

CHAPTER 8 PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<p>QUESTION 30: Landscape character</p> <p>Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape?</p> <p>Support:53 Object: 6 Comment: 11</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes sense • Crucial if Vision is to be achieved • Support from 24 Parish Councils for policy • Retain character of area – this is why people chose to live here. Developments must add to landscape not detract from it. • Should reflect distinctive landscapes in design guides to highlight individual character of areas • Threat to landscape from development which planning has little control over – wind farms and new highways – difficult to blend into ancient landscape and development pressures resulting from buoyant Cambridge economy. • Particular account should be taken of distant views of any development and provision of trees and hedgerows • Must be clear what we are trying to protect/ enhance. • Best way to enhance landscape is NOT to build on it- use it for farming and woodland. • Countryside surrounding Cambridge vitally important to City residents. East Chesterton relies on open space outside of local area. • Landscape around Denny Abbey vital to character of area – once destroyed gone forever. • Woodland Trust – need to protect existing assets like ancient woodlands and trees plus create new habitats which buffer and extend ancient areas. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a matter for design principles • Present appearance result of laissez faire over time. Heavy handed interference would not be good or enjoy public support. • Same results can be achieved by other regulations • Not all development can reflect and enhance character – should exempt renewable energy projects and especially wind energy • When everyone is built on too late to consider landscape <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – County Council’s Cambridgeshire Landscape Character Guidance should be updated – Avoid Breckland type character invading. Need to retain distinctiveness of our local areas. – combining historic landscapes, biodiversity and rural

	<p>settlement data. Use Landscape East's more detailed East of England Landscape Typology. Landscape Institute's Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be followed for larger developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan must do better than hill created between Landbeach and Waterbeach where new recycling plant has been built which is not respectful of flat Fenland landscape. • Plan must balance need for development and landscape impact. Policy wording must ensure that it does not inadvertently prevent development. • Must identify and protect distinctive features in each local area – features to be identified by Parish Council and SCDC. (Haslingfield PC) • Modern architecture can enhance and integrate into landscape if designed sympathetically. • Natural England supports policy to require development proposals to reflect and enhance character and distinctiveness of landscape, to include recognition of the relevant NCA. A landscape character approach should be used to underpin and guide decisions on development and set out criteria based policies for landscape character areas. New development should build-in and ensure that consideration is given to the wider landscape based on landscape assessment. • Need flexible implementation • Policy should say development to respect landscape character and refer to Design SPD.
<p>QUESTION 31: Agricultural Land</p>	
<p>Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grade 1, 2, and 3a) from unplanned development?</p> <p>Support:66 Object: 1 Comment: 12</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support protection of high grade viable farmland • Support from 24 Parish Councils for policy • Valuable asset especially in future if world food prices rise. Short- sighted if build on it now. • Higher output per hectare on land in East Anglia than rest of Country therefore needs protection • Farming important part of South Cambs way of life, landscape and economy • Protect over brown field sites. • Best agricultural land needed for farming for local and export food market • Protecting high grade land should take priority over development of site in site allocation process • Such areas define separation between villages/ enhance resident's lifestyles. Clear environmental benefits. • Support but need to protect wildlife-rich sites which may be on poorer soil – Need balance to protect agricultural land for farming as well as native wildlife. (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should include requirement for development to fully assess impacts and provide suitable mitigation/ compensation for impacts(Natural England) • Should also recognise development can have major and usually irreversible adverse impact on soils. Mitigation should aim to minimise soil disturbance and retain ecosystem- careful soil management. Soils of high environmental values (wetland soils) should be considered as part of ecological connectivity. (Natural England) • Support but should allow small developments on such land where local need is unable to be met in other ways (Little Abington PC and Great Abington PC) <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, lower grade agricultural land should be developed before brownfield sites where there is opportunity to enhance biodiversity. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3A should be taken more seriously • Support policy so existing and new settlements cannot have new sites added on agricultural land adjoining settlement near end of Plan Period if pressure for more sites. (Cambourne PC) • Impossible to build on edge of Waterbeach without impinging on high value agricultural land • Not possible to build on edge of Cottenham without impinging on high value agricultural land. • Local Plan seems to say development is more sustainable than agriculture • Need to balance needs of a village – if by building on grade 2 land it protects other land that is need for employment uses and has flooding issues – eg in Sawston
<p>QUESTION 32: Biodiversity</p>	
<p>A: The Local Plan needs to protect and enhance biodiversity. Have we identified the right approaches?</p> <p>Support:51 Object: 0 Comment: 10</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible approach • 18 Parish Councils support approach • Essential for quality of life of current and future generations • Requires a higher level of investment • Cambridgeshire County Council - should ensure that mapping of local ecological networks considers wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation (see paragraph 117 of NPPF). Also should be recognition of importance of preserving brownfield sites for nature conservation. While effective use of brownfield land should be encouraged, this should not be at the cost of any high environmental value, e.g. biodiversity or

