

Cottenham Village Design Group

Planning comments

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues and Options Report

= CVDG made no comment

Chapter 2

Question 1:

*Do you agree that the Council's corporate vision is the right vision for the Local Plan?
Do you have any other suggestions?*

Support – Yes.

Question 2:

*Do you agree that the objectives set out in Issue 2 should be included in the Local Plan?
Please provide any comments.*

Support – Yes; the listed objectives are closely aligned with Cottenham Village Design Group's own aspirations, as shown in the Cottenham Village Design Statement; our ideal would be to see that these are implemented in our village.

Chapter 3

Question 3:

*How much new employment do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?
Lower jobs growth – 14,000 additional jobs over the Plan period (700 jobs per year)
Medium jobs growth - 23,100 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,200 jobs per year)
High jobs growth - 29,200 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,500 jobs per year)
Please provide any comments.*

Comment - Employment creation is a key point within the Cottenham Village Design Statement, choice ii is seen as a good steady objective to maintain sustainable growth in the local area, however please see our comments regarding settlement/job/dwelling creation for Cottenham itself.

Question 4A:

*How much new housing do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?
Lower housing growth - additional 4,300 dwellings (equal to 925 dwellings per year)
Medium housing growth - additional 7,300 dwellings (equates to 1,075 dwellings per year)
High housing growth - additional 9,300 dwellings (equates to 1,175 dwellings per year)
Please provide any comments.*

Comment - Option ii for a Medium level of housing growth is seen as the likely best figure by the Cottenham Village Design Group, however whilst it is hoped and expected that sites around Cottenham be allocated for some of this housing and employment creation it is

expected that the majority of this growth should be centred on the larger identified development sites, such as Northstowe and Waterbeach etc.

Question 4B:

Do you agree with the assumption for delivery of housing at Northstowe of approximately 500 homes per year? This is a technical question aimed mainly at the development industry, although any views are welcome.

Please provide any comments.

- #

Question 5:

Do you consider that the Plan should include an allowance for windfall development?

Please provide any additional comments.

Comment - The local plan should still include an allowance for windfall development as this is a reasonable provision and allows sites not previously considered to be assessed within the plan period.

Question 6:

What level of 5-year land supply buffer do you think the Council should plan for that would be capable of being brought forward from later in the plan period?

5% buffer; or

20% buffer

Please provide any additional comments.

- #

Chapter 4

Question 7:

A: Do you think local aspirations can be reflected in the Local Plan?

B: If yes, how can this best be done? If no, why do you take that view?

Comment – A - No; the Cottenham Village Design Group do not believe that local aspirations can be successfully reflected in the local plan. Our belief is that supplementary planning documents, such as the Cottenham Village Design Statement, are still needed at a local level to record and reflect how local opinion and the vernacular should be represented in further development.

If supplementary planning documents are prepared for specific local areas the local plan can, through reference to these, both accurately reflect local views on development but still leave the local authority in charge of a more regulated planning system.

B – There is potential for a Local Plan to reflect neighbourhood aspirations, to do this it would need to incorporate specific strategic guidance for each village that goes beyond merely choosing between different developer-submitted options. In the case of Cottenham, the aspirations of the village are not merely for more housing, but for measures that will support and increase sustainable employment opportunities within the village, enhance the community services on offer and support and build up the retail businesses in the village core. The local plan would need to incorporate some strategic aims - for example:

- making the centre of the village more pedestrian friendly with additional raised and controlled crossings and other measures
- improving the number and accessibility of parking spaces in the centre of the village
- increasing the number of small and medium-sized flexible business spaces
- encouraging the establishment and growth of village-based businesses - perhaps with start-up grants
- encouraging the re-purposing of redundant agricultural buildings for a commercial use
- increasing the amount of publicly accessible open space
- creating new footpaths, particularly to create more circular routes adjacent to the village
- creating additional cycle ways to connect to more neighbouring villages and developments such as the Cambridge Research Park

Any planning gain from new developments could then be focussed on achieving these strategic aims. In addition, the Local Plan can reference supplementary planning guidance such as the Cottenham Village Design Statement which provides important additional guidance to developers. Cottenham already has a successful design statement in place which is evidence of the local aspiration towards maintaining the quality of any development proposals.

Neighbourhood plans are not considered to be preferable in this regard as it is better that the local authority remains in charge of land allocations through the normal planning process.

Question 8:

Do you think the Local Plan should include a specific policy focusing development on the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, where the land is not of high environmental value?

Please provide any comments.

Comment - Yes; the re-use of previously developed land would be preferable over previously undeveloped sites.

Question 9:

What do you think is the best approach to the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire? All options are expected to need to involve some village development to provide flexibility and early housing provision:

Cambridge focus (would require a review of the Green Belt)

New Settlement focus

Sustainable Villages focus (would require a review of the Green Belt)

Combination of the above

Please provide any comments.

Comment - A combination of the listed approaches is considered the best option as this would allow developments to be provided equally.

Question 10:

Do you think that the Green Belt purposes and functions remain appropriate for the new Plan?

Please provide any comments.

Support – Yes; the Cottenham Village Design Group believe that the Green Belt's purpose and function remain as appropriate now for the new plan as they ever were before, however it would be appropriate at this juncture to consider reviewing particular arrangements of the Cottenham Village Design Group

Green Belt. This is particularly important to Cottenham where some opportunities for the development of housing and employment are at present restricted by the arrangement of the Green Belt.

Question 11:

Do you consider that more land, beyond that already released and committed, on the edge of Cambridge and potentially at larger villages, should be released from the Green Belt in order to achieve sustainable development?

Please provide any comments and explain why you think there are exceptional circumstances?

Support – The Design Group strongly supports the concept of the Green Belt and would not wish to see any wholesale changes. The arrangement of the Green Belt around Cambridge should be reviewed with development potential marked on its merits and impact etc. More importantly for us the present arrangement of the Green Belt around Cottenham should be reviewed as its current arrangement may be having a distorting effect, pushing the land available for development into unsuitable and less sustainable areas. The Green Belt approaches the southern and eastern edges of the village very tightly. Whilst we do not consider that any large-scale loss of Green Belt would be appropriate, the re-designation of small areas adjacent to the village edge could release sites that have the potential to offer particularly good locations for development, being near, and potentially well connected to the village's retail centre and schools. We also note that any further development of the Village College and the sports and community education facilities which operate from the site, is severely restricted by the present Green Belt boundary.

It should be borne in mind that the areas to be reviewed are relatively small. It remains especially important for the residents of Cottenham that there is no coalescence with Histon.

Any loss/adjustment of Green Belt could be compensated for by the designation of additional areas, and/or by improving the quality of and access to some of the existing areas.

