the South of Station Road, Harston (ref: 115742) Jesus College object to Policy S/RRA due to insufficient housing and employment allocations in rural areas, which threatens village vitality and local services. The principle of sustainable development in rural areas is outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which promotes housing that enhances rural community vitality. The Draft Local Plan's limited rural allocations could lead to an imbalance in housing supply, increasing reliance on strategic sites and undermining village growth. The approach of directing some growth to the villages should also take account of existing and proposed public transport improvements. With reference to Harston, whilst it is a relatively small village, it benefits from being within the A10 corridor, plus close proximity to further facilities and services available in nearby villages.	203428 (Jesus College)
Guilden Morden – HELAA Refs. 40300 (Land south of Church Street, east of High Street) and 40304 (Land off Swan Lane), which have been submitted for consideration as a consolidated proposal. Guilden Morden – HELAA Ref. 40315 (Land at Town Farm) Steeple Morden – HELAA Ref. 40294 (Land to the west of Brook End) Arrington – HELAA Ref. 40292 (Land to the southwest of Ermine Way) Kneesworth – HELAA Ref. 40299 (Land to the east of Old North Road) EW Pepper objects to Policy S/RRA. The following sites should be allocated for housing development, in the following settlements.	204091 (E W Pepper)

Land at Girton Road, Girton (site ID 115170) Not all locations in the Rural Area are equal as is implied by the policy, for example the proximity of Land at Girton Road, Girton to Cambridge and local amenities is strong evidence that sustainable transport options can be viable from rural areas. The residential allocation of Land at Girton Road is well connected to the city centre and aligns with the plan's ambition to support knowledge-intensive sectors by providing homes for employees within sustainable commuting distance. Development at Land at Girton Road would utilise land no longer in agricultural use and provide access to local shops, schools, and high-quality sustainable transport links.	204504 (Wain Estates)
Land south of West Street and west of South Street Comberton (Site ID 115659, HELAA Ref. 40152) The respondent objects to Draft Policy S/RRA due to insufficient site allocations in the Rest of the Rural Area. The respondent identifies as a suitable site to address housing needs in Greater Cambridge. The site is considered Grey Belt land according to the NPPF (2024) and should be reviewed for release from the Green Belt. The respondent recommends that the site be identified as Grey Belt in the forthcoming review, removed from Policy S/GB and Policy I/SI designations, and allocated for housing development.	204609 (Bellway Strategic Land)
Land west of South Street, Comberton (Site ID 115134, HELAA Ref. 40310) The respondent objects to Draft Policy S/RRA due to insufficient site allocations in the Rest of the Rural Area. The respondent identifies as a suitable site to address housing needs in Greater Cambridge. This Site should be allocated for housing development. Representation responds to the HELAA Addendum (2025) and discusses the site's merits in light of national policy changes since 2021, particularly the NPPF. The site is deemed suitable, available, and achievable for residential development, and is grey belt.	204626 (Bellway Strategic Land)

Land west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (Policy S/RRA/CR) Vistry supports Draft Policy S/RRA (Site allocations in the rest of the rural area) in as far as it includes the allocation of Land west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (Policy S/RRA/CR) as a well-located, sustainable and deliverable site.	204645 (Vistry)
Land south of High Street and west of M11, Hauxton, (HELAA reference 40283) Redrow objects to Policy S/RRA on the basis that the draft Local Plan fails to allocate sufficient land within the rural area to meet the uplifted housing needs identified elsewhere in these representations, and that the policy does not provide a mechanism for including additional sustainable village edge sites. Overall housing requirement should be increased, greater emphasis should be placed on distributing growth to the most sustainable villages, and the Plan should release appropriate areas of Green Belt, including “grey belt” land.	204767 (Redrow South Midlands)
'Land South of St Neots Road and West of Howells Way, Hardwick The respondent objects to Draft Policy S/RRA, stating that the housing allocations are insufficient to meet local needs in villages and omits ' for residential development. Proposed allocations are overly focused on strategic sites, which risks under delivery due to infrastructure constraints, and calls for a better balance between large and smaller-scale developments. The respondent highlights the importance of including rural locations in the development strategy to support the vitality of village settlements, referencing Paragraph 83 of the NPPF. The respondent promotes the site at Hardwick as a suitable extension for residential development, citing its logical location, existing services, and potential for transport enhancements.	204907 (Pigeon)
Land West of Beach Road, Cottenham (HELAA Reference 48095)	208775 (Croudace Homes)

Additional allocations in rural areas are required to make the plan sound. The site at is sustainable, located close to public transport links, active travel routes and a range of services. It is immediately available and deliverable, without the need for major infrastructure, in early stages of the plan period. It would therefore contribute to the objectives of the Local Plan. Landscape and heritage impacts can be mitigated. Safe highway access can be provided.	
Land at Station Fields, Foxton (Site ID: 115171 and HELAA Ref: 40084) Additional allocations in rural areas are required to make the plan sound. The site at is sustainable, located close to public transport links, active travel routes and a range of services. This site could support growth of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and new local infrastructure such as a level-crossing bypass, A10 bridge and multimodal travel hub. It would therefore contribute to the objectives of the Local Plan. The site meets the requirements of the new draft NPPF for development close to railway stations.	208782 (Axis Land Partnerships Ltd)
Land off Brook Road, Bassingbourn (Site Ref. 40342) It is requested that is identified as an additional allocation as for the Rest of Rural Area (Policy S/RRA).	210668 (Gladman Developments)
Land off Whitecroft Road, Meldreth (Site Ref. 40338) It is requested that is identified as an additional allocation as for the Rest of Rural Area (Policy S/RRA).	210670 (Gladman Developments)
Land off Station Road, Over (Site Ref. 40551) It is requested that is identified as an additional allocation as for the Rest of Rural Area (Policy S/RRA).	210671 (Gladman Developments)
Land south of Willingham Road, Willingham (Site Ref. 40340) It is requested that is identified as an additional allocation as for the Rest of Rural Area (Policy S/RRA).	210672 (Gladman Developments)

Land South East of Hattons Road, Longstanton (HEELA Site ID 200801) These representations are accompanied by the submission of for consideration as an allocation in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.	211088 (Hallam Land Management)
Land to the west of Water Lane, Melbourn, Cambridgeshire (HELAA Reference 40274) These representations are accompanied by the submission for consideration as an allocation within the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Alongside the two already proposed allocation sites, the Site could provide additional housing to support sustainable growth of the settlement, which contributes towards the Councils' overall housing needs as well as providing an opportunity for the village to grow and thrive by supporting local services.	211089 (CALA Group Ltd)
These representations are accompanied by the following site submissions to be considered for allocation as part of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan: - Land to the south-east of Cambridge Road, Foxton (HELAA Reference 40408) - Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton (HELAA Reference 40412)	211093 (R2 Developments)
The following sites should be considered for allocation for residential development in the Local Plan: Swavesey – Land on the south side of Fen Drayton Road (HELAA Reference 208846). Swavesey – Land North of Home Close and West of Moat Way, Swavesey (HELAA Reference 40415). Swavesey – Land North of Home Close and west of Moat Way (smaller site) (HELAA Ref 208849).	211094 (Ceres Property)
The following sites should be considered for allocation for development in the Local Plan: • Histon and Impington - NIAB Park Farm, Villa Road, Histon (HELAA 208851) • Girton - Land East of Redgate Road (HELAA 40241) • Histon and Impington - Land West of South Road (HELAA 40232)	210096 (NIAB Trust)

• Histon and Impington - Land North-East of Villa Road (HELAA 40236) • Histon and Impington - Barn 3, Park Farm (HELAA 200772)	
Land at Beach Road, Cottenham (Site Ref. 40251). Upward adjustments are required to the housing target, the development strategy should direct development to the more sustainable villages, and there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt. All these factors indicate that additional allocations should be made in the draft GCLP to meet development needs. Cottenham contains a good range of services and facilities, and employment opportunities. Key village facilities include a doctor's surgery, pharmacy, primary school, village college, church, shops, village hall, library, and a community sports centre, and access to the Guided Busway for wider transport.	211249 (Manor Oak Homes)
Rectory Farm, to the North-West of Milton (HELAA Reference 54906 / Site ID 115167) These representations have been accompanied by details to support for consideration as an allocation in the Local Plan.	211449 (Gonville & Caius College)
Land to the south west of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA Reference 40378) These representations are accompanied by the submission of for consideration as an allocation in the Local Plan. The site is an agricultural parcel of land bounded by Hurdleditch Road to the east, as well as some residential development which wrap around to the southern boundary. Beyond the western and northern boundaries is further greenfield land.	211469 (Hayfield Homes Construction)
Land to the South of Butt Lane, Milton (HELAA Reference 40365) Turnstone Real Estate Limited are promoting as part of this consultation alongside the Diocese of Ely. Turnstone Real Estate Limited object to the site not being allocated as part of the Local Plan.	211590 (Turnstone Real Estate)

Land East of Ridgeway and Old Pinewood Way, Papworth Everard (Site Ref. 40439) Bloor Homes object on the basis that has not been allocated in the Local Plan. The site's suitability as an allocation has been set out in accompanying evidence.	2116117 (Bloor Homes)
Land North of Cambridge Road, Linton (Site Ref. 51654) Bloor Homes object on the basis that has not been allocated in the Local Plan. The site's suitability as an allocation has been set out in accompanying evidence.	211621 (Bloor Homes)

Comments referring to Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth, (Newlands) (Site reference: 47353, 115237)

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Strongly object the promotion of the site to the west of Boxworth Road: • Newlands promoting site to west of Boxworth Road, opposite the Cambridge services/Jaynic site. Combined effect would be a disaster for local environment. Traffic chaos would result. Newlands proposal itself wholly inappropriate: area far too large would create distribution monopoly for the area; not aimed at supporting Cambridgeshire; proposed building heights up to 24m (= 7 storeys) wholly inappropriate and incapable of mitigation by trees etc; Swavesey south roundabout can't cope even now. Alleged "community hub" just disguised lorry driver cafe; if it were real would simply compete with local village halls. Water/sewage capacity insufficient; creates flood risk.	201492 (P Rainey)
Very concerned about the potential Newlands development at J24 A14. This is not in the Local plan for good reason but is likely to apply for planning. This project is excessive in size and proposed for	205288 (A East)

National not local need. The access off the Swavesey dumbbell is unsatisfactory for an extra 4000+vehicles /day. There is no credible indication of how 2000+employees will get to the site other than by car - there is no public transport, cycleways or people living close enough to walk! Also I'm concerned about the lack of water and the handling of foul water.	
Proposal at the Boxworth junction with the A14. Obviously Newlands intend to apply, and appeal. Development focussed on unnecessary distribution warehousing. Proposal would involve a multiple of the current HGV use of the A14 junction which does not have capacity for the current HGV use. Inevitable congestion renders the business case for occupying the site for distribution non-viable. Would also create a multiple of the small vehicle use of the local Boxworth road. Scale of buildings proposed is totally inappropriate with no mitigation such as excavation to lower the ground level. Water supply and disposal will inevitably create further issues.	205351 (W East)

Policy S/RRA/ML: The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The promoter of the site supports the policy and confirms that the site is deliverable, available and viable.