	<p>geodiversity interest (see paragraph 17 of the NPPF).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should include appropriate diversity • Unique and varied landscape of County / local wildlife and habitats must be protected/ is precious. Core to quality of life of local people (Countryside Restoration Trust) • Need to enforce not just have fine words • Need to include more detail. Need to specify places especially large-scale habitat creation schemes and management regimes and show how they will be funded. • Wildlife Trust - Show priority areas for habitat enhancement on map of Local Plan. Reflect priorities in Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy • Natural England (NE) supports. Recognises requirement, in line with NPPF, for development to minimise negative impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible. NE would welcome policy to address this, along with a requirement for developers to seek to reduce habitat loss and fragmentation. Support update of Biodiversity SPD • Woodland Trust – Extend approach to include sites and individual trees of high biodiversity value. Ancient woods are irreplaceable and changes to nearby land uses can threaten habitat. NPPF recognises value of such woodland but many not designated or listed. Need to have inventory of all woodlands – local designation? <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not overlook value of private gardens as reservoir for wildlife. • Development causes loss of habitat. How can it then maintain/enhance biodiversity? • Need to preserve and establish wildlife corridors • Should be stronger • Middle Level Commissioners - encourage principle of water level management/ flood defences that provide for creation of green infrastructure/ habitat. Maintenance must be considered. Care taken to ensure water level management/flood defence system does not suffer because of biodiversity 'green' issues. Board adopted Biodiversity Action Plan as policy. • Consideration of biodiversity can delay planning process. Policy must be appropriate to biodiversity value of site • Impact on loss of habitat and local biodiversity would present strong case against new town at Waterbeach.
--	---

<p>B: Do you think the Council should retain and update the Biodiversity SPD?</p> <p>Support:41 Object: 2 Comment:3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should retain and update regularly (every 5 years). – CPPF; CPRE; National Trust(NT) • Support from 14 Parish Councils • Nature enhancement areas need to be widened and base on detailed research of wildlife – CPPF. • Need to protect all wildlife not concentrate on few species • Need to enforce it. • May need to strengthen SPD to reflect changes in Planning System and reduced availability of funding. Local Plan may not be able to demonstrate sustainable development if do not strengthen wording. - NT • Council should work with parish councils and partner organisations • Conflict between maximising agricultural land and improving biodiversity <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection from Litlington and Steeple Morden Parish Councils
<p>QUESTION 33: Green Infrastructure</p>	
<p>A. Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure?</p> <p>Support:69 Object: 4 Comment: 9</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter to Six Quadrant vision document supports protection of natural and historic landscape including recommendations for implementation in area of four villages • 24 Parish Councils support policy • More green initiatives • Developers should be made to finish amenities that are part of planning consents. • New development must be sympathetic and integrate into green environment. Install early so flourishing by time new residents move in. • Developers must be responsible for effect they have on environment. • South Cambs is rural district. Development must include green infrastructure to make this best place to live and to balance addition of more concrete to area. • Cambridge City Council pleased to see reference to projects within Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011 • Better recognition needed to large scale green spaces – country parks, large reserves open to public • Support from developers requiring them to contribute to Green Infrastructure when developing sites especially in Broad Location areas. • Requirement important aspect of sustainable development – addresses core principles of NPPF

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to implement Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. Need funding from developers in absence of central Government funds. • Crucial to delivery of the Vision. • Green infrastructure provides space for biodiversity and for people – is essential. Bar Hill good example. • Could give residents of Cottenham better access to surrounding countryside – better quality of life. • Need for flexibility in policy • Not to be applied to brownfield development. • Need for more trees as this is least wooded county in England. Woods have wide range of benefits. • Include footpaths to access open sites • Important function of green infrastructure is giving opportunity to access to open space- Natural England’s ‘standards for accessible natural greenspace (ANGSt) sets benchmark to be used to ensure new and existing residents have access to nature. • Support Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Chalk Rivers project being on list. – The Country Park needs protecting in perpetuity as open space. • Need for creation of network of safe cycle routes. • Countryside around Cambridge vital amenity – particular importance is green corridor formed by River Cam. • Undervalue undeveloped green fields – if build on greenfield must replace equal area somewhere else. • Green infrastructure target areas must be in Local Plan and shown on appropriate map and listed as infrastructure eligible for CIL funding. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reasonable to require all new development to contribute to green infrastructure. District already benefits from network of green spaces. Some proposals will not have adverse impact on or create additional demand for green infrastructure. • Will make smaller and brownfield schemes unviable. • This favours applications on open land as it is easier to so called mitigation to be applied even though more damage to environment will occur. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter to Six group suggest more recreational/leisure role for Green Belt on western edge of Cambridge. Development at Broad Location 1 could contribute to green infrastructure – wildlife reserve/ Country Park/ green corridors retained in area.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No maps included in consultation setting out strategic green infrastructure. Hunts DC has chosen to map such areas. If these areas extend beyond boundaries into S Cambs need to co-operate on this further. • Development reduces green infrastructure – land is finite resource • Need for specific policy in Local Plan for Rights of Way (RoW). Need to retain and enhance network. Major developments should contribute to new routes. • How would this be implemented? Another tax on development? • Need to ensure that increased access to countryside does not adversely affect sites particularly ones protected for biodiversity.
<p>B. Are there other new Green Infrastructure projects that should be added?</p> <p>Representations: 23</p>	<p>SUGGESTED NEW GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guided Busway popular cycle path. Could create additional links to villages to each other and Cambridge. E.g. Cambourne to Coton via Caldecote and Hardwick / Madingley to Cambridge NW site. • Should refer to opportunities for Green Infrastructure (GI) in North West Cambridge at NIAB2 and University site. • Cambridge Past Present and Future (CPPF) - Wandlebury and Coton estate need resources for management; and land south of Balsham owned by CPPF they wish in future to plant woodland for public recreation • Rights of Way should be included as GI project • Recommend new Local Plan includes a specific policy for Rights of Way • Add to GI list Wandlebury, Wimpole Hall estate, Ditton Meadows, Shepreth L-moor, the Roman Road and an off-road link north through to Cherry Hinton Road, links from Nine Wells to the Gog Magog Trust reserve and through Babraham woodlands • If large scale development at Waterbeach should have priority for RoW and GI as deficit of provision in area. • Need to include in ‘Woodland linkages’ scheme in GI list Gamlingay Wood, Sugley Wood, Potton Wood (Beds), Waresley Wood, and Hayley Wood must be a priority for the west of the district. • Green corridors within developments and connecting to local areas. Create wildlife corridors. • Include Milton Country Park <p>COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Nature Partnership and GI Forum should be contacted to discuss potential new projects