We believe that a review of the Green Belt around Cottenham is a matter of some importance and urgency. We feel that it should be coupled with a pro-active and strategic study to determine in overall terms the best options for new development which takes a wider view than simply reacting to proposed developments, and that the site options should not be determined until this review has been completed.

Question 12:

Do you consider that any of the following broad locations have potential to be released from the Green Belt to provide new housing to help meet the needs of the Cambridge area?

Land to the North & South of Barton Road (includes land in both districts)

Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts)

Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only)

Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts)

Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts)

Land South of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road & Shelford Road (includes land in both districts)

Land between Babraham Road & Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts)

Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)

Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)

Land between Huntingdon Road & Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)

Please provide any comments, and indicate the area of land at the relevant broad location that you feel has potential, either in words or provide a map.

12 – #

Question 13:

Which, if any, of the following changes to the rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?

Rural Centres:

Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from a Minor Rural Centre)?

Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre?

Minor Rural Centres:

Should the following be added as Minor Rural Centres?

Milton

Swavesey

Bassingbourn

Girton

Comberton

Better Served Group Villages:

Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages?

Milton

Swavesey

Bassingbourn

Girton

Comberton

If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall within this new category? They are:

Papworth Everard

Willingham

Waterbeach

Other Group Villages and Infill Villages:

Should these remain in the same categories as in the current plan?

Please provide any comments.

Support – The rural settlement categories for some villages are being reviewed and it has been suggested that Cottenham should become a Rural Centre. The Cottenham Village Design Group is not convinced that the data merits this particular change, we also note that the differences between the categories seem at times arbitrary and we are not entirely convinced of their value. However, if by a change from the Minor Rural Centre category the village could allow more sustainable opportunities for development that could have a positive impact. The justification in a Yes and accepting this change is the removal of the 30 house limit so development plans can be brought forward sustainably with coordinated master plans etc, rather than in piecemeal chunks.

Any development should be brought forward together with an increase in employment opportunities and retail, retail being especially important in the historic core of the village. Larger developments also bring with them an opportunity to make significant improvement to the quality of village life for all residents through the investment that they bring.

Question 14:

What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for individual housing schemes within village frameworks on land not specially identified for housing:

- i. Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes*
- ii. Increase the size allowed for individual schemes.*
- iii. Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres, and if included for Better Served Group Villages, so they are the same as Rural Centres*
- iv. Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village*

Please provide any comments.

NOTE: See also Question 7 on Localism.

Comment - The approach that the Local Plan should take on individual changes in village frameworks should be a removal of scheme size limits for all categories of village, this would allow applications to be judged purely on their merits without artificial limits being imposed. In this regard sustainable development criteria and a judgement of the appropriate scale for the local area etc become the critical design parameters for them.

For Cottenham we consider that the crude numerical limits placed on development by the village's status as a 'Minor Rural Settlement' are unhelpful and unnecessarily restrictive. Under certain circumstances larger developments have the potential to be better planned and integrated than a series of small piecemeal developments. We would favour increasing the limits, or possibly replacing them altogether with a set of principles, especially by including the stipulation that new development should be appropriate in scale. If this were done then only significant advantage to changing the village's designation might be to increase the possibility of additional retail.

Question 15A:

Do you think the new Local Plan should:

retain village frameworks and the current approach to restricting development outside framework boundaries as defined on the Proposals Map

retain village frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map but include policies that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met, addressing issues including landscape, townscape, and access.

delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through a written policy.

Please provide any comments.

NOTE: See also Question 49 on Approach to Exception Sites for Affordable Housing and Question 7 on Localism.

Question 15B:

Are you aware of any existing village framework boundaries that are not drawn appropriately because they do not follow property boundaries?

For guidance in answering this question, buildings associated with countryside uses are not normally included in village frameworks, nor are small clusters of development away from the main body of a village. Properties on village edges with very large gardens may also not always be wholly included in the village framework.

If so, please identify the change you think should be made to the framework boundary (please provide a map).

NOTE: Current Village Frameworks can be viewed on the Adopted Proposals

Map: www.scambs.gov.uk/ldf/adoptedproposalsmap

Support - A - The local plan should retain village frameworks but these should generally be reviewed, their retention would still allow for some measure of control but would allow a village room to expand, especially to bring economic activity.

The Cottenham village framework has served a useful purpose to date, but we consider that if it continues as a hard and fast boundary it may prove too restrictive in the future. There may be some merit in retaining it as a 'soft' or 'permeable' edge to help prevent cumulative sprawl, but we believe that applications adjacent to the built-up areas of the village should be judged on individual merit according to a clearly defined set of principles. From our point of view these would include:

- The aesthetic effect on the view into the village from the countryside beyond.
- The connectivity between any new development and the existing village, most importantly providing short and safe pedestrian routes from any new development to village schools, to the existing retail centre of the village and to other village facilities. This will help to ensure that new developments are well integrated into the village, that the new residents benefit from village facilities, and that facilities and retailers benefit from additional footfall.

B – The Cottenham Village Design Group do not believe that Village frameworks should necessarily hug existing development lines as is indicated in the question, our alternative view is that these sometimes arbitrary boundaries between places can restrict the clear understanding of the envelope, it would be preferable that in some cases these be allowed to cross fields etc, thereby creating land that can then be developed or planted to contain the edge.

Chapter 5

Question 16A

Which of the site options do you support or object to and why?

Please comment on the individual site options below.

Figure 8 showing the location of the site options being proposed

New Settlement Site Options

Site Option 1: Extension to Northstowe

Land north west of B1050, Station Road, Longstanton (Northstowe Reserve)

Site Size: 56.08 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 900

SHLAA Reference: Sites 242 & 273

Comments

Pros

Site already reserved for development

Good public transport links via Guided Bus

Would allow for flexibility in how Northstowe is developed

Cons

Unlikely to lead to additional housing delivery at Northstowe to 2031

[*Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 1: Extension to Northstowe*](#)

Site Option 2: New Town at Waterbeach

Land north of Waterbeach

Site Size: 558.68 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 12,750

SHLAA Reference: Site 231

Comments

Pros

Reuses previously developed land

Cottenham Village Design Group

*Relatively close to Cambridge
Close to railway station
Large enough for two secondary schools
Cons*

*Impact on Denny Abbey and landscape setting
Capacity of the A10 and A14*

[*Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 2: New Town at Waterbeach*](#)

Site Option 3: Small New Town at Waterbeach

Land north of Waterbeach (MOD only)

Site Size: 280.20 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 7,600

SHLAA Reference: Site 231 (part)

Comments (where different from above)

Pros

Less impact on landscape setting

Large enough for a secondary school

Cons

Less need/incentive to move Railway station and sewage works

[*Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 3: Small New Town at Waterbeach*](#)

Site Option 4: Waterbeach Barracks built area only

Land north of Waterbeach (built area only)