Comments have noted that the site is relatively far from the station and is likely to result in a number of car trips whilst the proposed number of homes on the site could be high density given the modest site area. There is a factual comment about the adjacent land uses and how they are described in the supporting text.

Historic England note that the Heritage Impact Assessment recommends development of no more than 2 storeys, but this is not reflected in the policy wording.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

The site is adjacent to the existing Settlement Framework and the proposed Defined Development Extent, and it is within a reasonable walking and particularly cycling distance of Meldreth railway station. It is also within a short walk of Melbourn High Street and the village college. The suitability of the site from a highways perspective has been considered by the highways authority and is considered to be acceptable.

The supporting text has been amended to reflect the allotments and other boundary features whilst the policy includes specific building heights, as evidenced by the Heritage Impact Assessment.

As set out in the Site Allocations Capacity Schedule, the net dwellings per hectare is considered appropriate reflecting the

village location of the site. However, this would need to be tested in greater detail through a planning application process.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
We fully support allocating The Moor. The landowner has expressed his continued intention to promote the land for development though this Local Plan process. We consider that the site also remains deliverable and viable, when considered against both existing and emerging policy requirements. We are pleased to confirm that Land at the Moor remains both available and deliverable and that we, and our client, would be pleased to work with the Council in the progression of this site.	208350 (Sworders)
The site has no other access to the highway network and that vehicles to and from the site would pass Melbourn Village College and Melbourn Leisure Centre. The closeness of the site to services and facilities is a relative and subjective concept but it is noted that the distance to the railway station is about 1.1 miles and the route runs through the centre of Melbourn and the four way traffic light controlled junction formed by Cambridge Road, High Street, Mortlock Street and Station Road. In terms therefore of access to public transport links it is buses rather than trains which are truly proximate and preferable for those not using cars.	209056, 209057 (Fowlmere PC)
The supporting information also states that the site “is bounded by development on three sides, with screening provided by existing vegetation”. The existing development appears to FPC only to be on two sides, namely on the south-east boundary and across the road on the south-west. On the north-west boundary there are allotments (not traditionally referred to as “development”) and whilst the	209058 (Fowlmere PC)

science park is on the north-east boundary it is open green land rather than buildings across the boundary.	
The density envisaged appears to be high, particularly for housing in a village. It ignores the beneficial effects of private outdoor space and the spaciousness which people expect and seek in villages.	209059 (Fowlmere PC)
Welcome criterion 1b. The HIA refers to building heights of 2 storeys or less. This should be included within the policy.	210155 (Historic England)

Policy S/RRA/H: Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The developer of the site supports the policy but identifies that the site could form part of a larger allocation. Historic England broadly support the policy whilst a site promoter for an alternative site states that their site should be allocated for development and the HELAA process has not been applied consistently. EWR seek to ensure if does not allocate land required for the railway.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Alternative sites have been considered through the update to the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (2026) whilst the Development Strategy Topic Paper sets out the council's position on why sites were rejected.
- Noting the broad support in the other representations, there are no proposed amendments to the allocation. The policy wording is broadly consistent with the outline planning permission for the site and does not prohibit it from being implemented.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
We are disappointed that Site 40509 remains unallocated in the emerging Local Plan, which we consider unreasonable and unjustified. A review of the HELAA shows clear discrepancies between the assessments of allocated sites and Site 40509.	204316 (Waterbeach Instruments)

Vistry Strategic Land supports the allocation of Phase 2 (Policy S/RRA/H) and Vistry has provided comments in favour of it. However, it is recommended that the policy be amended to ensure that it reflects the planning permission for the site.	204046 (Vistry Group)
Site 40011, located on the east side of Highfields Road, is proposed as an additional phase to the draft allocation S/RRA/H, contributing more homes and green infrastructure. Phase 3 is positioned near facilities in Highfields-Caldecote, promoting accessibility by foot or bicycle. Access to Phase 3 from Highfields Road can be achieved through phases 1 and 2, ensuring safe and suitable access. The site is in a sustainable location and can provide additional homes and green infrastructure as an extension to Phase 2.	204954 (Vistry Group)
We welcome the preparation of the HIA and criterion 1d.	210156 (Historic England)
EWR Co is currently developing its proposals for environmental mitigation and temporary Public Rights of Way (PRoW) in this area, which have the potential to interface with the eastern boundary of this allocation site. The land which EWR Co has currently identified as being required for EWR within the allocation site is included in the safeguarded area. EWR project, EWR Co requests that draft Policy S/RRA/H is amended in order to avoid a conflict between the proposed allocation and the EWR Safeguarding Directions.	211897 (East West Rail)

Policy S/RRA/SCS: Land to the south of the Cambridge Services A14

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive summary:

There is broad support for the site allocation from Carter Jonas on behalf of Jaynic and the University of Cambridge.

Concerns were raised in relation to the need for and suitability of this use in this location.

Concerns were raised in relation to flood risk, water and impact on landscape.

Comments were made in relation to concerns about traffic congestion including impacts on the junction to the A14, roundabout and slip roads. Comments were also made on other sites which were not allocated in the draft plan.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The need for this site for logistics and industrial uses is identified in the evidence base, the Greater Cambridge Warehouse and Industrial Space Needs 2025 and the Draft Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Needs Update 2024-2045 20205. These studies outline the need for industrial and warehouse employment uses in Greater Cambridge.
- This site was selected for being in close to key transport route by the A14. The selection of the site was assessed through the HELAA, and the SA has explored the planning merits of the reasonable alternative sites, the Councils' preferred locations for the provision of B2/B8 space are on this site and Slate Hall Farm. Mitigation will be required for air quality, environmental protection, transport and archaeology, and this has been reflected in the policy wording.
- Point 1c has been added in response to representations concerned about building heights and the impact on the rural area. This sets out that -Building heights must be sensitive to the local rural context.
- In response to National Highways, the requirements for Transport capacity assessments have been included.

- In response to Anglian Water, point 1k has been added to the policy to ensure that construction of or route of the Grafham Pipeline is able to accommodate water infrastructure.
- Evidence regarding the transport impacts and required mitigations for the A14 allocations proposed within the plan is being prepared to inform the Proposed Submission Plan, including drawing on transport modelling and, where relevant, on site promoter material. The transport measures required to enable delivery of each site are set out in the relevant allocation policies and within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Highways Authority at Cambridgeshire County Council have commissioned additional evidence to understand the implications of logistics on traffic congestion and the road network in the A14 corridor.
- The site will be subject to a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment to mitigate against any potential flood risk issues.
- The management of water and foul water is set out in the wider Integrated Water Management Strategy for Greater Cambridge. Specific requirements for the site will be set out in development management Policy CC/IW: Integrated water management, sustainable drainage and water quality.
- In response to Cambridgeshire County Council, the reference to the requirement for an odour assessment and reference to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) for further information.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Two large employment proposals (Land north of A1307, Bar Hill and Land south of Cambridge Services, A14) are located near the boundary with Huntingdonshire on which collaboration would be appreciated. The Economic and Employment Needs Assessment from Huntingdonshire identifies sector-specific needs to support local business and employment growth. Huntingdonshire District Council expresses a desire to work with GCSP on masterplanning to ensure the proposals complement local opportunities rather than create competition. The aim is to promote and diversify the local economy while supporting employment opportunities for residents with limited travel needs.	201660 (Huntingdonshire DC)

In light of the West Suffolk local plan approach, NPPF and PPG, the council asks Greater Cambridge to work collaboratively with its neighbouring authorities, including West Suffolk to seek to identify and address wider needs for large scale strategic logistics provision and data centres arising from national and regional demand and taking a strategic cross border approach. In particular as no provision for large scale B8 units or those meeting regional or national demand is made in allocations S/RRA/SCS and S/SHF and neither does policy J/NE support such proposals.	204774 (West Suffolk Council)
Proposals for new large logistics and business sites between the A14 Swavesey J24 and Bar Hill J25 junctions would impact Swavesey in the following ways. The Parish Council wishes to raise its concerns and highlight the following points: • There is a concern regarding the increase in traffic volume, including HGVs, delivery vehicles, and cars, leading to rat-running through villages alongside the A14. The integrity of the A14 flyovers is questioned, as they are reportedly sinking under current traffic flows. The respondent highlights the need for additional HGV parking to address existing issues and dangers in and around villages and the A14. Additional HGV parking is vital for any consented developments. A cumulative impact assessment of increased traffic from both consented and proposed housing and business developments in the area is required. • The size and height of proposed logistics buildings in a flat, open landscape near villages must be carefully evaluated for their environmental impact. • Concerns are raised about surface water from the site potentially increasing flood risk in Swavesey, necessitating a condition for attenuation basins. Cumulative data and management plans regarding the effects of developments on the Swavesey drainage system is requested with concerns over water release from basins after high river levels. All foul water from proposed sites will flow into Uttons Drove Treatment Works and then into the Swavesey system, adding to the surface water concerns already mentioned.	203039, 207719, 207720, 207723, 207727, 207728 (Swavesey PC)

• Major new housing at Cambourne North, Bourn and continued development of Northstowe will impact both highway and water infrastructure around the Swavesey area. • Cumulative impact needs to be a consideration of each individual development site.	
The Jaynic site on the land to the south of Cambridge services shows all traffic entering and leaving the site from Boxworth Road, a narrow, single carriageway road which is currently subject to a 7.5 ton weight restriction. Jaynic should be required to show how their site can be accessed from a combination of the A14 slip road (for HGVs) and the roundabout adjacent to the Cambridge Services.	202758 (Boxworth Parish Meeting)
Site is partly located within the Consultation Area for the Uttons Drove Water Recycling Centre. This should be identified as a constraint in the supporting text. The following supporting text is recommended for inclusion.	210601 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Specific access proposals – Slate Hall Farm/C25 via the A1307, Jaynic via Boxworth Road, Tritax/Noon Folly's new slip-road onto the B1050, and Newlands via the Swavesey south roundabout – would add substantial traffic and are inadequately addressed. Where logistics developments are included in the local plan the relevant Policy should be amended to make specific reference to acceptable access routes to the national road network. We maintain that, far from being 'detail', without site access requirements being set out in the Draft Plan Policies we are unable to assess the cumulative impact on our local communities.	206379 (Boxworth Parish Meeting on behalf of A14 Logistics), 211432 (Boxworth Parish Meeting)
All developers should be explicit about how they will manage HGV parking provision to avoid further impacts on communities along the A14 corridor at Bar Hill and Boxworth.	206380 (Boxworth Parish Meeting on behalf of A14 Logistics), 211433 (Boxworth Parish Meeting)