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for Blue Infrastructure Strategy for SCDC, Cambridge City, Cambridgeshire County Council and stakeholders for waterways in area. • Many opportunities lose when more houses crammed into villages- need to do more to protect small scale sites without need to travel. • Planning Policies for strategic GI sites can cross local authority boundaries (eg. Wicken Vision). The Local Plan needs to set out clearly how Local Authority will work jointly with relevant other local authorities and organisations to achieve biodiversity and recreational objectives for these areas. Otherwise implementation and sustainability balance of the overall Plan strategy will be questionable.
<p>QUESTION 34: Impact of Development on the Green Belt</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Support:97 Object:3 Comment: 11</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes - so all applications are integrated and blend in with surroundings. • Support from 23 Parish Councils • Any development MUST be required to mitigate its impact on rural character • Need to clarify meaning of ‘unacceptable impact’ if it means anything more than a belt of planting along countryside frontages • Don’t build on the green belt at all – CPRE • Quarter To Six Quadrant vision document fully supports the protection and development of landscape, agriculture, biodiversity, green infrastructure, green space, community orchards and woodland, the Cam, and heritage assets, and makes recommendations in the area around the four villages.(Barton; Coton; Madingley and Grantchester) • Mitigate impact of large buildings by early planting of shelter belts of native trees. – CPPF • Concern that maximising housing numbers within footprint of Ida Darwin site will overdevelop this Green Belt site – Fulbourn Forum • Support especially in relation to Fulbourn and surrounding countryside <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst Cambridge City Council supports inclusion of policies, it is considered that explicit reference should be made to the purposes of Cambridge Green Belt. Also consider that insufficient account has been given to interface between urban and rural and setting of Cambridge and the South Cambs villages. In addition to policy covering important village frontages, it is important to conserve and enhance the landscape setting of the urban fringes, including sites within South

	<p>Cambs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not support further development in Green Belt No additional policy is needed – should be covered in design policies and NPPF <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Unacceptable' difficult to define. Need for housing great therefore compromise must be reached Planting a shelter belt would make development in green belt acceptable? Need design schemes that consider wider context rather than just hiding development. Cannot hide large developments Green belt should not be used for sports pitches Development can take place up to the edge of the Green Belt. However, need sensitive measures to soften transition. E.g. Allowing only low-rise buildings near boundary, tree planting, or a strip of grassland. Local Plan should follow NPPF requirements and detailed guidance to ensure adverse effects on natural environs are minimized – Natural England
<p>QUESTION 35: Redevelopment in the Green Belt</p>	
<p>Regarding infilling on, or complete redevelopment of, previously developed sites in the Green Belt should the Local Plan :</p> <p>i Rely on National Planning Policy Framework guidance for determining planning applications?</p> <p>Support:4 Object:4 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support – Cambridge University; Litlington Parish Council <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPPF always the most wishy washy line – not enough for local situation <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPPF most appropriate
<p>Regarding infilling on, or complete redevelopment of, previously developed sites in the Green Belt should the Local Plan :</p> <p>ii Include more detailed guidance regarding design, such as scale and height of development?</p> <p>Support:47 Object: 0 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to include consultation with local community beforehand. Local issues need local solutions Support from 15 Parish Councils Need for different guidance for different places Need to allow flexibility to allow innovative solutions for re-use of land Need to ensure any development is of high quality Could include guidance in Design Guide SPD Guidance should encourage use of other sites <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ensure developments are sympathetic. Need to protect Green Belt for future generations

<p>Regarding infilling on, or complete redevelopment of, previously developed sites in the Green Belt should the Local Plan :</p> <p>Please provide comments</p> <p>Support:3 Object: 0 Comment: 11</p>	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can only be approached on a site by site basis • Quarter-To-Six Quadrant vision document fully supports the protection and development of landscape, agriculture, biodiversity, green infrastructure, green space, community orchards and woodland, the Cam, and heritage assets, and makes recommendations as to how this could be implemented in the area around the four villages (Barton, Coton, Madingley and Grantchester) • Detailed guidance may not be acceptable given tenor of NPPF • Any further policy requirements that go beyond NPPF should be included in Local Plan • Include more detailed guidance to ensure adverse effects on natural environment are minimized (Natural England) • Should have strong reference to the parish councils and residents associations which are currently often ignored. • Need corresponding relaxation of rural policies to allow conversion of existing buildings within green belt
<p>QUESTION 36: Green Belt and Recreation Uses</p>	
<p>Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring the cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreational 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?</p> <p>Support:38 Object: 9 Comment: 8</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although in some instances sport pitches and recreation areas can provide a soft transition between urban and rural areas • Support from 19 Parish Councils • Policy essential to ensure well- spread and easily accessible sports pitches • Over-concentration of recreational activities will lead to urban rather than rural character – not normal ‘green’ landscape • Over- concentration will have impact on biodiversity, landscape and designated sites such as SSSI and County Wildlife Sties • Each village should have its own pitches – more sustainable. Reduce driving miles for training and problems of parking e.g. Milton. • Quarter-To-Six Quadrant vision document fully supports the protection and development of landscape, agriculture, biodiversity, green infrastructure, green space, community orchards and woodland, the Cam, and heritage assets, and makes recommendations as to how this could be implemented in the area around the four villages (Barton, Coton, Madingley and Grantchester) • Sports grounds in Green Belt should be resisted unless they involve virtually no infrastructure. • Unfortunately sports grounds tend to breed car parks, floodlights, astroturf, pavilions, fencing etc. Increased traffic and noise