Site Size: 58.15 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 930

SHLAA Reference: Site 231 (part)

Comments (where different from above)

Pros

Less impact on landscape setting and Denny Abbey

Cons

As a large village extension unlikely to have critical mass to bring significant infrastructure improvements

Too small for a secondary school

[*Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 4: Waterbeach Barracks built area only*](#)

Site Option 5: New Village – Bourn Airfield

Bourn Airfield, Bourn

Site Size: 141.70 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 3,000-3,500

SHLAA Reference: Sites 057 & 238

Comments

Pros

Former airfield counts as reuse of previously developed land

Relatively close to Cambridge

Cons

Relatively poor links to Cambourne, especially to centre

May be too small for a secondary school

Would form a ribbon of development south of the A428

[*Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 5: New Village – Bourn Airfield*](#)

Cottenham Site Options

Site Option 21:

Land at the junction of Long Drove and Beach Road, Cottenham

Site Size: 1.63 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 35

SHLAA Reference: Site 234

Cottenham Village Design Group

Comments

Pros

Limited impact on landscape setting

Good accessibility to employment locations

Cons

Loss of Green Belt

Encroachment into countryside

On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities

[Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 21](#)

Site Option 22:

Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham

Site Size: 4.90 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 110

SHLAA Reference: Site 260

Comments

Pros

Limited impact on landscape setting

Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot

Cons

On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities

[Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 22](#)

Site Option 23:

The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham

Site Size: 2.87 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 65

SHLAA Reference: Site 003

Comments

Pros

Limited impact on landscape setting

Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot

Cons

On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities

[Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 23](#)

Site Option 24:

Land south of Ellis Close and East of Oakington Road, Cottenham

Site Size: 4.40 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 100

SHLAA Reference: Site 129

Comments

Pros

Limited impact on landscape setting

Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot

Cons

Impact on setting of Listed Buildings

On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities

[Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 24](#)

Site Option 25:

Land off Histon Road, Cottenham

Site Size: 0.83 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 15

SHLAA Reference: Site 123

Comments

Pros

Limited impact on landscape setting

Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot

Cons

On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities

[Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 25](#)

Site Option 26:

Land to the rear of 34 - 46 Histon Road, Cottenham

Site Size: 1.04 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 20

SHLAA Reference: Site 263

Comments

Pros

Limited impact on landscape setting

Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot

Cons

On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities

[Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 26](#)

Site Option 27:

Cottenham Sawmills, Cottenham

Site Size: 1.35 hectares Dwelling Capacity: 25

SHLAA Reference: Site 124

Comments

Pros

Limited impact on landscape setting

Good accessibility by bus, cycle and on foot

Cons

On village edge so relatively distant from services and facilities

Loss of employment

[Supporting technical assessments for Site Option 27](#)

16 – A - The Cottenham Village Design Group consider that many of these sites would be ideal locations for the additional housing numbers we are told are required, however our interest must remain in the locale of Cottenham and so on this matter it has been decided that we will not comment specifically on each of the individual sites. Our preference in all cases is to see the development of well designed and coordinated masterplans, without arbitrary limits, but with the developments judged on their individual merits.

Near to Cottenham we would be in favour of a combination of development within and around our own village, with the developments being coordinated and integral to the existing village and with the benefit that well thought out and designed additions could bring to the village in terms of investment in the schools and retail core and then the development of larger settlements such as at Northstowe and Waterbeach options 2 or 3 where these larger settlements bring with them further employment opportunities beyond those that might be created within and around our own and the development of more coordinated transport arrangements that would end up serve outlying villages such as our own indirectly as well.

Question 16B

Are there any other sites that we should consider? (These could be sites already submitted through the “Call for Sites” process or new sites).

Please provide any comments.

B - There are a number of site options put forward for consideration within the SHLAA of particular importance to Cottenham, these are the options sites 21 - 27

A review of the Green Belt and/or scale of permitted developments as discussed previously would change how these options site are considered, reviewing each of the options in turn the most suitable of all of them is that at the junction of Long Road and Beach road, site option 21, however it should be noted that loss of Green Belt as shown within the pros and cons columns is incorrect in this case.

Of Option 22 and 23, 22 would be the more suitable of the two due to its relative proximity to the existing village edge, a closer alignment with the aspirations of the Cottenham Village Design Group could be achieved if these sites were considered together.

Site option 24 is actually considered a more suitable site for a larger scale development than the two above, although for it to be implemented a review of the Green Belt as it is currently laid out would be required. The benefit of the site in creating a coordinated village 'shape' outweighs the loss of the Green Belt here, although it is expected that extensions and access to Green Belt land here and elsewhere could compensate for this. A con of the site is noted as being impact on the listed building which must be the Almshouses on Rampton Road but it is not thought that there would truly be much impact here due to the distance.

Options 25 and 26 together would be more appropriate if they could be reviewed together with 24 adjacent.

Site 27 is currently shown as distinct from the others by two areas of garden land and so is not considered by the group to be appropriate at this time, but it should be borne in mind if these two parcels of land could be brought forward within the plan period to allow a connection of this whole group.

It would be important to the village that if these sites were brought forward that successful connections into the village could be made, their ability to take part in village life is especially important. It might also be a consideration that a part of these areas be brought forward for further employment as any of these would be a reasonable location for an area of high quality business premises, those currently available in Broad lane and on Twentypence Road are more industrial in nature and so relatively large for the actual employment they generate, this could be mitigated by some further employment land on the South of the village.

Chapter 6

Question 17:

Have the right issues for addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation been identified?

Please provide any comments.

Support – Yes; climate change mitigation are key parts within the Cottenham Village Design Statement, however qualified engineers are better qualified to answer this question in exactly how this should be sensibly achieved.

Question 18A:

A:What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for the generation of renewable and low carbon energy?

i. Include a criteria based policy seeking to maximise the generation of renewable and low carbon energy in the district and identifying the issues that would need to be addressed, and this would leave developers to make applications for their preferred areas.

ii. Include a criteria based policy as set out in option i, but specifically requiring a separation distance of 2 km between a proposed wind farm (2 or more wind turbines) and any residential property, to protect residents from disturbance and visual impact. If the applicant can prove this is not the case a shorter distance will be considered.

Please provide any comments

Question 18B:

Should the Local Plan identify future growth areas and new settlements as potentially suitable locations for the inclusion of renewable or low carbon district heating systems?

Question 18C:

What type of renewable and low carbon energy sources should the Local Plan consider and at what scale?

Please provide any comments.

18 – A – Comment - The local plan should promote the generation of renewable and low carbon energy and an important consideration of this is where it may be appropriate to consider wind power, this kind of development should again to judged on its particular merits etc.