Lolworth supports development that is planned, allocated, and policy-compliant under the GCLP. However, the Tritax proposal represents an unallocated, disproportionate, and inappropriate form of development that conflicts with the Local Plan's spatial strategy, harms the rural character of the area, and places unacceptable pressure on infrastructure and residential amenity. While Lolworth supports GCLP-allocated growth, the Tritax development should not be permitted on the basis of the above reasons and also that it will exceed the GCLP required capacity and is therefore not needed. For clarification Lolworth also supports the separate submission made or to be made by the A14 Logistics Forum.	201654, 205856 (Lolworth Parish Meeting)
The proposed Tritax development does not form part of the GCLP's spatial strategy and has not been identified as a suitable or necessary allocation through the plan-making process. Allowing a speculative, large-scale logistics development outside of the adopted or emerging plan framework would fundamentally undermine the integrity of the Local Plan system. The Tritax proposal represents a quantum of development entirely disproportionate to Lolworth's scale and function. The Tritax proposal is driven by regional or national logistics demand rather than the needs of Lolworth or its surrounding communities. Introduces traffic volumes and HGV movements that will place undue pressure on transport network. Tritax proposal would result in: Significant landscape and visual harm. Increased noise and air pollution Light pollution inconsistent with a rural setting. Lolworth has accepted and supports development where it is properly planned, justified, and allocated. The Tritax proposal does not meet these tests.	205850, 205851, 205852, 205853, 205854, 205855 (Lolworth Parish Meeting)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are a number of assets nearby, St Peters Church Boxworth and all Saints Church, Lolworth, both listed at grade II* as well as a	210157 (Historic England)

number of other listed buildings. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. The HIA refers to the importance of managing heights in relation to heritage impacts. Employment uses have the potential for greater impact due to scale and massing. To that end the need for detailed heritage impact assessment should be included in criterion 1 c. References should also be made to nearby heritage assets in the policy. Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding the potential impact on the historic environment of this employment allocation. The HIA should be reviewed prior to Regulation 19 to consider this issue in more detail. This should also include further evidence in relation to heights and mass informed by some visualisations. We need to be able to explore further whether there is likely to be an impact on these assets and, if so, what mitigation may be needed.	
Request provision of transport evidence base, appropriate strategic transport model assessment and supporting modelling to be provided.	209011 (National Highways)
Concerns raised around traffic congestion, specifically around the roundabout and slip roads to A14.	201260 (C Howlett), 201284 (J Witherow), 201324 (M Lester), 201445 (S Pink), 201449 (C Barnard), 201497 (V Lebedeva),
There are real concerns about traffic safety at this, already busy junction. With relation to climate crisis any further employment at this site means everyone has to drive to this site which will add more traffic. IF	201751 (S Barnard)

such a site is requited in this area it makes more sense to locale at southern Barhill southern site for distribution/logistics which is more integrated with transport networks.	
In favour of the lorry park increase in capacity if lorry parking is restricted.	201260 (C Howlett)
This is an inappropriate site for development for a number of reasons: Overdevelopment of a predominantly rural site; Access to/from the A14 via the existing junctions is poor and dangerous & unsuitable for additional HGVs; Adds additional freight traffic in a rural location, placing pressure on existing roads, and adding an enormous amount of addition CO2 and local air pollution; It is not served by public transport, therefore will lead to significant additional vehicle journeys by employees; It is contrary to the Climate Change emergency and to policies to reduce carbon and to protect biodiversity; Better alternative sites exist.	201449 (C Barnard)
The site is suitable next to existing services and lorry parking. Conditions are required for height restrictions and use of roundabout for access.	201490 (P Rainey)
The site should retain treeline and plant new trees.	201490 (P Rainey)
In the event that the draft allocation is maintained, we would ask that the site area proposed is revisited to avoid this conflict, and that additional wording is added to the Policy wording to require the future developer to engage with Anglian Water from the outset to agree the design and layout in order to ensure the two developments are compatible including their construction phasing, alongside agreeing appropriate easements and access for long term maintenance. Until such time that appropriate	210196 (Anglian Water Services)

amendments are made to the draft allocation and its wording to safeguard the delivery of the downstream route corridor for the Fens Reservoir, Anglian Water object to the draft allocation. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the policy area and wording with you further	
This response recognises the drivers behind the principle of allocating land south of Cambridge Services for HGV parking and employment uses, but highlights several tensions and delivery risks. It notes the conflict between the scale and 24-hour intensity of the proposed development and objectives to preserve rural character, alongside under-specified mitigation for landscape, noise, and lighting impacts. It raises concerns about reliance on Boxworth Road for access and recommends a direct A14 slipway to reduce rural traffic impacts. It calls for a full Transport Assessment with junction modelling and an HGV routing strategy. It also seeks clearer definitions of “local needs,” tighter controls on ancillary facilities, stronger energy and drainage requirements.	201781 (A Jackson)
They need to make provision for rail/light rail freight. They haven't.	203791 (A Carpen)
I accept that delivering extra needed lorry parking at the Cambridge services. My concern is the access onto Boxworth Road should be straight off the services roundabout. Also the amount of traffic that will come through Boxworth Village. I also believe that Newlands Development are going to apply for a much larger logistic site opposite the Jaynic site which would completely alter the area of farmland looking towards Boxworth which at present is beautiful rolling countryside. Apart from causing considerable amount of traffic through Boxworth completely ruining one of the better views in Cambridgeshire with warehouses up to 24m high.	201284 (J Witherow)

Jaynic proposal South Boxworth Services. Access needs to be on slip road to services as the road into Boxworth is not suitable for an entrance by lorries. Buildings need to mirror size of Buckingway B P opposite. More info on increase in traffic through villages needed	201306 (S Hoyland)
There is no “local need” for an industrial site here. Note number of unoccupied units at existing sites along A14 corridor. Size of proposed units overbearing and developers are being misleading about actual height! Proposed access not in consultation with Highways.	201321 (R Morley)
It is not clear this development meets local needs. The roundabout level with the bridge over A14 is routinely congested; More HGVs will exacerbate this. Extra road capacity will be needed. Traffic through Boxworth is a concern now. The current weight restrictions are not enforced or policed & routinely ignored. The proposal to increase signage and calming measures is not credible given the failure of the current arrangements. The size of the buildings is not specified – the visual impact on the environment from big blocks is a major concern	201324 (M Lester)
This is an inappropriate site for development for a number of reasons: Overdevelopment of a predominantly rural site; Access to/from the A14 via the existing junctions is poor and dangerous & unsuitable for additional HGVs; Adds additional freight traffic in a rural location, placing pressure on existing roads, and adding an enormous amount of addition CO2 and local air pollution; It is not served by public transport, therefore will lead to significant additional vehicle journeys by employees; It is contrary to the Climate Change emergency and to policies to reduce carbon and to protect biodiversity; Better alternative sites exist.	201449 (C Barnard)
The respondent notes key issues against this proposal:	201497 (V Lebedeva)

Scale and height of proposed structure are inappropriate for this setting. It is scaled at national and regional needs, not local needs. Concerns around increased traffic and roads not being able to cope. This is an inappropriate setting for such a facility.	
The sole access to this site should be from the slip road off the A14, not from the Boxworth local road. Lorry parking spaces should be maximised to reduce illegal parking on local roads and the roundabout at the services. A shelter belt of trees should be planted between the site and Boxworth village, to reduce visual impact. These trees need to be professionally maintained so they become established. Buildings should be low rise and have solar panels to help meet net zero targets.	201487 (Dr E and J King)
Accept need for more logistic space that serves local needs. Scale of buildings and site needs to be in line with pre-existing buildings and planning restraints of Buckingham Way and service area. Service area is well screened and should provide model for this area.	202738 (L Turton)
The road network in South Cambridgeshire is reaching capacity, particularly roads into Cambridge, necessitating urgent attention. The planning, design and construction of the A14 bridges and junctions, including at Cambridge Services, has not worked. The lack of a full junction between the A14/M11 and A428 at Girton is a significant issue that requires resolution. Frequent traffic congestion and accidents at the Cambridge Services junction and roundabouts are concerning, particularly for school bus routes. There is a need for stricter regulations on HGV parking at roundabouts to enhance safety. The increase in lorry traffic from the new sites would be problematic, especially with the planned EWR station and North Cambourne developments. Redesigning junctions from the A14 and stopping HGV traffic going through villages is necessary to manage increased vehicle movements and improve safety.	203575 (G Pope)

The proposed site is not advisable given the current road network. The Newlands site with large warehouses is even less suitable.	
Building heights on this development should be similar to those of the Buckingway development on the opposite side of the A14, max 12/13m The additional lorry parking places are welcome but the access to this parking and the access to the site needs rethinking as traffic already backs up on the Cambridge Services roundabout. The developer has been told that access of the A14 slip road is not possible however National Highways should be engaged to review as there appears to be plenty of space to introduce an access off the slip road. Boxworth Road access in not acceptable	204071 (N Turton)
Although the development will mean additional traffic on local roads and congestion at the junction, it is by far preferable to alternative suggestions such as the Newlands proposal on the NW side of the Boxworth road. There is flexibility to build a separate access road so that vehicles can access and the site without using the Boxworth road, and the proposal includes additional HGV parking. (Currently illegal HGV parking is a cause of inconvenience and a safety hazard. The size and scale of buildings needs to be appropriate (like the development at Buckingham Way opposite) with minimal light pollution.	205246 (W East)
I am broadly supportive of this development but with a few concerns: The access needs to be away from the unsuitable local road - please consider a separate slip road off the A14. The Swavesey dumbbell roundabout on the Boxworth side is unfit for purpose already so will need major improvement. The size and scale of the buildings should be appropriate for the landscape i.e. small to medium size, and for local not national need.	205247 (A East)