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danger of being too prescriptive to detriment of local opportunities • Objections to policy from two Parish Councils – Fen Ditton and Papworth Everard • Controlling cumulative impact should not be specific policy – like other developments this should be considered on its merits and impact • There is a shortage within the district. Perhaps the University could be encouraged to make its facilities more widely available to the general public <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited sports facilities available in Cambridge area. Unlikely any area will suffer from over-concentration of public sports facilities. Should restrict large commercial leisure centres and University owned facilities unless they share with local community • Sufficient sports grounds in Haslingfield – if demand for more facilities local authority should approach colleges about sharing sports grounds. • Review of Green Belt for high value areas and totally protect these. • NPPF policies on issues of openness and rural character would be sufficient to deal with issue? • More sustainable to co-locate sports facilities in one place rather than distribute them? • Wherever possible sports amenities and playing fields should be within housing developments
<p>QUESTION 37: Protected Village Amenity Areas</p>	
<p>A: Should the existing policy for Protected Village Amenity Areas be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p>Support:99 Object: 2 Comment: 7</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting retention of policy • 26 Parish Councils support • Green rural feel of villages needs to be retained. • Shortage of open space in villages. • Best villages are those that have retained green space within village E.g. Thriplow • Once lost PVAA cannot be replaced. Losing ‘family silver’. • New sites should be considered especially in villages that are growing to create new spaces for local people to enjoy. • Need to be able to designate new sites which come to light through localism agenda. • Village greens, orchards, recreation grounds, footpaths and bridleways should be automatically protected. • Need clarification in policy as to what development is considered acceptable within PVAA. • Policy confusing as it both opposes and permits development. Hard to understand why some land

	<p>is in PVAA especially if land is inaccessible to public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should be drafted so in exceptional circumstances PVAA could be amended in the life of the new Local Plan to allow for very limited development. • Criteria should be clear so village knows what protected amenities are. If village does Neighbourhood Plan can conform to Local Plan. • New areas in Great Chishill. • Support retention of PVAAs in following villages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pamisford - Great Abington and Little Abington - Caldecote - Haslingfield - Toft - Sawston - Bassingbourn <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PVAA is superfluous designation not supported by NPPF. Duplicated policy designations where Conservation Areas of Local Green Space designation would be more suitable. Restricts development in sustainable locations which could meet local housing need. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove PVAA policy since changes to national and regional planning policy. Policy restricts development opportunities in settlements particularly windfall sites. • If policy to be retained must review all existing PVAAs since some lost reason for original designation and new sites should be designated. • Having both PVAAs and Local Green Space which are similar designations could lead to overly complicated, onerous Local Plan. • Policy should not exclude community development if no other site can be found e.g. village hall.
<p>B: Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing PVAAs in villages (as shown on the Proposals Map) that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.</p> <p>Support: 15 Object: 1 Comment: 46</p> <p>Representations: 62</p>	<p>SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL NEW PVAAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn - New PVAAs (and/or Local Green Space) should be established on the play area and open space in Elbourn Way • Bassingbourn - on the play area and open space in Fortune Way and • Bassingbourn - on the highway and highway margins in Spring Lane between the extremity of existing housing development and the junction with the by-way at Ashwell Street. • Bassingbourn – Land between Spring Lane and South End. • Bassingbourn - A new PVAA should be established on The Rouses. • Gamlingay Parish suggesting outlying hamlets be included in policy - Dennis Green, The Cinques,