B – Comment - Yes; but perhaps with an emphasis particularly on commercial development such as retail and industrial where larger areas of roof would allow for particularly efficient arrays of solar panels etc; however this should be balanced against the possibility that investment would be reduced by having this as a condition.

Question 19:

To what extent should new development provide for onsite renewable energy generation?

i. All new developments should be required to provide onsite renewable energy? If so, should 10%, 15% or 20% equivalent provision be required?

ii. Small scale developments of less than 5 dwellings or less than 500 m2 of non-residential floor space should be exempt?

iii. No requirements for renewable energy generation should be made.

Please provide any comments.

Comment – It would seem appropriate to set some percentages for onsite generation and 10% seems reasonable. At this juncture, and particularly in relation to heritage areas such as conservation areas, the design of such elements should be considered at an early stage rather than as a somewhat arbitrary addition after the event.

Question 20A:

Should the Local Plan enable the setting up of a Community Energy Fund that would allow developers to invest in offsite energy efficiency and renewable and low carbon energy projects to meet their carbon reduction targets?

Question 20B:

Are there other Alternatives?

Please provide any comments.

Comment – Answer i might be a more appropriate way to deal with on site renewable generation for new developments in conservations areas, or in developments adjacent to heritage assets.

Question 21:

What sustainable building standards should be required in new developments?

i. Developments would only have to comply with Building Regulations requirements for energy efficiency?

ii. All new buildings would comply with sustainable building standards. If so, should all new dwellings meet at least Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4, and all non-residential schemes meet at least the BREEAM ‘very good’ standard?

iii. The zero carbon standard (Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5) would be required in larger scale developments?

Please provide any comments

Comment – A high level of quality in design is appropriate but with the continuing improvement in building regulations it is questionable whether there should be a requirement for dwellings to be designed much above these ever higher standards, this becomes more relevant further into the lifetime of this Local Plan.

Question 22:

What approach to sustainable show-homes should we take?

i. Rely on negotiating their provision on an individual site basis?

ii. Require all developments that include a show-home to provide a sustainable show-home?

iii. Require developments of over 15 dwellings to provide a sustainable show-home?

Please provide any comments

– #

Question 23:

What approach should the Local Plan take to construction methods:

i. Continue to include a construction methods policy?

ii. Not specify construction methods in the Local Plan?

Please provide any comments

Comment – Yes; the construction of new additions to the built environment should not be detrimental to the existing.

Question 24:

What approach should the Local Plan take on water efficiency in new housing development?

What are your views on the following options?

i. Rely on Building Regulations standards to reduce water use below the average existing levels.

ii. Seek additional measures such as water efficient fixtures and fittings (to achieve equivalent of Code 3 or 4 of Code for Sustainable Homes), subject to financial viability.

iii. Seek grey water or rainwater recycling (to achieve equivalent of code 5 or 6 of Code for Sustainable Homes), subject to financial viability.

Please provide any comments.

24 – #

Question 25A:

Have the right approaches to managing, protecting and enhancing water quality been identified?

Question 25B:

*Are there any other issues which should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

25 – A – Support - Yes

Question 26A:

Have the right approaches to managing water and drainage sustainably been identified?

Question 26B:

*Are there any other issues which should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

26 – A – Support - Yes; this is especially important within/adjacent to the low lying areas of the county, particularly in the case of Cottenham where a large area is drained by an adjacent cut.

Question 27A:

Have the right approaches to managing flood risk been identified?

Question 27B:

*Are there any other issues which should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

27 – A – Support - Yes; the impact of flooding on low lying areas of the county such as at Cottenham would be great, management of this issue by effective policy is seen as being of particular benefit in this area.

Chapter 7

Question 28A:

Have the right design principles been identified to achieve high quality design in all new developments?

Question 28B:

Should the Local Plan provide guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees?

Question 28C:

Do you think the Council should retain and update the District Design Guide?

Question 28D:

*Would you like your village to produce its own design guide? If so, please let us know which village so that we can discuss how to take this forward with the local Parish Council.
Please provide any additional comments on any of these questions.*

28 – A – Support - Yes; securing high-quality design is of particular importance, especially to the Cottenham Village Design Group.

B – Object - No; guidance is important but what should be ensured is that the local context is taken into account, any guide should therefore not be so prescriptive as to be contrary to the individual structure of an areas. Villages and particular areas often have the own unique character which could be historically contrary to the general guidance. For example in Cottenham the lanes areas of the village is a successful and intimate part of the village but was not designed for the predominance of the car. This intimacy may not be appropriate in all areas but could be successfully reintroduced with less emphasis on highways suitability within proposals.

C – Support - Yes; the current council design guide should be updated.

D – Support - Yes, but the existing Cottenham Village Design Statement already fulfils many of the functions of a village design guide. We consider that while this continues to have the status supplementary planning guidance a specific design guide is not necessary.

Other villages should also be able to produce their own design guides, especially to record their individual characters. The Cottenham Village Design Group also feel able to offer their assistance to other villages in the preparation of their design statements.

Question 29:

*What approach do you think the Local Plan should take on public art?
Please provide any additional comments.*

29 – Comment - The provision of public art within development schemes is considered important, however this should be encouraged as being a part of the high-quality design expected of developments and should not be too prescriptive of the form it takes.

Chapter 8

Question 30:

*Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape?
Please provide any additional comments.*

30 – Comment - Yes; the character and distinctness of the landscape as should be reflected can be recorded in the design guides that will highlight the individual characters of the areas.

Question 31:

*Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a) from unplanned development?
Please provide any additional comments.*

31 – Support - Yes; the local plan should include this policy, high grade land should be considered of utmost value.

Question 32A:

The Local Plan needs to protect and enhance biodiversity. Have we identified the right approaches?

Question 32B:

Do you think the Council should retain and update the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document?

Please provide any comments.

32 – Support - Yes; the protection and enhancement of biodiversity is commented on within the Cottenham Village Design Statement.

Question 33A:

Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure?

Question 33B:

Are there other new Green Infrastructure projects that should be added?

Please provide any additional comments.

33 – A – Support - Yes; a policy requiring developers to provide and contribute towards new or enhanced green infrastructure is seen as being a good idea. The Cottenham Village Design Group would hope that this may allow Cottenham better access to the surrounding countryside which would be desirable to the quality of life in this area.

Question 34:

Should the Local Plan include policies to ensure that development in and adjoining the Green Belt does not have an unacceptable impact on its rural character and openness?

Please provide any additional comments.

34 – Support - Yes; it is considered important that the local plan has policies to ensure that the development in and adjoining the Green Belt does not have an unacceptable impact on its rural character and openness.

Question 35:

Regarding infilling on, or complete redevelopment of, previously developed sites in the Green Belt, should the Local Plan:

Rely on National Planning Policy Framework guidance for determining planning applications;
or

Include more detailed guidance regarding design, such as scale and height of development?