There is emphasis employees cycling and walking to work. This will be easier from the Bar Hill developments. I'm in favour of additional lorry parking.	
As a resident of the village of Boxworth I obviously have some concerns with extra commercial building projects that I feel will impact on myself and the residents of the village. It should be plain to see that the area as a whole simply does not require the amount of warehouses being proposed at this time but after saying that, the building of this much smaller site than the one proposed by Newlands is much preferable not only for the aesthetics but far less traffic coming through the local villages and congestion on the A14.	205269 (P Kitson)
After visiting the public consultation held in the village hall close to us (Boxworth) it does seem that the developers have put a lot of thought and effort in to this project but two things stand out. 1. The proposed height of the warehouses (up to 24metres). 2. The considerable amount of extra traffic requiring entrance and exit to the site during building works and also once open for business.	205396 (P Kitson)
Entry and exit routes to site are critical, should not be off Boxworth Road. Swavesey South roundabout is not for purpose now. Provision of more lorry parking is welcome. Increase in traffic along rural roads needs consideration as does the policing of weight restrictions.	205639 (L Turton)
Direct lorry access off A14 into & out of the site only, preventing site movements accessing Boxworth Road. Noise & disruption to local residents (additional tree lines & sound proofing screens). Protect Boxworth Road's ancient treeline & idyllic access. Protect Boxworth roaming local habitats (muntjaks, badger & black squirrel). Boxworth Road bollard lorry restricting methods, prohibitive signage & ANPR cameras. Screening provisions, protecting sightlines to Boxworth village. Restrict building heights to	203940 (R Chamberlain)

10/12m. Comments are on a compromise basis, with an overall OBJECTION to the adjacent Newlands Development proposals.	
The Local Plan must gather data on a cumulative basis, to show the impact this proposal will have on the wider area. This is for volume of traffic on major and local roads and also for water management, both surface water and treated foul water. Development is proposed in this area for a number of large sites, all of which will send surface and foul water through the same drainage system out to the River Gt Ouse. Cumulative impact must be assessed.	202551 (L Miller)
Proposal at the Boxworth junction with the A14. Obviously Newlands intend to apply, and appeal. Development focussed on unnecessary distribution warehousing. Proposal would involve a multiple of the current HGV use of the A14 junction which does not have capacity for the current HGV use. Inevitable congestion renders the business case for occupying the site for distribution non-viable. Would also create a multiple of the small vehicle use of the local Boxworth road. Scale of buildings proposed is totally inappropriate with no mitigation such as excavation to lower the ground level. Water supply and disposal will inevitably create further issues.	205351 (W East)
The road network in South Cambridgeshire is reaching capacity, particularly roads into Cambridge, which raises concerns about traffic management. The planning and design of the A14 bridges and junctions, especially at Cambridge Services, have not been effective and require reassessment. The lack of a full junction between the A14/M11 and A428 at Girton is a significant issue that needs urgent attention. Frequent traffic congestion and accidents at the Cambridge Services junction, particularly on the roundabouts, highlight the need for improved traffic flow and safety measures. There is a concern regarding HGV parking on roundabouts, which should be addressed to enhance safety and traffic	203568 (A Pope)

management. The potential increase in lorry traffic poses a risk to local villages, particularly with the developments of the EWR station and North Cambourne. Consideration should be given to the impact on school bus routes, such as those servicing Swavesey Village College. Redesigning the junctions from the A14 is necessary to accommodate increased vehicle movements and to improve safety and reduce tailbacks.	
There are real concerns about traffic safety at this, already busy junction. With relation to climate crisis any further employment at this site means everyone has to drive to this site which will add more traffic. IF such a site is requited in this area it makes more sense to locale at southern Barhill southern site for distribution/logistics which is more integrated with transport networks.	201571 (S Barnard)
Access off Boxworth Road should be from A14 or services roundabout, Building heights should be tightly restricted to max 10m, and Development should meet local not national needs.	201784 (J Bennison)
I strongly object to the proposed development. This proposed 24.58-hectare logistics development near Boxworth presents significant risks to public safety, ancient woodland, and rural community wellbeing. The logistics scheme would concentrate HGV traffic on the A14 corridor, worsening congestion, pollution and delaying emergency-service response, posing an unacceptable public-safety risk. • The development would destroy ancient elm woodland and associated species, causing irreversible loss of irreplaceable ecological and heritage assets. Cambridgeshire is already one of the most nature-depleted counties in England; further loss of ancient habitat is unacceptable. • This area is already under pressure from solar farms, housing expansion and other industrial proposals, creating an overbearing concentration of development. The proposal threatens Boxworth's rural community by removing agricultural land, undermining generational farming livelihoods and eroding the village's heritage and wellbeing.	201886, 206006, 206007, 206008, 206009, 210498, 210499 (M Goldberg)

• Even with the proposed 25-metre landscape buffers, the development will generate significant light pollution, air pollution, noise disturbance, surface-water impacts, further congestion on the A14 and increase in emergency services and emergency response times. These harms cannot be offset by planting, drainage adjustments or visual-impact assessments. • This is a high risk logistical rest stop and will have cumulative impacts for the local community.	
The Draft Local Plan lacks a comprehensive assessment of the cumulative effects of proposed developments on traffic, road network adequacy, and flood risk, which is seen as a fundamental flaw.	203556 (D Pope)
The respondent expresses concerns about the proposed allocation under Policy SRRA.2, stating that the site's limited scale and capacity are insufficient to meet the strategic need for B2 and B8 accommodation in Greater Cambridge. The allocation is seen as prioritising specific operational needs over the delivery of modern, large-scale industrial and logistics space that aligns with market demand, raising doubts about its effectiveness.	204233 (Bidwells LLP on behalf of Tritax Big Box Developments)
Large industrial units are incompatible with existing landscape patterns of hedgerows, tree belts and open farmland, causing traffic impacts, light pollution and flooding issues.	204574 (I Chamberlain)
Support for the policy.	204661 / 204675 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Jaynic), 204818 (University of Cambridge)
Extra MSA Group fully support the proposed allocation for additional HGV parking at Cambridge Services, as set out in Policy S/RRA/SCS.	207081, 207082, 207083 207084 (Zerum on behalf of Extra MSA Group)

Policy S/RRA/BBP: Land at Buckingway Business Park, Swavesey

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

There is broad support for the inclusion of inclusion of reference to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan from Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire County Council supports the allocation of the site.

Concerns were raised about the pipeline for the Fens Reservoir as it goes adjacent to the site and Anglian Water have therefore requested continued engagement on the site.

Further responses were received from Historic England supporting the HIA and allocation and requesting amends to the requirement for a detailed HIA has been added to point 1d and the timescale for an archaeological assessment has been included in point 1f.

Concerns were raised about the allocation is not large enough to significantly address the identified need for strategic B2 and B8 accommodation as per the supporting evidence base.

Concerns were raised about the impact on traffic particularly around the A14 junction and the need for more public transport.

Concerns were raised by Swavesey Parish Council in relation to traffic and HGV parking.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The responses have been considered and the representations considered on the individual Local Plan:

- Support noted for the inclusion of reference to supporting text and allocation from Cambridgeshire County Council.
- In response to Anglian Water, the policy has been revised to include wording to refer to continued engagement and design around the pipeline for the Fens Reservoir.
- In response to Historic England, the requirement for a detailed HIA has been added to point 1d and the timescale for an archaeological assessment has been included in point 1f.
- The comments from Tritax Big Box Development are noted with regard to employment floorspace supply of B8. There is an oversupply in Greater Cambridge of employment floorspace to provide flexibility in the market.
- Evidence regarding the transport impacts and required mitigations for the A14 allocations proposed within the plan is being prepared to inform the Proposed Submission Plan, including drawing on transport modelling and, where relevant, on site promoter material. The transport measures required to enable delivery of each site are set out in the relevant allocation policies and within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
I have concerns about increase to traffic at the junction to the A14 if this goes ahead due to increased traffic. It makes more sense to site a logistics /distribution hub at the Barhill southern site where there would be better links to transport for employees. Any new employment created would mean that everyone would have to drive to this site as there isn't a good bus network here. With climate crisis council and planners need to be reducing road traffic not increasing it.	201752 (S Barnard)

This makes sense, but adequate consideration needs to be made for employee commuting as there is no public transport, so this will add congestion to local roads as well as increased carbon emissions.	201452 (C Banard)
Support for the allocation. 201451	202121 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council)
Concerns raised about impact on traffic congestion on local road networks.	203125 (Swavesey PC)
The respondent has no objection to the proposed allocation, noting it may contribute positively, though limited, to the overall supply of employment land. This site allocation is not large enough to meet identified need for B2 and B8 accommodation.	204280 (Bidwells on behalf of Tritax Big Box Developments)
The proposed allocation covers 2.11 hectares at Buckingway Business Park and has capacity for approximately 10,000 sqm of B2/B8 Industrial and Logistics development. This draft allocation is adjacent to the preferred route of the associated water infrastructure. As mentioned above, the design refinement process for the Fens Reservoir is ongoing and the alignment of the pipeline is potentially subject to change which may impact this allocation in due course. Given the proposals are still at an early stage, Anglian Water requests ongoing engagement with the Council throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, and the future developer at the appropriate time. This will ensure that both developments can be progressed and are compatible, including during construction and operation.	210197 (Anglian Water Services)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there is a grade II listed barn for the north-east of the site. There is also a cluster of listed buildings at Lolworth, including the grade II* All Saints Church. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to these heritage assets through	210158 (Historic England)

development within their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We note that the HIA has given some consideration to heritage assets at Lolworth. We welcome criterion d and the reference to Lolworth church. Employment uses have the potential for greater impact due to scale and massing. The need for a detailed heritage impact assessment should be included in criterion 1 d. We welcome criterion f though it would be further improved by clarifying when the assessment will be required. Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding the potential impact on the historic environment of this employment allocation. The HIA should be reviewed prior to Regulation 19 to consider this issue in more detail. This should also include further evidence in relation to heights and mass informed by some visualisations. We need to be able to explore further whether there is likely to be an impact on these assets and, if so, what mitigation may be needed.	
Support for inclusion of supporting text.	210602 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Policy S/RRA/SNR: Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

The site promoter supports the proposed allocation but requests that the site includes other employment uses to meet local needs, provide greater flexibility and align the allocation with the emerging National Planning Policy Framework. EWR seek minor amendments.