	<p>Mill Hill, Little Heath, The Heath which are considered as important to our rural character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford - Parts of the green belt which form frontages in the village such as at Rectory Farm, Church Street, Great Shelford included. • Fulbourn - Small parcel of land between the Townley Hall at the Fulbourn Centre and the access road to the same, and fronting Home End, should be given PVAA status. • Fulbourn - the field between Cox's Drove, Cow Lane and the railway line - as well as the associated low-lying area on Cow Lane adjacent to the Horse Pond. • Fulbourn - two fields between Fulbourn Old Drift, Hinton Road and Cambridge Road. • Fulbourn - land between the Ida Darwin site and Teversham Road • Haslingfield - Wellhouse Meadow • Haslingfield - Recreation Ground as LGSA • Haslingfield - small but significant area of land including a public bridleway along the bank of the River Cam (Rhee) ; • Haslingfield Parish also includes part of Byron's Pool , a popular riverside location accessed from Grantchester • Ickleton - part of Back Lane • Pampisford - Challis Garden, now controlled by the Challis Trust and the Spike (controlled by Towgood's Charity) are proposed as additions to the existing list. • Over – Re-designate site at Station Road/Turn Lane which was once PVAA • Over – Willingham Rd- west of Mill Road • Steeple Morden - The Recreation Ground, Hay Street • Steeple Morden- The Cowslip Meadow, • Steeple Morden - The Ransom Strip, Craft Way, <p>SUGGESTED REMOVAL OF EXISTING PVAAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duxford – Remove land at end of Manger’s Lane • Guilden Morden – 36 Dubbs Knoll Road –land needs to be taken out of PVAA • Little Abington – Remove PVAA on meadow surrounded by residential development and Bancroft Farm. • Over - land to the rear of The Lanes should be removed from PVAA. <p>COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owners and developers will want to develop land to make money, not to benefit community. Must be not be allowed. Takes value from everyone else.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to Comberton Parish PVAAs should be derived from a current/future Village Plan • Need to consult local people if designating PVAAs. Landowners should be warned and consulted. • Local Plan should support development of new or improved open space for Caldecote.
QUESTION 38: LOCAL GREEN SPACE	
<p>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?</p> <p>Support:65 Object: 3 Comment: 35</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to preserve local green space close to local community. Valued by locals and vulnerable to development • 20 Parish Council support idea • Policy should include important flood plains as identified by village communities and 'greenways' between villages. • Should include both large and small spaces and sites in private ownership that can contribute to setting of village (CPPF). • Large areas such as country parks and nature reserves should be listed with robust criteria and clear policy for LGS • Areas of historic importance which are privately owned fields, such as ridge and furrow fields and ricking fields should be automatically protected from development • Presume it can include land owned by SCDC • Cambridge City Council suggests that it is important to work together with SCDC on LGS designation as new policy and need to establish similar approach to cross boundary green spaces • When LGS are designated need to consult with local people including land owner for each village • Changes to the current Comberton LGS should be derived from any current/future Village Plan. • Should be no net loss in green spaces and plan should be flexible to allow for adjustments in future. • There are areas in Great Chishill which would benefit from being designated PVAA, LGS or ICF's • Important to protect green area around edge of village envelope and also sports pitches. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGS should be a matter determined by each community locally, and it should not be for the Local Plan to identify these. • Object to LGS being alongside existing PVAA policy – unnecessary duplication. Local Plan should align with NPPF • LGS designation will be not appropriate for most open space according to NPPF. Sets out strict criteria. PVAAs do not meet definition for designation.

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessary outside planning frameworks because there is no presumption in favour of development in those places • Should not include private open space as LGS • Each site should be thoroughly assessed. • National Trust interested in working with local communities to achieve LGS where they are close to Wicken Vision area. <p>SUGGESTED AREAS TO BE IDENTIFIED AS LGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn - on the highway and highway margins in the southern half of Spring Lane • Bassingbourn - The Rouses between South End and Spring Lane. • Caldecote – Recreation sports field off Furlong Way • Cambourne – Large areas within the village and around the edge. • Coton Countryside Reserve • Cottenham – All open space as identified in Cottenham Village Design Statement • Fulbourn – Land between Townley Hall at the Fulbourn Centre and the access road to the same, and fronting Home End • Fulbourn - Two fields between Fulbourn Old Drift, Hinton Road and Cambridge Road. • Fulbourn - Field between Cox's Drove, Cow Lane and the railway line • Fen Ditton - linkage of Wicken Fen along disused railway for green access and green corridor • Foxton -Foxton Recreation ground • Foxton - The Green • Foxton - The Dovecote meadow • Foxton - The green area on Station Road in front of, and beside, the Press cottages • Great Abington – Current allotments if land is released for housing along Linton Road. • Great Eversden - Field between Walnut Tree Cottage and the Homestead, Church Street • Great Shelford - Grange field in Church Street; • Great Shelford - Land between Rectory Farm and 28 Church Street • Haslingfield – Wellhouse meadow • Haslingfield – Recreation Ground • Haslingfield - A small but significant area of land including a public bridleway along the bank of the River Cam (Rhee). • Haslingfield – Byron's Pool - popular riverside location accessed from Grantchester. • Ickleton – Village Green • Ickleton – Part of Back Lane • Litlington - Recreation Ground,
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Litlington - Village Green • Litlington - St Peter's Hill • Milton – Field opposite Tesco Milton beside the Jane Coston Bridge • Milton - Long strip beside Fen Road, Milton on the left including trees and grazing. • Milton - The spinney running perpendicular to Fen Road to the North. • Papworth Everard - Wood behind Pendragon Hill • Papworth Everard - Pendragon Primary School Playing fields • Papworth Everard - Village Playing fields and wood at Wood Lane • Papworth Everard - Baron's Way Wood • Papworth Everard - Rectory Woods • Papworth Everard - Jubilee Green • Papworth Everard - Meadow at west end of Church Lane • Papworth Everard - Papworth Hall/ Papworth hospital grounds , South Park and woods at South Park • Papworth Everard - Summer's Hills open space • Wandlebury Country Park • Sawston - Orchard Park, • Sawston - The Spike • Sawston - Mill Lane Recreation Ground • Sawston- Spicer's Playing Field • Sawston - Lynton Way Recreation Ground • Sawston - Bellbird School Playing Field • Sawston Millennium Copse • Sawston – The Spike Playing Field • Toft - Home Meadow, • Toft - the Recreation Ground • Toft - land adjacent to 6 High Great Shelford - Field to the east of the railway line on the southern side of Granhams Road.
QUESTION 39 : Important Countryside Frontages	
<p>Should the existing policy for Important Countryside Frontages be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p>Support:90 Object: 1 Comment: 8</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support existing policy • 21 Parish Councils support the policy • Need to allow time for additions and subtractions to be proposed to policy • Subjective benefits to the views and tranquillity are hard to measure • ICF contributes to variety of perceived landscape. Contribute to feel of village • Vital to quality of life to have frontages giving essential rural character to village E.g. Caldecote – would lose this if Bourn airfield developed. • Need for policy setting out clear criteria for identification of ICF • Changes to the current Comberton ICFs should be