Please provide any additional comments.

35 – Comment - Infilling or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites on the Green Belt should be considered on their merits and not arbitrarily prescribed by the national policy framework, a design statement might assist in giving guidance regarding the design, scale and height of these development which should also refer to the local design guide and any design statement.

Question 36:

Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring the cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered, to avoid the over-concentration of such sports grounds where it would be detrimental to the character and rural setting of Cambridge and Green Belt villages?

Please provide any comments.

Comment - It is not considered that a specific policy to control cumulative impact of sports and recreation development needs to be considered, these, like other developments, should be considered solely on their merits and impact.

Question 37A:

Should the existing policy for Protected Village Amenity Areas be retained in the Local Plan?

Question 37B:

Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing PVAA's in villages (as shown on the Proposals Map) that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.

Please provide any additional comments.

37 – A – Support - Yes; the existing policy for the retention or protection of eligible areas should be retained within the plan.

B – Comment - It is considered important for Cottenham that these areas are maintained and if possible expanded in the future.

Question 38:

Should the Local Plan identify any open spaces as Local Green Space and if so, what areas should be identified, including areas that may already be identified as Protected Village Amenity Areas?

Please provide any comments, including particular sites, with a map if possible.

38 – Comment - Yes; green spaces as identified within the map in the Cottenham Village Design Statement are important and there should be no net loss in the amount, however flexibility for future adjustment could also be maintained in the plan.

Question 39:

Should the existing policy for Important Countryside Frontages be retained in the Local Plan?

Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing Important Countryside Frontages in villages that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.

39 – Support - Yes; countryside frontages are important and should be retained in the local plan; particularly important frontages for Cottenham are identified within the Cottenham Village Design Statement.

Question 40:

Should the Local Plan seek to encourage the creation of community orchards, new woodland areas or allotments in or near to villages and protect existing ones?

Please provide any comments.

Support – Yes; the creation of community orchards and new woodland areas and allotments, together with the protection of existing ones, is one of a number of key elements within the Cottenham Village Design Statement. These can also be considered as an important forerunner to the expansion of a village where a mature woodland screen can already have been laid down in advance, for example see the Les King Wood Cottenham off of Rampton Road.

Question 41:

Should a policy be developed for the consideration of development proposals affecting waterways that seeks to maintain their crucial importance for drainage, whilst supporting their use as a recreation and biodiversity resource?

Please provide any additional comments.

41 – Support - Yes; a policy considering development proposals affecting waterways, particularly towards maintaining their crucially important role of drainage is of particular importance to the low lying villages of the county such as Cottenham. If a further guide is needed above the NPPF then this should be developed.

Question 42:

*Taking account of the importance of the heritage asset, should the Local Plan include:
Individual policies addressing historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas; or
A single policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets
Please provide any additional comments.*

42 – Comment - Yes; individual policies highlighting the importance of heritage assets should be developed but only if needed beyond the national and local design statement principles.

Question 43A:

Do you consider the Local Plan should protect undesignated heritage assets?

Question 43B:

*If so, are there any specific buildings or other assets that should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

43 – A – Comment - No; it is not considered that the Local Plan should have a policy for the protection of undesignated heritage assets, if these are important they should be brought forward to the appropriate level of recognition/protection rather than have another designation developed.

Question 44A:

Should the Local Plan include a policy to provide guidance on how listed buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas can be adapted to improve their environmental performance?

Question 44B:

*If so, where should the balance lie between visual impact and the benefits to energy efficiency?
Please provide any comments.*

44 – A - Comment - Yes; development of a listed building SPD together with a conservation area SPD, to be read in conjunction with the local area design guide and any particular local design statements, would allow coverage of this policy. It is considered of particular importance that any supplementary planning documents ensure that locally appropriate details and materials are used on these buildings and that they ensure that the character is not lost.

B - The local planning authority should also liaise with their building control department to enable assistance with these measures to ensure that the edict of 'reasonable' provision is maintained against historic details.

A concentration towards the improvement of new build houses over any minimum provisions which would at least allow older buildings, which have great importance in the visual impact

of our places, to remain original in character, this would be achieved by an offsetting of the benefits achieved.

Chapter 9

Question 45:

Which of the following options do you agree with:

Provide no specific guidance on density

Include a policy with a density target of an average of 30 dph on a development but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstance

Include a policy with higher average target densities in the most sustainable locations and lower average densities in the least sustainable but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstances.

Please provide any comments.

45 – #

Question 46:

Which of the following options do you agree with?

Provide no guidance on housing mix (house types).

Include a policy on housing mix (house types) but only for market housing.

Any policy on housing mix (house types) should only apply to sites of 10 or more homes.

Any policy on housing mix (house types) should seek to balance demographic trends for smaller homes with market preferences for larger homes by seeking the provision of market housing as follows:

At least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes,

At least 30% 3 bedroom homes

At least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes

With a 10% allowance for flexibility which can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.

Please provide any comments.

46 – #

Question 47:

What approach do you think the new Local Plan should take to securing houses adapted to meet the needs of people with reduced mobility, looking at the following options?

i) Provide no guidance on the provision of housing for people with reduced mobility.

ii) All affordable and 5% of market housing should be designed to Lifetime Homes standards.

Please provide any comments.

47 – #

Question 48A:

What target should the Local Plan include to address the need for affordable housing?

The target for affordable housing remains at 40% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission accompanied by policy provisions which explicitly allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions over time.

The target for affordable housing is reduced to 30% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission in relation to very large strategic scale sites and in those parts of the district with low house prices and remains at 40% elsewhere. Such a change could allow

flexibility to increase the level to 40% across the district in response to changing market conditions over time.

Please provide any comments.

Question 48B:

The threshold for seeking affordable housing provision could be increased to 3 dwellings or another higher number. What number would you prefer and why?

48 – #

Question 49A:

What approach do you think the Local Plan should take to affordable housing on rural exception sites?

- i) Allow the minimum amount of market housing necessary on exception sites to make the affordable housing viable?*
- ii) Provide more market housing to support local communities, the Local Plan could allow a greater amount of market housing on exception sites to support the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing.*

Please provide any additional comments.

Question 49B:

Do you think the Local Plan should allow greater flexibility in the occupation of exception site affordable housing to include the needs of a group of neighbouring villages?

See also Question 15 on Approach to Village Frameworks and Question 7 on Localism.

49 – #

Question 50:

Do you think that new homes are often too small? How do you think we should deal with the size of new homes?

- i) Not include a policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan.*
- ii) Include a policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan which would cover both affordable and market housing and which would be consistent with national standards set by the Homes and Communities Agency.*
- iii) Include a more general policy on residential space standards in the Local Plan and include the actual standards in a Supplementary Planning Document.*

Please provide any comments.