Historic England support the policy wording in relation to addressing any potential heritage impacts.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The site remains allocated for E class uses. Through the allocation of other sites, the Local Plan seeks to meet its identified local warehousing and logistics needs and therefore it is not necessary to include these uses on this site. Additionally, the site is adjacent to a number of residential properties, and these types of uses may have adverse impacts on residential amenity.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
The respondent supports the continued draft allocation of the site for employment uses but with suggested amendments:	201589 (Paragon Land & Estates Limited)

• The site has potential for a wider range of employment uses than those currently proposed in the draft allocation. • Amending the policy to include B2 and B8 uses alongside the proposed E class uses. • Changes regarding site area, capacity, and development requirements	
We welcome the preparation of the HIA and criterion 1e. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the designated heritage assets and their settings. However, there is considerable vegetation and distance between the site and the proposed allocation.	210159 (Historic England)
The land within the site which EWR Co has identified as being required to deliver its proposals is included within the EWR safeguarded area. EWR Co supports the requirements of draft Policy including criterion 1b and 1c. EWR Co request the following minor amendments for clarity and to ensure the proposals do not conflict with the Safeguarding Directions.	211896 (East West Rail)

Policy S/RRA/OHD: Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

One representation received, which notes that the policy does not reflect all of the recommendations from the Heritage Impact Assessment.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy has been updated to reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Development of this site has the potential to affect local heritage assets and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas. We welcome the preparation of the HIA however not all of the recommendations of the HIA are fully reflected within the policy. In particular, the following recommendations are absent: • Siting of development to avoid obstructing or interfering with views of the church tower from Twenty Pence Road	210160 (Historic England)

• Restricting building heights to limit visual intrusion into the conservation area and in views of the conservation area e.g., 1-2 storeys. These should be included within the policy.	

Policy S/RRA/NW: Norman Way, Over

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad support for the site allocation from Cambridgeshire County Council and Historic England.

Comments were made by Esco Prospect to encourage the allocation of residential uses in this area.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- This site allocation has been assessed as suitable employment uses through the HELAA and has demonstrated to be deliverable through the Housing Trajectory. The scale of development is appropriate for the level of services and amenities in this location.
- In response to Historic England and Cambridgeshire County Council, the support and comments are noted.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue

Support for policy.	202119 (Carter Jonas on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council)
No residential development is proposed for Over despite being close to new site allocations proposing employment floorspace and therefore more jobs.	203146 (Chaplin Farrant Ltd on behalf of ESCO Prospect)
Whilst the principle of development of this site has already been established and there is a buffer of planting between the site and nearby heritage assets, any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA and criterion 1 a, 1b and 1d.	210161 (Historic England)

Policy S/RRA/CRH: Land Adjacent to Cambridge Road (A10) and Mill Lane, Hauxton

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Historic England welcoming the preparation of a HIA, and an image of the landscaped open space in the northern part of the site and no more than 2 storeys (residential) to be included in the policy wording.

Comments were made by the Environment Agency that an FRA and sequential approach are needed.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to Historic England, these comments are noted and the policy has been amended to include wording around restrictions for the landscaped area already in the existing wording for clarity and point 1c has been added to include the restrictions on the building heights for residential development not exceeding two storeys.
- A requirement for an FRA and sequential approach are set out in Policy CC/FM Managing Flood Risk.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
This part of the site lies very close to the cluster of grade II listed buildings at Hauxton Mill. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.	210162 (Historic England)

We welcome the preparation of the HIA. There are opportunities for design to enhance the setting of the heritage assets. The HIA recommends an area of landscaped open space in the northern part of the site. This is shown in diagrammatic form in the HIA. This diagram should be included in the Local Plan. The HIA also recommends no more than 2 storeys (residential). This should be included in the policy.	
This policy should refer to the requirement for an FRA and need to take a sequential approach to the site layout.	211181 (Environment Agency)

Policy S/RRA/CH: Land at Compass House, Chivers Way, Histon and Impington

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

There is broad landowner support for the allocation however they requested that the policy also allow for residential uses, whilst several other comments raised concerns about the impacts of development on adjacent properties including overlooking and environmental factors like light pollution. Comments also noted heritage assets adjacent or close to the site and how development could have an adverse impact on them and their setting if not managed sensitively. The majority of comments requested that the policy include additional criteria so that these issues are addressed through the future design and layout of the development.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to Historic England, these comments are noted and the policy has been amended to include additional heritage assets within close proximity to the site that could be affected by the redevelopment of the site.
- The Councils have a separate and agreed process for the consideration of Non-Designed Heritage Assets. Should this particular NDHA be nominated for consideration, the councils would then consider the historic merits of the property in line with this agreed process.
- The policy has been amended to reflect the comments made in relation to the relationship of the site within adjacent residential properties, requiring the careful consideration of direct and indirect impacts through the planning application process.
- Matters in relation to flooding are already addressed through other Local Plan polices and therefore, are not repeated in this policy.
- An additional requirement has been added to the policy in relation to mitigating any transport impacts in a timely way.

- The NPPF is clear that Local Plan should not impose architectural styles. However, the policies within the Great Places chapter of the Local Plan require development proposals to reflect the site's context, which may include its historic uses and architectural built form.
- The policy has been retained for employment uses only. The site is currently in employment use and therefore the principle of this land use has already been established. The introduction of residential uses in addition to employment uses would require further testing to understand the impacts generated by the proposal and whether they could be suitably mitigated. It is also not clear from the representation whether the introduction of residential development is, in part, replacing the existing office floorspace or in addition to the proposed uplift. Given this uncertainty and that at this stage, it is not clear whether a mixed-use development it suitable or achievable, the policy has not been amended regarding this point.
- The policy also requires development to take comprehensive approach to placemaking when considering adjacent sites, including Vision Park, which is supported by the landowner.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
I am concerned about the redevelopment of the site: • flooding impacts given existing issues • Overlooking into existing residential properties • Light and noise pollution • Traffic near the Busway junction • Overcrowding on the bus network	201007 (L Cooper), 201008 (R Thomas), 201009 (D Hall)
The car parks already there seem mostly empty, are more offices necessary and will they be used? Would hope that the pond/cafe/trees will remain.	201007 (L Cooper)
The site is located close to a group of older properties that give Histon and Impington its character. I am concerned about how intensification here will affect the conservation area. The policy would benefit	201009 (D Hall)

from clearer limits on scale and type of use, better protection for the cottages facing the site and stronger expectations around drainage, traffic and screening. I am not against redevelopment, but feel the policy needs firmer safeguards so any future scheme fits well with the surrounding homes and the character of this part of Histon and Impington.	
The best bits of the old Chivers factory buildings should be rebuilt and restored - down to the last moss-covered roof tile. Failing that, any new building designs should explicitly demonstrate they have been inspired by the wonderful architecture and design of the old Chivers works.	203831 (A Carpen)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, Histon Conservation Area lies to the north of the site. The grade II listed 82-92 Station Road also lies to the north of the site. The Mill Cottage Grade II and Impington Mill grade II* lie to the south of the site. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. Criterion b should also refer to the Impington Windmill (grade II* and Mill Cottage (Grade II). The plan should be clear about the status of the potential NDHA.	210163 (Historic England)
General support for the allocation. The NPPF 2024 promotes comprehensive and coordinated development and it is considered the policy wording should be amended to include ensuring the development aligns through collaboration with the Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area (Area of Major Change) (policy S/AMC/HIS) and with Vision Park (owned by our client). This will help to deliver coherent masterplanning, high-quality design outcomes and long-term	204479 (The Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd)

deliverability with a comprehensive approach to placemaking across Vision Park, Compass House, and Histon & Impington Station Area holistically.	
This draft allocation covers the Site boundary and is currently allocated for Class E(g)(i) and E(g)(ii) uses. It is proposed that the allocation be updated to the following: “Site area of 1.7 hectares Allocated for mixed use employment and residential, including office (E(g)(i)), research and development (E(g)(ii)), residential units (including shared-living forms of residential accommodation) and associated ancillary uses.	211109 (Quod)

Policy S/RRA/CR: Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Broad support for the policy however the landowner commented that the allocation should either support a residential only scheme or be more flexible to enable a residential led development to come forward, noting the lack of demand for this type of employment uses in this location.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The policy has been amended to account for the representations received by the site promoter. This site is well served by the existing village, including its services and facilities, and is in close proximity to a large employment location. Given the consented development, the policy has been amended to reflect a change in the proposed land uses.

Table of representations

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
There are no designated heritage assets within and site. The Melbourn Conservation Area and associated listed buildings lies further to the south-west of the site. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion 1c and 1d	210164 (Historic England)

Broadly support the proposal for residential development given the site's location within the village and proximity to employment uses. The Melbourn Science Park has planning permission for expansion and there is no other employment requirement in this location. Therefore, request the policy is for housing only, or is amended to mixed use where employment provision can be demonstrated at the time of a planning application submission There is a factual error in relation to the criteria for a landscape edge but that this issue will be addressed at the planning application stage. Given the distance between the site and existing heritage assets, there is no requirement to list them within the allocation. They would already be addressed through the other policies of the Plan.	204704 (Vistry)
Subject to the above comments, FPC supports this policy There is no indication why the site should integrate with the adjacent Science Park. Development will be dependent on the consent of the owners of the existing Science Park to achieve this creating a possible ransom situation. Housing density should be appropriate for village dwellings and recognise the beneficial effects of private outdoor space and the spaciousness which people expect and seek in villages. Generally, supports commercial development where sensibly located. Designating this site for such development, being situated alongside the existing science park, clearly has significant benefits. There will also be increases in traffic along Cambridge Road, the A10 and other nearby parts of the road network. Meldreth railway station is over a mile away from the site so rail access unless supported by shuttlebus and bicycle parking on site is unlikely to be desirable. The policy could usefully specify the need to address that aspect.	209051, 209052, 209053, 209054, 209055 (Fowlmere PC)

Unnecessarily pessimistic view of the design of the development and opportunities presented by the site. Rather than requiring the development to be hidden, the policy should require a high standard of appropriate design. The proposal in the plan gives the opportunity to create a sense of entry with an elegant design and setting which could reflect the presence of science, homes and rural life	

Policy S/RRA/FID: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Historic England to highlight the and Settlement site by Caudle Corner Farm Scheduled Monument and welcome the HIA and points 1c and 1f of the policy.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The policy wording has been amended to directly address the comments made by Historic England.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
This site lies within Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. The eastern part of the site lies opposite the scheduled monument Settlement site by Caudle Corner Farm. The site lies close to the Fulbourn Conservation Area and its listed buildings, and the grade II listed windmill sits on elevated land to the south of the site. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion 1c although we recommend that the scheduled monument is also specifically referenced in this clause. We welcome criterion 1f.	210165 (Historic England)

Policy S/RRP: Policy Areas in the rest of the rural area

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made by Papworth Everard PC to set out that Policy H/4: Papworth West Central is still relevant to the Local Plan.