	<p>derived from any current/future Village Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be kept under constant review because landowner can plant trees behind frontage which would destroy amenity trying to protect. • Needs to be matched with a similar policy from the city for villages on the district/city boundary. • Support existing frontages in Litlington, Swavesey, Great and Little Abington, Hinxton and Pampisford. • Support policies that retain rural character of Fulbourn <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For villages to retain their character cannot butt up to another estate. Need space between. • Frontages stop infill development which would destroy village setting. <p>OBJECTIONS TO EXISTING FRONTAGES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fowlmere - Object to current ICF of east boundary of land west of High Street. • Longstanton – Remove ICF due to presence of Northstowe proposal <p>SUGGESTED NEW FRONTAGES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne – a number identified around edge of village • Cottenham – vistas as included in Cottenham Village Design Guide SPD • Fulbourn - The view into the countryside from the end of School Lane and its continuation along Cambridge Road and up Shelford Road. • Fulbourn - The view into the countryside from Church Lane, up through The Chantry and Lanthorn Stile. Land backs onto Station Road and Apthorpe Street. • Fulbourn - Agricultural land plus the trees and hedges around the Fulbourn windmill • Gamlingay has many outlying hamlets such as Dennis Green, The Cinques, and the Heath which are part of the local character. The village frontage policy should be extended to these hamlets as well as to Gamlingay village, to ensure that the local character is not destroyed by infilling between these hamlets. • Great Eversden – north side of Church Street between the Hoops and the church • Great Shelford - southern side of Granhams Road hill • Guilden Morden - open views of the countryside that extend north-west from Dubbs Knoll Road • Guilden Morden – opposite 38-44 Dubbs Knoll Road • Over - Longstanton Road, • Over - Willingham Road/Mill Road • Over - New Road/Station Road
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Cam corridor • Sawston - The frontage between Sawston Hall Grounds and open countryside should be protected
QUESTION 40: Community Orchards and Allotments	
<p>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?</p> <p>Support:74 Object: 0 Comment: 2</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports new areas being created. Existing must be protected. • 20 Parish Councils support policy • Encourage yes. Enforce no. • If left out of Local Plan will imply that they are not valued • Orchards and woodland add to landscape, biodiversity and beauty of area. Improve quality of life of community • Should include traditional old commercial orchards • Need to ensure that wooded areas are managed and looked after – not just left to be nuisance to neighbours. Could set up partnerships between residents in community to maintain trees. • Need to increase woodland cover – many benefits of trees according to Woodland Trust. • Allotments should be catered for based upon needs assessment . • Allotments need water supply and to be close to residential areas • Where existing facilities priority should be to secure financially their future rather than create new separate facilities with increased cost to community • Need to consult with Parish Councils • Where open space is limited local community may have greater need for accessible playgrounds and local recreation grounds • Caldecote – Support development of new or improved open space. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not be funded by District or County Council. Parishes can increase precepts which other levels of government cannot. They best appreciate local wishes. So does this need to form part of Local Plan? <p>SUGGESTED SITES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham - There are small strips of land throughout village which may be considered for community orchards if local residents support.(40508) • Duxford - Land at end of Manger's Lane, Duxford designate for community orchard/ residential mixed use (43670) • Sawston – Existing allotments, community orchard

	and open spaces should be protected
QUESTION 41: River Cam and Other Waterways	
<p>Should a policy be developed for 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?</p> <p>Support:62 Object: 0 Comment: 12</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on success of Chalk Rivers project • Excellent upgrading of river in Trumpington Meadows Country Park- expand work to Rhee. • QTSQ fully supports • 23 Parish Councils support • Conservators of the River Cam support • Need for clearly written policy so cannot be argued with. Would have to be devised in consultation with such bodies as English Nature, the Environment Agency, the boating fraternity and the Cam Conservators. The potential for a clash of interests is high. • Cambridge City Council supports but considers importance of River Cam needs greater acknowledgement. City Council is considering carrying out a water space study. Wish to work with SCDC in development of policies and any accompanying studies. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future supports – Need for detailed river/ waterspace strategy to protect and enhance river Cam and its corridor between Hauxton and Bait's Bite Lock. Need to establish design code to enhance setting of river and adjacent green spaces. Iconic views along and across river must be protected. Strategies too for smaller waterways – flood prevention; wildlife and amenity. • Old Chesterton Residents Association – need for holistic study of river corridor – like Bedford Waterspace study. River suffers from fragmented regulation. Need co-ordination and comprehensive strategy • Environment Agency happy to assist in production of policy • Maintaining waterways essential to prevent flooding – Vital function of waterways. Primary function. • Developments near rivers should not be allowed to destroy existing habitats and increase flooding downstream • Separate joined up policy that will increase protection of the River Cam and the conservation and recreational qualities of Cam and related water habitats/linked streams. • Bringing forward Broad Location 5 will help deliver recreation and biodiversity objectives. • Improve access to waterways for range of leisure purposes, including walking, non-motorised boating and kayak use and wild swimming. (Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary concern should be biodiversity (CPRE; Wildlife Trust) • Clear guidance on types of development permitted, sites and opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. • Recent heavy rainfall shows need for policy • Policy will need to consider size and average flow / dry periods of the water courses selected. • Waterways are for quiet recreation –use of powered craft should be restricted. Upstream of Grantchester no right of way along Cam/Granta/Rhee. • Need to promote use of rivers for tourism • Proposals related to the new station on Chesterton Sidings identified in Cambridge City Local Plan as opening up opportunity for a flood relief channel which could be used to enhance the leisure and recreational values of Ditton meadows - The 'camToo' Project <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wish to avoid footbridge or cycle connections directly from Fen Ditton village or meadows across to Chesterton and the planned Cambridge Science Park station. • Meadows along River Cam are important green spaces - totally opposed to the concept described as "camToo". • Particular concerns for new developments near rivers and brooks. Waterbeach seems sustainable site but expansion should be limited and constructed to protect Cam as well as providing public space for enjoyment. • Rivers at Bourn and Melbourn should be protected. It is easy to focus on these possible developments because they have significant water courses. • Need to protect wildlife • National Trust wants to encourage provision of bridges and crossing points to enhance access to open space. E.g. At Waterbeach – if this site is developed need for new bridge as currently River Cam is barrier for access to Wicken Vision. Also need for upgrading of footpath network to serve local community.
<p>QUESTION 42: Heritage assets</p>	
<p>Taking account of the importance of the heritage asset, should the Local Plan include:</p> <p>i) Individual policies addressing historic landscapes; archaeological</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan should have separate, distinct policies. Each issue is different and a blanket policy would not accord with Central Government advice. • Support from 10 Parish Councils • Vital to have separate policies (CPRE) • If single policy would be less robust, too general – adverse effect on heritage assets