50 – #

Question 51:

How do you think the Local Plan should deal with extensions to dwellings in the countryside?

- i) Not include a policy.*
- ii) Include a simplified version of the policy requiring the extension to be in scale and character with the existing dwelling.*
- iii) Include a simplified version of the policy as in ii), but also remove from it limitations concerning the creation of a separate dwelling.*

Please provide any comments.

Comment – Extensions to dwellings in the countryside have been a small part of the applications with Cottenham Parish but are in many respects currently the most contentious. A simplified version of the policy just requiring that these be in scale and character to the existing dwelling may be appropriate, however it still may be too limited and it is considered

that a policy clearly stating that individual applications be judged on their merits taking due consideration of the character of the area, local building design and alike, together with an appraisal of the site itself would be more appropriate.

Question 52:

How do you think the Local Plan should address the issue of replacing existing housing in the countryside?

i) Keep the existing policy and continue to limit replacement dwellings in the countryside to being no more than 15% larger than the dwelling they replace.

ii) Include a less restrictive policy on replacement dwellings in the countryside.

Please provide any comments.

Comment - The local plan should address the issue of replacing existing housing by including a less restrictive policy on replacement dwellings in the countryside. These should also be judged on their merits and in all cases be of a high quality.

Question 53:

What do you think the Local Plan should say about the development of residential gardens?

In seeking to resist inappropriate development should the plan:

Seek to prevent the loss of residential gardens except where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to local character.

Allow for development of residential gardens in principle so long as the proposed development is consistent with the design policies of the Local Plan.

Please provide any comments.

Comment - A preference for the development of residential gardens, especially in Cottenham where historically these have been especially long in comparison to the houses, would be for ii where any proposed development would be considered in line with the design policies of the local plan, including any related design guides. As designs should be judged on their merits prescriptive policies may not be useful in this regard.

Question 54:

How do you think the Local Plan should address reuse of buildings in the countryside?

i) Not include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use?

ii) Include a policy on the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use setting out what factors would be taken into account.

Please provide any comments.

Comment - The re-use of buildings within the countryside is not disagreeable to the Cottenham Village Design Group, option ii would seem to be the better option as this would set out what factors would be taken into account when discussing these types of conversions.

Question 55:

What approach should the Local Plan take to working at home?

i) Not include a policy on working at home and rely on the other policies of the Local Plan and the NPPF to consider proposals.

ii) Include a policy on working at home stating that proposals will be approved unless there would be an effective loss of residential use, or there would be unacceptable impacts on factors such as residential amenity, local character, heritage assets, and traffic and parking.

Please provide any comments.

55 – Comment - The ability for residents to work at home is seen as a key part of how an area of high population with limited ingrained transport networks and high employment can manage itself in the future. The in built ability for home working applies less pressure on the local transport networks.

Question 56:

What approach should the Local Plan take to new countryside homes of exceptional quality?

i) Not include such a policy.

ii) Include a policy on exceptional homes in the countryside.

Please provide any comments.

Comment - A specific policy on dwelling of exceptional quality in the countryside should not necessarily be needed, all applications should be judged purely and solely on their merits and therefore the national policy planning framework may well allow for the determination of these.

Question 57:

What approach should the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?

Do you agree with any or all of the following approaches?

i) Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031, which means we would need to provide an additional 50 permanent pitches by 2031.

ii) Not set a target for Travelling Showpeople occupation and rely on an additional windfall site coming forward over the plan period.

iii) Explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts.

iv) The Local Plan require that site provision be made for Gypsy and Traveller occupation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 new homes.

Please provide any comments.

Comment - An exact understanding of what the Local Plan should allow for travellers, travelling show people etc is not an area that the Cottenham Village Design Group wish to comment on specifically. Any proposals should however be brought forward on the basis that location is a key criteria and that the design and merits of the individual applications are considered with the same checklist that any development is required to match, in terms of quality of design, drainage and screening etc.

Question 58:

How should the Local Plan address the needs of dwellings to support rural enterprises?

i) Include a policy which sets out the circumstances in which it will be acceptable to build a new home for an employee of a rural based enterprise.

ii) Not include such a policy and rely upon the policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Please provide any comments.

Comment - This area of South Cambridgeshire has a lot of rural based enterprises and a policy that sets the circumstances in which it is acceptable to build new homes in the countryside to fulfil this requirement should be developed, however it should not be too dissimilar from the one for high quality countryside dwellings, ie that these be judged on their merits and the high quality of their design as might be outlined within the local design statements and design guide.

Chapter10

Question 59:

The Local Plan needs to aim to meet in full the forecast employment growth in South Cambridgeshire depending on the option selected (at question 3), by providing a supply and range of employment sites over the Plan period.

Should employment provision be planned for:

Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and densification on the Cambridge Science Park?

On new allocations on the edge of Cambridge which have previously been designated Green Belt (See identified broad locations in Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy)

Both Option i and Option ii

Neither Option i or Option ii

Please provide any comments.

Comment - Employment provision in Cambridge and around should be by a combination of the options, however there is a wish to see some of this provision made within the villages as well, especially Cottenham.

Question 60:

A: Should the existing employment allocations where development is partially complete be carried forward into the Local Plan?

B: Should the existing employment allocation North of Hattons Road, Longstanton be carried forward into the Local Plan?

C: Are there any other areas that should be allocated in the Local Plan for employment?

Please provide details, including a map.

60 – #

Question 61:

A: Should the Council consider issuing Local Development Orders to help speed up employment development?

B: If so, where?

61 – #

Question 62:

What approach do you think the Local Plan should take to the Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises policy?:

i. Retain the current policy approach to encourage high tech research and development but offices, light industry and warehousing being small scale local provision only.

ii. Retain the policy in its current form for specified areas:

Cambridge Science Park

Granta Park

Babraham Institute

Wellcome Trust

Melbourn Science Park

North West Cambridge (University)

iii. Amend the policy to allow for large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters to locate to South Cambridgeshire.

iv. Remove the policy apart from the restriction on large-scale warehousing and distribution.

v. Remove the policy entirely.

Cottenham Village Design Group

Page 23 of 34.

Please provide any comments.

Comment – The Cottenham Village Design Group are not aligned to any industrial or commercial sectors but the retention of an existing policy seeking the creation of low intensity high value employment would seem to align with the general employment trend of the area. It should be noted that it is a wish to see some of this employment creation centred on Cottenham directly.

Question 63:

*Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy supporting the development of clusters?
Please provide any additional comments.*

Support – Yes.

Question 64:

*Should the Local Plan seek shared social spaces on or near employment parks?
Please provide any additional comments.*

Support – Yes; especially if the creation of this sort of facility can be used to supplement the provision of existing social and sports facility of the local area.