Comments were made in support of the sites in the Rest of Rural Area from Gamlingay Parish Council.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

Policy H/4: Papworth West Central of the 2018 Local Plan was first introduced in the South Cambridgeshire Site Specific Policies DPD adopted in 2010. At that time the village was undergoing considerable change. In addition to the news the hospital would be relocating, there were a range of redundant or soon to become redundant sites. A policy area was identified to ensure a coordinated approach to delivery of a mix of uses. Since then, the majority of those land parcels have been redeveloped or have gained planning permission. Whilst there are some small areas which may provide future development opportunities, and there may be other buildings that in future come forward for redevelopment, a standalone site specific policy is no longer required. Other policies in the local plan can ensure that they make proper contribution towards infrastructure to make development acceptable.

Support noted from Gamlingay PC.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Papworth Everard Parish Council cannot see that Policy H/4: Papworth West Central has been carried forward from the adopted Local Plan 2018. Policy H/4 of the adopted Local Plan 2018 remains valid for the reasons set out in full, as fully evidenced based, in the adopted Local Plan 2018. The reasons and evidence remain current and valid, and justify the maintenance of Policy H/4 for sites in the policy area.	205094 (Papworth Everard PC)
Support the proposals of development in the rest of the rural area- land associated with Papworth Hospital - reuse of brownfield land.	201378 (Gamlingay PC)

Policy S/AMC/IWM: Imperial War Museum, Duxford

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Broad support for the policy area from Twenty5 Planning Ltd on behalf of Henry Boot Developments Limited.

Concerns were raised around reflecting the AvTech proposals in the policy area.

Comments were made by Historic England to reflect the heritage assets nearby and a need for an HIA to be completed.

Comments were made by Cambridgeshire County Council to refer to the Duxford Water Recycling Centre and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Gonville & Caius support the designation, and suggest that point 5 be added to reflect aviation development in NPPF, and that the masterplan requirement be amended.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- In response to reflecting AvTech proposals within the policy area, the policy wording been amended to set out that - A masterplan for development focused on aviation and other complementary uses to support the future of the museum site, must align with the wider masterplan for IWM Duxford. This is also in response to Gonville & Caius College.
- In response to Gonville & Caius, support is noted, and NPPF requirements are not duplicated in the Local Plan, this is an approach taken across the Local Plan.
- In response to Historic England, the suggested amendments have been made.

– In response to Cambridgeshire County Council, the suggested amendments have been made.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
There are multiple designated assets on this site including Duxford Airfield Conservation Area, five grade II* listed buildings and over 20 grade II listed buildings. The Conservation Area is on the Heritage at Risk Register. Often the best use for an asset is its original use. However, this clearly has implications for development in the surrounding area. Development in this policy area has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings. We welcome the reference to the need for a site wide masterplan for the site as well as references to the historic nature of the airfield and heritage assets. Criterion 2 should specifically mention the Conservation Area and listed buildings.	210166 (Historic England)
The policy should state that the masterplan should be informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment. The potential uses for the land in the west end of the site should be set out in the policy and/or supporting text. Historic England is keen to support the ongoing use of the site as a museum which is an important visitor attraction, educational, commercial and aviation facility.	210166 (Historic England)
Support for the policy, which identifies the special case of the site. • It is requested that the policy be amended to allow for a specific masterplan for the IWM Lab and AvTech as part of an application at land promoted (HELAA Site Ref: 40095, Site ID 115178). • The wording on the masterplan-led approach should be amended to state that the existing Imperial War Museum masterplan is sufficient and a wholly new masterplan for the whole site is unnecessary.	205225, 206940, 206941, 206942, 206943, 211453, 211454, 211455 (Twenty5 Planning Ltd on behalf of

• Infrastructure requirements are already covered by other policies.	Henry Boot Developments Limited)
Proposals for the AvTech research and technology park represent a major employment-led development, with the potential to accommodate a substantial number of employees and generate significant traffic movements, breaching NPPF paragraphs 20, 22 and 31. The absence of AvTech from the Plan prevents a holistic assessment of cumulative impacts, particularly in relation to the A505 corridor and surrounding villages. This undermines the justification of the spatial strategy and risks leaving significant impacts to be addressed in a piecemeal manner through planning applications.	206691 (Cllr R Williams)
Support for the policy.	208279 (Imperial War Museum)
Site is partly located within the Consultation Area for the Duxford Water Recycling Centre. This should be identified as a constraint in the supporting text. The following supporting text is recommended for inclusion. "This site is near to the Duxford Water Recycling Centre. An odour assessment may be required. Please refer to Policy 16 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) for further information."	210605 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
SCDC have omitted comments regarding any impact on the A505 running through to Junction 10 and beyond. The additional encroachment from the expansion of operations at the site needs careful consideration.	209060 (Fowlmere PC)
It is requested that the draft policy be amended to: 2. ‘Development of the site will be masterplan that masterplan led which will enable…….’ This minor	210576 (Imperial War Museum)

alteration of the wording covers all future development proposals in the AMC and accommodates the existing IWM Duxford masterplan and the AvTech 1 / IWM Lab masterplan currently in preparation.	
Caius welcomes and supports the inclusion of Policy S/AMC/IWM and the extension of the “red line” designation at Figure 122. • Aviation uses should be recognised in part 1 of the policy/ • A new policy point 5 be added to recognise further aviation development opportunities in line with NPPF paragraph 111(f). • The wording on the masterplan-led approach should be amended to state that the existing Imperial War Museum masterplan is sufficient and a wholly new masterplan for the whole site is unnecessary. • Detailed amendments are suggested to policy and supporting text.	211421, 209028, 209029, 209030, 211450, 211451, 211452 (Gonville & Caius College)

Policy S/AMC/PH: Papworth Hospital, Papworth Everard

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Broad support for the policy from Papworth Everard Parish Council.

Comments were made to raise concerns about the marketing restrictions placed on replacement healthcare uses.

Concerns were raised by Historic England to change the name of the allocation and reflect the heritage assets onsite.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The title of the policy has been amended to say Papworth Hospital, Papworth Everard in response to comments from Historic England.
- The marketing requirement of two years to prioritise finding replacement healthcare uses is required to maintain healthcare related uses on the site, and there is general support for this from the local community.
- The requirement for a HIA and the reference to the Grade II* and Grade II Listed assets onsite has been amended in the policy wording in response to Historic England.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue

The statement "after the site has been marketed for healthcare for a period of no less than 2 years would other employment uses ... be permitted" makes no sense. The NHS has been trying to offload the site since the hospital moved to Cambridge around 6 years ago. At one point, they had a sale in principle agreed with a Chinese company, which eventually disappeared. Has the "marketing" period therefore already started or when will it begin? Also, there is a covenant on the site which prevents its use for non-healthcare purposes.	201409 (South Cambridgeshire DC Cllr P Sandford)
Support for the policy.	204223 (Papworth Everard PC), 205498 (Papworth Everard PC),
We recommend add the words Papworth Everard to the Policy title to avoid any confusion with the New Papworth Hospital at CBC. This site includes the part of the Papworth Everard Conservation Area and lies adjacent to and in the setting of the grade II* listed Papworth Hall, scheduled monument moated site and close to the grade II listed Lodge. Development in this policy area has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings. The policy should require the preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment for the Site. The HIA should be used to inform a masterplan for the site. The policy should specifically reference the fact that the hall is Grade II*, the scheduled moated site and the grade II Listed Lodge.	210167 (Historic England)

Policy S/AMC/FD: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made to extend the Fen Drayton Land Settlement Association Estate boundary to include Land West of Mill Road

Comments were made by RSPB to review the removal of the Wildlife Reserves from the allocation.

Concerns were raised by Historic England to reflect the heritage assets onsite.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The existing policy area is to enable development within the existing plots rather than to expand the settlement. This aligns with the Local Plan's strategy seeks to deliver housing in what it considers to be sustainable locations, as opposed to promoting the extension of development in locations with poorer public transport options.
- In response to RSPB, the site allocation boundary has been amended to remove the Fen Drayton Lakes RSPB Reserve and Fen Drayton Gravel Pits County Wildlife Site from the allocation.
- In response to Historic England, their suggested amendments have been made.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue

The RSPB objects to the current mapping of the allocation, as it includes part of the Fen Drayton Lakes RSPB Reserve and Fen Drayton Gravel Pits County Wildlife Site, which should not be designated for infill development. The RSPB emphasizes that the area around Springhill Lagoon is integral to the Reserve and will not be sold for development, requesting the council to amend the allocation accordingly. The respondent notes the adopted SPD requires control of surface runoff from developments, highlighting its importance for preventing surface water pollution to the lagoon, particularly for new developments along Springhill Road.	201507 (RSPB)
The respondent highlights the potential for sustainable rural development at Land West of Mill Road, Fen Drayton, which has been submitted for consideration in the call for sites. The surrounding land has been allocated under Policy S/AMC/FD for the 'rest of the rural area' and has a Supplementary Planning Document guiding sustainable living since 2011, but no changes have occurred. The proposal suggests allocating Land West of Mill Road as an extension to the Land Settlement Area, promoting a sustainable living agenda and enhancing the character of Mill Road.	205328 (Varsity Town Planning Ltd on behalf of O&H Land)
The Fen Drayton Conservation area and associated listed buildings lies to the east of the site. Any development of the site has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings. There is currently no reference to these heritage assets in the policy. Reference should be made in the policy and supporting text to nearby heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset). The policy should include some reference to the need to consider views into and out of the Conservation Area. Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording.	210168 (Historic England)

Policy S/AMC/HIS: Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made to raise concerns about the marketing restrictions placed on replacement healthcare uses.

Concerns were raised by local residents about loss of amenities and parking provision.

Comments were raised that the proposals should comply with the Histon and Impington Neighbourhood Plan 2021.

Concerns were raised about alignment with nearby sites and the use classes being overly restrictive.