<p>sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas</p> <p>Support:33 Object: 2 Comment: 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPPF requires that historic environment should be addressed in strategic policies (paragraph 156) and these strategic policies will also be relevant to guiding neighbourhood plans. This does not replace the need for a suite of policies for development management. – English Heritage <p>Crucial aspect of NPPF is that plans should contain a clear strategy for enhancing built and historic environment (paragraph 157). Policies for the historic environment should carry forward national policy while reflecting locally important issues and guidance. English Heritage would hope to see both generic and specific issues addressed, including heritage at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site of Denny Abbey and the Farmland museum is unique like other heritage assets in District. Whilst a general policy might define some overall principles each heritage asset needs to be considered separately to create anything really meaningful. – Farmland Museum and Denny Abbey <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single policy better National Trust wants Council to consider policies to protect the setting of heritage assets, including Registered Parks and Gardens through the identification of a settings policy specific to a property. The National Trust site at Wimpole is one such property where this approach could be considered .An example of a Local Plan which contains just such a setting policy is the North Norfolk District Plan which relates to Sheringham Park. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Imperial War Museum at Duxford supports this option. Will help preserve specific character and importance of sites, such as the IWM Duxford Conservation Area, on a focused and case by case basis. Approach adopted should acknowledge desirability of sustaining and enhancing significance of each heritage asset. Finding viable uses, as advocated in paragraph 131 of the NPPF, for example, requires careful consideration and control. Given the high number and wide range of heritage assets within the District, this is more likely to be facilitated by individual policies.
<p>Taking account of the importance of the heritage asset, should the Local Plan include:</p> <p>ii) A single policy regarding</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These issues should be brought together in a single policy to reduce complexity and aid clarity. Support from 5 Parish Councils Blanket policy is simplest given the manpower restriction on detailing individual sites - but long

<p>the protection of all heritage assets</p> <p>Support:14 Object: 4 Comment: 5</p>	<p>term that is desirable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for very detailed policy to be able to consider all heritage assets <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complex , difficult to write and have compromises • Support single policy but this option fails to fully reflect NPPF specifically its aspiration to both conserve and enhance historic environment. Redevelopment that improves heritage asset should be looked on favourably. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan should be concise. Single policy for issues although recognise heritage assets challenging for one policy • Consistent with NPPF. Single policy provides more certainty to property owners as avoids planning policy contradictions • Sounds great but how would it work? • Ok as long as policy does not weaken protection of heritage assets
<p>Taking account of the importance of the heritage asset, should the Local Plan include:</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 0 Comment: 14</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both, there should be an overarching policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets, with each asset having a sub policy that addresses its individual requirements. • One policy that could be added to as necessary <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single policy to conform to NPPF but include all existing policies as is within it. • Many bodies – official and unofficial concerned with protection of heritage asset and their concerns do not always coincide. Need single all-embracing policy to reconcile their respective concerns • English Heritage would like to see historic environment integrated into all relevant parts of the plan as well as in stand-alone policies. Further guidance in the ' Heritage in Local Plans' on English Heritage's website • Current planning procedures cause serious difficulties to individuals needing to maintain heritage sites or buildings e.g. Sawston Hall empty for 10yrs because of planning issues • The Woodland Trust believes that both ancient woodland and ancient trees should be recorded as heritage assets in either a single policy that protects all heritage assets or an individual policy that identifies, protects and encourages expansion/buffering of this irreplaceable asset. • Reasons against possible new town at Waterbeach - need to protect historic assets like Denny Abbey, Waterbeach Abbey and Car Dyke
<p>QUESTION 43: Assets of Local Importance</p>	