Question 65:

*Do you think that the Local Plan should include a policy seeking provision for broadband infrastructure in new developments?
Please provide any comments.*

Support – Yes; this is important for the local economy and would allow effective homeworking.

Question 66:

*A: Should development within established employment areas in the countryside be allowed?
B: Should additional areas (both around 10 hectares), be included at –
Eternit UK site between Meldreth and Whaddon;
Barrington Cement Works (area of existing and former buildings)
Please provide any comments.*

66 – #

Question 67:

What approach should the Local Plan take to the scale of employment development in villages?

Continue to restrict to small scale development (employing 25 people) and the size limitations: Offices (B1a): 400 m², High tech / R & D (B1b): 725 m², Light Industry (B1c):800sq m², General Industry (B2):850 m², Warehousing (B8):1,250 m².

A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category, character and function of the settlement.

Please provide any comments.

Comment – A more flexible approach should be taken in the policy in that it should be towards employment creation being in keeping with the scale and character of the area, this may prove to be more successful rather than by the setting of arbitrary limits.

Question 68:

A: What approach should the Local Plan take to employment development on the edges of villages?

Flexibility to utilise previously developed land adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of any villages.

Flexibility to utilise green-field land adjoining, and logically related to the built form of the settlement of Rural, Minor Rural Centres [and Better Served Group villages if added as a new category of village – see question 13].

Please provide any comments

B: Should applicants be required to demonstrate there is a lack of suitable buildings and sites within the settlement?

A – Comment - A flexibility to use land adjoining a settlement would be useful. Any employment generating sites should have good communication and transport links to the settlements whose employment needs they should ideally serve.

B – Comment - Whilst it might be important to allow for the creation of employment generating land it should be the policy of the Local Plan to promote the use and reuse of existing sites in preference to these.

Question 69:

What approach should be taken to extension of existing businesses in the countryside?

continue to apply a generally restrictive approach, where proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances; or

support expansion of existing firms where schemes are of an appropriate scale, do not have an adverse effect in terms of character and amenity, and can be justified through submission of a business case.

Please provide any comments.

69 – Option ii, where individual applications are judged on their merits.

Question 70:

A: Should the Local Plan continue to prioritise employment uses for rural buildings where traffic generation is not a problem?

B: Should the Local Plan support extensions where they enhance the design and are not out of scale and character with the location.

Please provide any comments.

A - Comment – Yes; any judgement on the reuse of existing buildings should be towards their suitability in terms of location to existing settlements.

B – Comment - Yes

Question 71:

Do you consider that the Local Plan should continue to support farm diversification?

Please provide any comments.

Comment – Yes.

Question 72:

A: Should the Local Plan continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses: in villages only;

include areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages.

Please provide any comments

B: Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed tests in Issue 72 for determining when alternative use of an employment site should be permitted?

B - Comment – Applications should be judged on their merits, in this respect buildings and sites no longer fit for purpose should be judged in a different light to those applications elsewhere.

Question 73:

A: Should appropriately scaled development for visitor and holiday accommodation in villages, and the conversion or redevelopment of rural buildings in the countryside be supported?

B: Should the Local Plan provide greater flexibility for new visitor accommodation by allowing redevelopment of any previously developed land in the countryside for small scale holiday and visitor accommodation?

Please provide any comments.

73 – #

Question 74:

A: Should the Local Plan contain a policy supporting the development of appropriate tourist facilities and visitor attractions?

B: Could these be located in the countryside?

Please provide any comments.

74 – #

Question 75:

Where should new retail and service provision occur?

New retail provision and main town centre uses should be in scale with the position of the centre in the retail hierarchy as follows:

Town centres: Northstowe;

Rural Centres village centres;

All other villages.

New facilities should be provided differently – if so, how?

Please provide any comments.

Comment – As option i.

Question 76:

What should be the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments are required?

2500m² - large superstore

500m² - village scale supermarket

250m² - typical village shop

Please provide any comments.

76 – #

Question 77:

Should the Informal Planning Policy Guidance on foodstore provision in North West Cambridge be reflected in the new Local Plan?

Please provide any comments?

77 – #

Question 78:

Do you think that the Local Plan should support development of new or improved village shops and local services of an appropriate size related to the scale and function of the village?

Please provide any comments.

Support - Yes; the increase and protection of existing provision is especially important to the Cottenham Village Design Group. It should be expected that any new developments should be able to link into the existing retail core with good pedestrian connections etc and that the Local Plan should assist with the development of these existing retail areas to maintain their viability and importance to village life.

Question 79:

Do you think that retail development in the countryside should be restricted?

As described.

To include additional facilities.

Please provide any comments.

Comment – Yes.

Chapter 11

Question 80:

A: Should the Local Plan continue to seek Health Impact Assessments (HIA) to accompany major development proposals?

B: Should the threshold when HIA are required:

Remain at 20 or more dwellings or 1,000m² floorspace; or

Be raised to 100 or more dwellings, or 5,000m² floorspace.

Please provide any additional comments.

80 – #

Question 81:

A: Should the Local Plan seek to continue to protect where possible local services and facilities such as village shops, pubs, post offices, libraries, community meeting places, health centres or leisure facilities?

B: Are there any other services and facilities that should be included?

Please provide any comments?

C: Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed and stringent tests proposed in Issue 81 for determining when an alternative use should be permitted?

D: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?

Please provide any additional comments.

81 – A – Support - Yes; local service provision is key to maintaining the viability of the rural centres etc as self contained communities.

Question 82:

A: Do you agree with the principles of service provision in Issue 82?

B: If not, why not? What alternative issues do you think should be included?

Please provide any additional comments.

A – Support - Yes; the most important being the timely provision of supporting services such as health, retail and transport.

Question 83:

A: Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan review?

B: If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?

C: If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?

D: Is there a need for any other sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities that should be considered through the Local Plan review?

E: If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?

If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?

Please provide any additional comments.

83 – #

Question 84:

A: Is there a need for a community stadium?

B: If there is a need, what type and size of facility should it be, and where is the most appropriate location?

Please provide any additional comments.

84 – #

Question 85:

A: Is there a need for an ice rink in or near to Cambridge?

B: If there is a need, where should it be located?

Please provide any additional comments.

85 – #

Question 86:

A: Is there a need for a concert hall in or near to Cambridge?

B: If there is a need, where should it be located?

Please provide any additional comments.

86 – #

Question 87:

A: Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy for open space provision?

B: Do you agree with the standards of provision listed in Issue 87 that is similar to the current adopted policy?

C: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?

Please provide any additional comments.

Comment – Adequate Open Space is an important consideration in new developments but this should be considered in light of the developments impact on the surrounding area.

Question 88:

A: Should major new housing developments include provision of allotments?

B: Do you agree with the standard of provision proposed in Issue 88?

C: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?