Historic England made comments on the need to make reference to heritage assets in the policy wording.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- Parking standards for development are set out in Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles. this is a location in close proximity to public transport and close to residential areas, and therefore a low car parking plan is suitable in this location.
- The Histon and Impington Neighbourhood Plan 2021 forms part of the development plan alongside the Local Plan and therefore development will need to be in compliance with it.
- The loss of local amenities is mitigated by the policy area specifying that community uses are suitable in this location.
- The suggested changes from The Land Development Limited have been made.
- The suggested changes to the policy from Historic England have been made.
- In response to Quod, Eg i and ii have been added into the policy wording.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
I worry the development will remove the local shops and facilities (the general store, cafe and pub). Impington has very few truly local retail businesses; they are vital to our community. Being without them — even if only during the development would be a great loss.	201183 (J Dent)
The 'low car' parking plan is not reassuring. As new families grow, they will heap pressure on surrounding streets — a poor outcome for those new residents, their families, visitors, and those living nearby. Better for all would be to invest, to provide sufficient parking for the development in its own right.	205549 (J Dent)
Proposals should comply with the Histon and Impington Neighbourhood Plan 2021 or any successor documents. All schemes must integrate with surrounding uses, respect local character, and maintain the vitality of the village centre while preserving 'The Copse'. The Histon & Impington Station Area is over 1 mile from the Cambridge City boundary and should not support development intended for Cambridge City, as it is classified as a Rural area. Any loss of employment or business premises must adhere to the justification outlined in Policy J/PB, particularly point 1.a.ii. The Kendal Court site, currently at 1,100sqm, will be lost if application 25/04793/FUL is approved, and there has been no effort to advertise or develop it for commercial use, thus supporting Policy J/PB point 1.a.ii.	201435 (Histon and Impington PC)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary but the Histon and Impington Conservation Area and associated listed buildings lies to the north of the site as well as other listed	210169 (Historic England)

buildings to the south (Impington Windmill grade II* and Mill House grade II). Any development of the site has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings. There is currently no reference to these heritage assets in the policy. Reference should be made in the policy and supporting text to nearby heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset). The policy should include some reference to the need to consider views into and out of the Conservation Area. Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording.	
Support the policy as it marks the area around the former Histon & Impington Railway Station and Guided Busway as an Area of Major Change through mixed use redevelopment and this will help create conditions for business investment, expansion and adaptation, as per paragraph 85 of the NPPF 2024. These uses are needed to support a modern economy as set out in paragraph 86c of the NPPF 2024 although, we highlight this site does not exist in isolation and is spatially linked to Compass House and Vision Park.	204488 (Stantec on behalf of The Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd)
Consider the policy wording should be amended to include ensuring the development aligns, in collaboration with Land at Compass House, Chivers Way (policy S/RRA/CH) and with Vision Park (owned by our client). This will help to deliver coherent masterplanning, high-quality design outcomes and long-term deliverability with a comprehensive approach to placemaking across Vision Park, Compass House and Histon & Impington Station Area holistically. It is considered this amendment to the policy is required to ensure it is effective as set out in paragraph 36 of the NPPF 2024.	204488 (Stantec on behalf of The Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd)

This Land Development Ltd supports the principle of mixed use development within the Histon & Impington Station Area and welcomes the continued recognition of this location as an opportunity for redevelopment. However, as currently drafted, Policy S/AMC/HIS introduces unnecessary constraints that risk reducing the flexibility and deliverability of future development when compared with the adopted Local Plan framework. The amendments proposed in this representation would strengthen Draft Policy S/AMC/HIS by ensuring it remains justified, and consistent with both the adopted policy framework and the intent of the updated Use Class Order.	201885 (Bidwells on behalf of This Land Development Ltd)
The draft policy's replacement of B1 with only E(g)(iii) is overly narrow, excluding offices (E(g)(i)) and research & development (E(g)(ii)) and therefore limits commercial flexibility. It is also contrary to the Government's intention behind the consolidated Use Class E, which was introduced to support adaptability, economic resilience and mixed-use regeneration. Given that the policy area is explicitly intended to support mixed-use development, it is important that the full range of compatible employment uses is retained.	206003 (Bidwells on behalf of This Land Development Limited)
Replace the term "align" with "complement" in Draft Policies S/AMC/HIS and S/RRA/CH to remove ambiguity and avoid overly prescriptive requirements.	206005 (Bidwells on behalf of This Land Development Limited)
S/AMC/HIS: Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area This draft policy encompasses the southern part of the Site and has aspirations to rejuvenate the area around the former railway station in Histon and Impington to create a vibrant gateway into this community, which features a mix of commercial, community and residential uses. Adding this additional	211110 (Quod)

point as 1d. d. Employment uses including office and research and development (Use Classes E(g)(i) and E(g)(ii)).	

Policy S/AMC/GT: Optimisation of Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of issues arising from Draft Local Plan representations:

Comments were made to raise concerns about safety on sites, and the potential for expansion of the sites and what this means for local communities.

Concerns were raised by local residents about the need for better enforcement to ensure that G&T sites are safe and are occupied by Gypsy and Travellers.

Comments were raised that the proposals should comply with the Histon and Impington Neighbourhood Plan 2021.

Concerns were raised by Cambridgeshire County Council about reference to the Waste Plan.

Historic England made comments on the need to make reference to heritage assets in the policy wording.

EWR request a minor amend to the policy area.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

The Councils' response to the matters raised in the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation includes:

- The purpose of optimising Gypsy and Traveller sites is to safeguard Gypsy and Traveller sites for use by Gypsy and Travellers. The policy's purpose is predominately to reconfigure sites to provide an improvement in health, safety and living conditions for Gypsy and Travellers and to make pitches available for those meeting the definition of Gypsy and Traveller. This process may result in the creation of new pitches, however new pitches are also allocated on strategic sites to address the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
- At the time of the Draft Local Plan publication in Autumn 2026 we reported that officers were investigating the occupancy of

these pitches, and are gathering other necessary information, to enable the Council to consider whether it is appropriate to take enforcement action to make these pitches available for occupancy by Gypsies and Travellers. Officers had also developed a protocol for dealing with any issues of homelessness that may result from any enforcement action taken. The Council have since continued with enforcement action and this is set out in the Strategy Topic Paper in Appendix 12.

- The policy has been amended to clarify what a suitable density is for pitches per hectare to ensure that it is clear what the aim of the policy is, to ensure safety of pitches and ensure that all pitches have sufficient amenity space.
- Amendments have been made to the policy to widen it more generally to optimisation of all sites, instead of just focusing on Chesterton Fen, Smithy Fen and Cottenham. Point 1 has been revised to include all sites of half a hectare and above.
- Amendments to policy wording have also the reflected the need to ensure there is sufficient capacity to utilities, including waste, electricity and water.
- In response to concerns about expanding these sites, especially where Northstowe and Waterbeach have new allocations, the policy is about optimising these sites for the intended occupants in a safe way, with sufficient utilities, infrastructure and amenity. New sites are needed as well as optimisation to meet the identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.
- Suggested amendments have been made to address Historic England's comments.
- Suggested amendments have been made to address Cambridgeshire County Council's comments.

Table of representations:

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
In January 2026, it has been suggested, by members of the Gypsy & Traveller communities living on Smithy Fen, that development of land, covered by injunction, on Water Lane has been affected with	201521 (S Bristow)

South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) officer(s) approval. While the claim is now under investigation and whether or not officers involved are complicit remains to be seen. Irrespective of the allegation the 'reality' of the development has relevance in that it demonstrates, SCDC's lack of awareness of what is going on. My husband has in his objection to the expansion of the sites has already set out to SCDC that they are already failing to enforce breaches of other injunctions. The aim of the policy, in order that it might be supported has to be capable of being delivered in that 'Intensification, expansion or reconfiguration of authorised pitches creates a positive, balanced and attractive environment with a material improvement in health, safety, living conditions and amenities for the existing residents and neighbouring occupiers' I do not believe that this aim is deliverable as SCDC has neither the power, the money or resource to sustain these conditions of expansion.	
Question as to whether the statutory duty under the terms of the Equality Act 2010 has been fulfilled. In discharging this Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) the PSED shall have 'due regard' for the 'Equality Impacts' of its decisions, taking into account both the positive and negative impacts. Does the policy fully account for these impacts?	201522 (S Bristow)
The LPA has carried out an Accommodation Needs Assessment and identified the G&T communities require more pitches through the period to 2040/41. A minimum of 130 pitches may indeed turn out to be more, especially if birth trends in the communities improves the general performance of the British public, but this acknowledgement of accommodation need', takes no account of social or dependence requirements including the general problem of successful community integration.	201523 (S Bristow)

The 130 + pitches are required for persons from across the Greater Cambridge Region not just areas around Chesterton and Smithy Fens and so umpteen person will be displaced from, from their preferred residential area without regard to social need. By not seriously considering or proposing that first each and every existing Gypsy, Traveller, or Showman, site should be prioritised for proportionate expansion, in an effort to seek to satisfy needs and opportunities whilst ensuring equality, before expansion of already large and existing sites (which may not be suitable for many), is a failure of the PSED. At Smithy Fen there has been no attempt to discuss proposals or opinions with the Parish Council, any local settled community members, nor even travellers themselves. This is a second failure of the PSED.	
In the short to medium term, at least, the Smithy Fen sites are neither suitable for, nor in need of, expansion. Until SCDC can re-house/rehome the plethora of those renting chalets and re-establish the boundaries of lawful pitches, demonstrate it can control existing pitches and licenses and uphold terms of injunctions. Until then there should be thought of, nor consideration for, any expansion at Smithy Fen.	201527 (S Bristow)
I think that the village has been overwhelmed with new homes in recent years and the supporting infrastructure has not been improved to support this growth. There should therefore be no additional development on any village site until there are sufficient services that are able to cope with increased demand	200998 (D Smith)
We do not support any expansion of the site in Smithy Fen. The site appears to have plots that are not currently occupied by those who identify as Gypsy and Travellers. The one entrance into the Fen and road infrastructure is not sufficient for additional plots. Given previous history and intimidation of local	201327 (J Dixon)

residents this is of major concern and may impact police resources. Additional sites in Cambridgeshire should be identified in line with planning policy	
Re. expansion of gypsy site on Smithy Fen. It's an appalling idea! We already have enough anti-social behaviour. This will cause more!!! The site is too big already. You will just cause more misery!!!! JUST STOP!	201462 (I Johnson)
Commenting on Smithy Fen (Cottenham). Site has a history of over use and adverse impact on surrounding countryside/environment (e.g. fly tipping, crop damage, fires) and settled communities (e.g. anti-social behaviour, over loading local services, frequent police intervention). Current lower and more sustainable occupancy has created harmony and co-existence of travellers and settled community. The consultation lacks detail on whether it will (i) intensify and increase occupancy or (2) enforce use by genuine travellers so site meets traveller needs. If point 1, I wish to object (intensification risks a return to past negative impacts). If point 2 I support the plans.	201532 (M Davis)
In 2003, Cottenham Residents Association (CRA) was formed specifically to press South Cambridgeshire District Council to take seriously its responsibilities in managing the relationship between settled communities and the Smithy Fen Traveller Site. At that time, residents experienced several problems including anti-social behaviour, theft. These issues have had a significant lasting impact on residents. Twenty-three years on, it is deeply disappointing that concerns remain. Currently there is a lack of visible and effective enforcement at Smithy Fen, that does not inspire confidence that the Council has learned from the past experience. I am particularly concerned to the potential intensification at existing sites. At Smithy Fen, many pitches are now occupied by individuals who don't meet the definition of Gypsies and Travellers. This raises the question If existing pitches are not being	201625 (Fen End farm)