<p>A: Do you consider the Local Plan should protect undesignated heritage assets?</p> <p>Support:63 Object: 4 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should be flexible to allow future assets to be added • 18 Parish Councils support policy • SCDC already drawing up a list? Note often a group of buildings contribute to local character. (CPRE) • Need to do district survey • Needs to be asset and site specific • Support but manpower restrictions may mean not a top priority • Where local communities designate asset or create a Community Asset Register need protection • If undesignated assets are identified need to follow guidance set out by English Heritage in its "Good Practice Guide for Local Heritage Listing"(May 2012). This requires owners of affected buildings to be consulted in advance of identification being made. • Not all ancient woodlands and ancient trees are recorded therefore should be included in policy. • OBJECTIONS: • If heritage asset is important should be given appropriate level of protection – not for Local Plan to introduce another designation. • Heritage assets which are undesignated are not designated for a reason; they are not of sufficient quality to be on the statutory list. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only designate where majority of local community want it
<p>B: If so are there any specific buildings or other assets that should be included</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 9 Representations:11</p>	<p>COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to the current Comberton ones should be derived from any current/future Village Plan. • All undesignated buildings in Conservation Area • Many agricultural buildings are of local vernacular interest and should be recorded before they are converted into expensive houses. <p>SUGGESTED LOCAL ASSETS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foxtton - The Green • Foxtton - Dovecote and meadow • Foxtton - Green area in front of press cottages, Station Road • Great Shelford - Shelford clay batt walls and houses should have some protection, along with domestic outbuildings such as coachhouses and wartime features such as gun emplacements. • Imperial War Museum, Duxford - Any structures and infrastructure which are associated with and form part of the character of the airfield including its site, setting and vista. • Over - The War Memorial,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over - Church End bench, • Over - Village pump and • Over - Village ponds in Overcote Road, Fen End and Longstanton Road • Steeple Morden - The Windmill, Mill Courtyard, Steeple Morden - St Peter and St Paul Church, Church Street • Steeple Morden - The Churchyard, St Peter and St Paul Church, Church Street • Steeple Morden - The Clunch Pit, The Quarry • Steeple Morden - The Motte & Bailey, behind St Peter and St Paul Church • Steeple Morden - The Village Well, Church Street, • Steeple Morden - The War Memorial, Church Street, • Steeple Morden - The War Memorial, Station Road, Odsey • Steeple Morden -The War Memorial, Old Airfield, Litlington Road, • Steeple Morden - The Stret (Ashwell Street), • Waterbeach Barracks
<p>QUESTION 44: Heritage assets and adapting to Climate Change</p>	
<p>A: 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?</p> <p>Support:36 Object: 7 Comment: 11</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to see reduction in carbon footprint of old buildings. Need to be sympathetic to their heritage but benefit to all if significant embodied energy within these buildings can be beneficially extended • Support from 16 Parish Councils • Current owners of listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas are unclear on what may /may not do. Many not allowed to fit energy efficiency measures. Need to allow green options • People more likely to look after such buildings if they can enjoy benefits of solar heating/double glazing so long as minimum impact on character of building • English Heritage has published advice on how energy conservation can be achieved in historic buildings based on a careful analysis of the special interest of the building and the range of options for energy conservation that are available. Can be found on the Historic Environment Local Management website. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan not proper place for guidance. Number of listed buildings wasting energy in heating them is not likely to be significant! • Objections from 4 Parish Councils • What is needed is advice, guidance and

	<p>information – not a policy. Expand the Conservation Section?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specialist advice available on a national level • Should allow owners to do own development within English Heritage guidelines • Leave listed building alone. Design and function may be compromised by misguided desire to make them more energy efficient. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature of Listed Buildings is that they are unique and therefore having a prescriptive policy detailing how energy performance should be dealt with is not practicable. This issue should be dealt with on a site by site basis • Only need guidance if adds value to national policy • Need sensitive solutions that do not detract from visual impact when seen from public places • Listed Building SPD and Conservation Area SPD plus local design guides should cover this policy. Local design guide would need to have local details to ensure local character is not lost • Need advice on Victorian/Edwardian houses within district • Only within financial reason – if made too difficult and costly sites will be lost • Best done on case by case basis
<p>B: If so, where should the balance lie between visual impact and the benefits to energy efficiency?</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 1 Comment: 29</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case by case basis <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not appropriate subject for policy which will freeze things for life of plan. Advice needs to change as appropriate <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not see need for traditional materials or methods to be used in restoration of listed buildings, provided that new materials do not detract from the appearance of the building. What are we trying to protect anyway? • Traditional material shown to last centuries. Modern materials need replacing e.g. plastic double glazing – every 10yrs. Balance of damage to building by installing modern which would only last short time. Building industry needs to develop products that meet both criteria • Aesthetics of listed building should not be compromised for greater energy efficiency • Any modification to enhance energy use should not destroy essential fabric of building • Retro-fitting of listed building does not have to be unsightly if conservation measures are internal rather than external • SPAB advice?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance towards visual impact when seen from public places – energy efficiency improvement should not detract. • Need to liaise with building control to enable 'reasonable' provision is maintained against historic details. • Concentrate on improving new build homes. Older buildings have greater importance in visual character of village so need to retain original features. This benefit offsets any adaption for climate change • Although costly it is possible to improve insulation of listed building without changing its appearance • Should have legal requirement to insulate walls and secondary double glazing • English Heritage says measures should be compatible with historic fabric and character of individual assets rather than seeking 'a balance'. They have published advice on how energy conservation can be achieved in historic buildings • Hauxton Mill been redundant for too long but could be used to generate hydro-electricity
--	--