Please provide any additional comments.

A - Comment – Provision of allotments is a good aim, however provision should be made for the good of the village etc as well as the new development, and in this respect agreement in their siting may serve as an obstruction to the development.

Question 89:

A: Do you agree the thresholds for when on-site open space will be required in new developments?

B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?

Please provide any additional comments.

A – Comment - Yes; the provision of open space is generally agreed as important as well as the provision of play space and allotments, however what needs to happen is for the location of these to be better considered such that they can also serve the local populace.

Question 90:

A: Should the Local Plan carry forward the existing allocations for recreation and open space?

B: Are there other areas that should be allocated?

Please explain your reasons in relation to any particular sites.

Please provide any additional comments.

90 – #

Question 91:

A: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect existing playing fields and recreation facilities?

B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included.

Please provide any additional comments.

Comment – Yes; however there should be provision to allow them to be reviewed such that other more beneficial schemes can be delivered for the good of the local area.

Question 92:

A: Should the Local Plan include a policy for indoor community space provision?

B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?

Please provide any additional comments.

92 – #

Question 93:

A: Should the Local Plan include policies dealing with lighting, noise, and odour issues?

B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?

93 – #

Question 94:

A: Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking appropriate investigation and remediation of contaminated land?

B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included? Please provide any additional comments.

A – Comment - Yes.

Question 95:

A: Should the Local Plan include a policy dealing with air quality?

B: If not, why not? What alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included? Please provide any additional comments.

95 – #

Question 96:

A: Should the Local Plan include a requirement for Low Emissions Strategies?

B: If not, why not? What alternative policy or approach do you think should be included?

96 – #

Chapter 12

Question 97:

Should the Local Plan include the principles regarding sustainable travel in outlined in Issue 97, and are there any additional issues that should be included?

Please provide any comments

Comment – Yes; the Cottenham Village Design Group supports the creation of coordinated transport networks such that access to employment and retail areas is as easy as it can be.

Question 98:

A: Should the Local Plan continue to require 'major developments' to produce a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, as well as smaller developments with particular transport implications?

B: Should an alternative threshold be used, if so what, and why? Please provide any comments.

98 – #

Question 99:

A: What approach should the Local Plan take towards residential car parking standards? (note – all options are subject to achieving appropriate highway safety)

Maximum parking standards - an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, up to a maximum of 2 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.

Maximum parking standards - an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling for developments on the edge of Cambridge, but increase to an average of 2 spaces per dwelling across the remainder of district, with an average of 2.5 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.

Remove all car parking standards and adopt a design-led approach to car parking provision in new developments.

Please provide any comments.

B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?

99 – #

Question 100:

A: What approach should the Local Plan take to the allocation of car parking spaces in residential developments?

The Local Plan should maximise the efficiency of car parking provision by not allocating any residential car parking to individual properties.

The Local Plan should only allocate a proportion of the car parking spaces to individual properties.

The Local Plan should not address the allocation of parking spaces, and it should be left to the design of individual developments.

Please provide any comments.

B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?

100 – #

Question 101:

What approach should the Local Plan take to residential garages?

Specify minimum size dimensions for garages to count towards parking standards, to ensure they are large enough to easily accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs; or

Not address the issue of residential garage sizes.

Please provide any comments.

101 – #

Question 102:

Should the Local Plan carry forward the maximum parking standards for non-residential development included in its existing plan?

Please provide additional comments.

102 – #

Question 103:

A: What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards?

Retain the current minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development.

Continue to set minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development, but develop new higher levels of provision.

Remove cycle parking standards, but include a policy requiring cycle parking provision, adopting a design-led approach

Please provide any comments.

B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?

103 – #

Question 104:

A: Should the Local Plan continue to protect rail freight interchange sites?

*B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

104 – #

Question 105:

A: Should the Local Plan continue to include a criteria-based policy for assessing and mitigating the impact of aviation related development proposals?

*B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

105 – #

Question 106:

A: Should the Local Plan include a policy that would only permit aviation development at Cambridge Airport where it would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity?

*B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

106 – #

Question 107:

A: Should the Local Plan include a policy to require development to provide appropriate infrastructure?

*B: Are there any alternative policies or approaches do you think should be included?
Please provide any comments.*

107 – #

Chapter 13 –

Question 108:

What approach should the Local Plan take to Cambridge Airport?

Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East.

Safeguard the site for development after 2031 or through a review of the Local Plan.

Return the whole site to the Green Belt or just the parts of the site which are open

Please provide any comments.

108 – #

Question 109:

What approach should the Council take to the potential for housing development on land North of Newmarket Road at Cambridge East? Should the Council:

Conclude that development cannot be relied on and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport?

Rely upon the policies of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan to determine any planning applications for development?

Include a new policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development?

Please provide any comments.

109 – #

Question 110:

What do you think are the key principles for the development of Cambridge Northern Fringe East?

Do you agree with our vision for the area?

Have we identified the right key principles for development?

What sites should be included in the boundary of the area?

Please provide any comments.

110 – #

Question 111:

What should the Papworth Hospital site be used for when the hospital relocates to Addenbrooke's?

A preference for continuation of healthcare on the site, and only if a suitable user cannot be found, other employment uses compatible with adjoining residential;

Employment uses that would be compatible with adjoining residential;

Housing led development, including mixed uses.

Please provide any comments.

111 – #

Question 112:

How can we best invigorate Papworth Everard?

Should the Local Plan include a specific policy to seek mixed-use development with community uses, employment and housing development?

Or should we not include a policy and deal with individual site proposals on their merits?

Please provide any comments.

112 – #

Question 113:

What approach should the Local Plan take to the Fen Drayton LSA Area?

Continue to support the redevelopment of existing buildings on the former Fen Drayton LSA site to support on-site experimental or other forms of sustainable living?

How do you think the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve?

Please provide any comments.

113 – #

Question 114:

Do you consider that if the Local Plan retains limits on the scale of extensions to existing dwellings or the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside, a different approach should be taken in the former Great Abington Land Settlement Association area to provide greater flexibility?

Please provide any comments.

(See also Issues 51 and 52.)

114 – #

Question 115:

Cottenham Village Design Group

*Should the Local Plan continue to restrict residential development south of the A1307 at Linton?
Please provide any comments.*

115 – #

Question 116:

*Should the Local Plan maintain the approach to development at the Imperial War Museum at Duxford, that it must be associated with the continued use of the site as a museum of aviation and modern conflict?
Please provide any comments.*

116 - #

Document viewed and comments prepared on behalf of Cottenham Village Design Group by Alex Darby, Steven Poole, Alex Thoukydides, John Williams and Mike Smith, September 28th 2012. Cottenham Village Design Statement, Supplementary Planning Document: <http://www.cvdg.org/design-statement-2007.pdf>