occupied by the intended community, what evidence is there that additional pitches are required at this location. It also suggests that Gypsies and Travellers themselves may not be choosing to live at Smithy Fen, which in turn raises questions about the site's suitability.	
Cottenham has suffered greatly in the past years of bad decision and ineffective management/enforcement by SCDC and its officers regarding Smithy Fen. The policy talks about the Intensification, expansion or reconfiguration of authorized pitches creates a positive, balanced and attractive environment with a material improvement in health, safety, living conditions and amenities for the existing residents and neighbouring occupiers," I am impressed with the wording give past events, I have little faith that should the expansion be authorised that the necessary steps would be put in place to manage an increase or reconfigure pitches. Given the amount of non-gypsy traveller occupation at Smithy Fen, this highlights the lack of control and enforcement. If enforcement was to be properly implemented there would be plenty of unoccupied pitches available, without the need for further expansion. Injunctive action was taken against a part of the site and further land on the Fen to stop further illegal expansion as it was out of control and illegal pitches had been created. This land should never be free from injunction, for the same reasons it was enforced at the time. Currently breaches of these injunctions are taking place. You state vehicular access is to be considered. Smithy Fen site access is over a single track bridge, it cannot contend with the traffic movement now let alone a significant increase.	201582 (C Simms)
The Plan further states " The proposed development meets the requirements of Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots." Do I take from this that the proposed developments are the only ones which are under consideration throughout Greater Cambridge Local	201583 (C Simms)

Plan areas? I find it hard to believe that no other current or new sites are suitable to meet the expected future need. I request that you provide a full disclosure of what other sites were investigated prior to publication and deemed not suitable.	
Concerns around the physical characteristics of the site, as Smithy Fen is low-lying and immediately adjacent to a watercourse that is regularly subject to flood alerts. Intensification or expansion at the site would place more residents at increased risk of flooding.	201626 (Fen End Farm)
The consultation document implies that site optimisation has been considered across the district. If this is the case, I would ask SCDC to make public the details of any studies undertaken into alternative Gypsy and Traveller sites	201627 (Fen End Farm)
It is my understanding that new major developments are expected to make provision for Gypsy and Traveller Communities. I have seen no evidence that such provision has been made, or meaningfully planned, within developments such as Northstowe or Waterbeach. If this understanding Is incorrect, I would welcome clarification; If it is correct, that the apparent failure to deliver such provision undermines the rationale for further intensification at existing, problematic sites such as Smithy Fen.	201628 (Fen End Farm)
Concern regarding the potential implications to the increase the size of the site located at Smithy Fen, Cottenham. Since 2003, we have burnt out cars dumped in hedgerows and we constantly have fly tipping which could be attributed to anyone, but the lack of security down the Fen does not enable this behaviour to be monitored. It is disappointing to see that despite all the enquiries, local injunctions and various representations from those in settled community on Fen that we are now again facing the expansion of this site.	201852 (S Dixon)

Concern that yet again there appears to be a lack of visible and effective enforcement at Smithy Fen and does nothing to give us confidence that the Council has not learned from past experience. Any intensification or expansion of this site must be viewed in the context of a long history of inadequate management and enforcement. There is also a local of oversight to ensure current plots are being used by those who meet the definition of Gypsies and Travellers as many appear to be sub-let to various ethnic groups. I question the suitability of the site, given that Gypsies and Travellers are choosing not to live on Smithy Fen. Smithy Fen does not have the infrastructure to make it a suitable site for expansion or intensification. Access to the Fen is by a single track, the site does not have street lamps. The site is also in an area of a local flood plain and therefore this also needs to be carefully considered.	201858 (S Dixon)
Fen Road is facing a high volume of speeding traffic and heavy goods vehicles, posing risks to residents, cyclists, and pedestrians, as well as causing damage to homes. Current traffic calming measures are inadequate; speed bumps exacerbate vibration and noise, and effective solutions like chicanes have not been implemented. The railway level crossing is no longer suitable for industrial traffic and closing it while providing a new traffic bridge would enhance safety for businesses and reduce HGV traffic through residential areas. There is an urgent need for action to prevent further harm to the community.	202159 (B McCann)
When in the consultation have you considered looking at other areas in Cambridgeshire for additional sites for Gypsies and Travellers? We cannot find any public documents that show assessments have been undertaken in line with local planning policy to consider additional sites in other villages. It was my understanding that major new developments such as Northstowe and Waterbeach should have made such a provision. Please confirm if that is the case.	201861 (S Dixon)

The cadence and pace of enforcement at Smithy Fen has not been able to constrain unauthorised development, development on injuncted land or to ensure that occupation is in-line with policy. The ability to meet and sustain the optimisation objective is extremely limited, thus intensification would remain the only option. The red lines shown in Figure 126 include land with existing injunctions precluding general occupation of redevelopment. Existing injunctions and site constraints are not recognised within the proposed policy. There have been increasing incidents of flooding on neighbouring properties and farmland coinciding with unplanned development within the boundary of the site	204478 (Cottenham PC), 208509 (Cottenham PC), 208510 (Cottenham PC), 208511 (Cottenham PC), 208512 (Cottenham PC),
There are circa 45-50 legal pitches if you include Setchell Drove and Water Lane. If these were to be filled, it would help the council fulfil their need, but what about the 14 Settled families that live in Smithy Fen. We would dread the situation the local residents found ourselves back in 2003. There is a concentration of travellers sites within a five mile radius of Smithy Fen, at Cottenham, Rampton, Willingham, Histon, Landbeach and Chesterton Fen. This should be quite enough for local services to have to absorb. You have two large new developments at Northstowe and Waterbeach that would be land set aside at each development (24 plots) for travellers provision. Is this not the case?	207686 (R Jones), 208474 (R Jones), 208476 (R Jones)
Concerns raised that there is a history of under-enforcement of the existing plots and I know of at least one family of non travellers living there. So the current plots and their use are not being adequately enforced to prevent their being used by non-travellers.	202105 (C Ward)
Concerns about safety, traffic and amenity raised, and a need for long-term infrastructure.	202157 (B McCann)

Concerns raised about SCDC to focus on enforcing injunctions and addressing the illegal allocation of existing sites to non-travellers and that the burden on rural communities, feeling neglected as SCDC and the police fail to provide assistance.	202810 (I Koutoudis)
Concerns raised about the absence of mains sewage at the Fen Road site is concerning, especially given its proximity to the wastewater treatment plant. The local authority and Anglian Water should collaborate to address this issue promptly, as the current situation is unsanitary and poses health risks.	202929 (Fen House Property Ltd)
The ANA concludes a need for a minimum for 130 additional Gypsy & Traveller 2040/4- the Planning Authority are minded to adhere to the findings of the ANA. While the ANA is available to public scrutiny under Appendix A(i) and Appendix A(ii) is withheld as confidential and sensitive containing the details of site locations. This decision alone confirms a lack of transparency in the plan.	201572 (Turks Head Farm)
The levels of proposed increased pitches would be totally unacceptable given the Fen has just 20 homes. The Smithy Fen should not be considered in the same light as Moor Drive, Chesterton or even Primrose Meadow, Rampton, where the extended family is cultural and controlled size increase is justifiable.	201572 (Turks Head Farm)
The ANA authenticity is not in question, but in compilation it did not, seek the views of the Cottenham Parish Council (CPC), seek the views of the traveller's living on the Smithy Fen sites and has not sought to upgrade statement on pitch 'under-utilisation'. The sites at Smithy Fen are within the Parish boundary and as such CPC should have been consulted.	201573 (Turks Head Farm)
Concerns raised about the ANA and how many pitches are considered on each site.	201573 (Turks Head Farm)

Smithy Fen has privately owned G&T pitches, and whereas full-time occupancy may exist at other sites in Cambridgeshire, this has not been the case for Smithy Fen. Travellers on Smithy Fen move places to place and the ANA should reflect this reality and the conclusions on vacancy and under-utilisation are no longer accurate.	201574 (Turks Head Farm)
Concerns raised about officers are withholding information that the plan for Smithy Fen is a large expansion.	201575 (Turks Head Farm)
Concerns raised about conditions not being enforced and not having adequate amenity and utilities arrangements.	201575 (Turks Head Farm)
SCDC need to ensure that licensing is correct at all times and regulate unit numbers, and spacing of such on all pitches meet standards for fire prevention. Lastly there needs to be a full liaison with the police/appropriate authorities before decisions are finalised.	201576 (Turks Head Farm)
Cottenham has enough traveller/gypsy sites and if more are required then look for alternative areas, spreading the load to other communities, our facilities are already bursting at the seams.	203867 (J Welford)
Support for the approach. The plan is completely inadequate in addressing the heavy industrial usage in the area, especially waste.	204491 (T Woodcock)
Concerns raised about enforcement.	205139 (E Wilson)
Concerns raised about needing this approach when sites are allocated on Northstowe and Waterbeach.	208475 (R Jones)
The Chesterton Fen Road site is located across the river from the Fen Ditton and Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Areas. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. This policy should therefore reference the nearby Conservation Area and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance the Conservation Area and its setting.	210170 (Historic England)

Site is partly located within the Consultation Area for the Cambridge Northern Fringe Aggregates Railheads and the Cambridge North Water Recycling Centre. Any proposals must demonstrate that they are compatible with the existing railhead and waste management uses and will not be adversely affected by their proximity. An additional criterion to policy S/SMC/GT should be added, suggested text: "The Chesterton Fen Site located near to the Cambridge Northern Fringe Aggregates Railheads and the Cambridge North Water Recycling Centre, any proposals must demonstrate compliance with Policy 16 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) (or any successor policies)."	210606 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
EWR Co has identified that a small area of land within the Chesterton Fen Road site is required for railway infrastructure works for EWR. This land is included in the safeguarded area. To avoid a conflict between the Chesterton Fen Road AMC and the EWR Safeguarding Directions, EWR Co requests that draft S/AMC/GT is amended.	211905 (East West Rail)