

# **Bourn Airfield New Village Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

## **Statement of Consultation**

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 require a local planning authority to consult the public and stakeholders before adopting a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Regulation 12(a) requires a statement to be prepared setting out who has been consulted while preparing the SPD; a summary of the main issues raised; and how these issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.2. This statement is a record of consultation undertaken during the production stage of the SPD prior to formal public consultation.
- 1.3. The Bourn Airfield New Village SPD has been prepared to assist in delivering the objectives as set out in Policy SS/7: Bourn Airfield New Village of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

### **2. Preparation of the draft SPD**

- 2.1. South Cambridgeshire District Council as the Local Planning Authority developed the draft SPD in consultation with the local community, members of the District and County councils, landowners and other stakeholders.
- 2.2. The District Council as the Local Planning Authority has been working in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council, the landowners and local interest groups to consider ways to deliver development on site in a successful manner.
- 2.3. In preparing the draft SPD, South Cambridgeshire District Council as the Local Planning Authority, have carried out the following consultations:
  - Developer/Landowner Meeting 1 – 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018. Invitees were developers and landowners and their representatives.
  - Stakeholder Meeting 1 – 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018. Invitees were:
    - officers from South Cambridgeshire District Council including planning officers, urban design and community development
    - officers from Cambridgeshire County Council specialising in transport, education and health
    - officers from Greater Cambridge Partnership.
  - Community Engagement Session 1 – Caldecote Village Hall, 21 November 2018. Invitees were local community representatives including local Ward and Parish Councillors, the Planning Portfolio

holder, Councillor with responsibility for strategic planning, Stop BAD, and the Coalition of Parish Councils.

- Developer / landowner Meeting 2 – 5 February 2019. Invitees were developers and landowners and their representatives.
- Stakeholders Meeting 2 – 5 February 2019. Invitees were:
  - officers from South Cambridgeshire District Council including planning officers, urban design and community development
  - officers from Cambridgeshire County Council specialising in transport, education and health
  - officers from Greater Cambridge Partnership.
- Community Engagement Session 2 – Caldecote Village Hall 6 February 2019. Invitees were local community representatives including local Ward and Parish Councillors, the Planning Portfolio holder, Councillor with responsibility for strategic planning, Stop BAD, and the Coalition of Parish Councils.

- 2.4. Following meetings and engagement sessions held in February 2019 provided an opportunity for attendees to comment in detail on the draft Vision and Objectives, in addition to options identified for the route of the high-quality public transport through the site.
- 2.5. A summary of these comments and how they have been addressed in the development of the SPD are set out in Appendix 1.
- 2.6. Additional discussions were held with stakeholders including Highways England, Greater Cambridge Partnership, and Cambridge County Council, Natural England, Historic England and the Environment agency.
- 2.7. Additional internal meetings were held with relevant officers at South Cambridgeshire District Council as the SPD progressed, including officers from Planning Policy, Development Management, Urban Design and Environmental Health.
- 2.8. Specialists at South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council provided input into the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which forms part of the draft SPD.
- 2.9. The Bourn Airfield New Village SPD has sought to address these comments constructively and creatively, balancing the practical needs of site delivery with the context of the local area and the Council's own objectives.

### **3. Consultation undertaken**

- 3.1. Formal public consultation was undertaken on the draft SPD for a period of six weeks, from 9 am on Monday 17 June to 5 pm on Monday 29 July 2019. Consultation on the SPD was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement adopted in 2010. A list of consultees is provided in Appendix 2.

- 3.2. The SPD was accompanied by an Executive Summary and supporting contextual information which explained the relationship between the new Local Plan and the SPD, the role and status of the SPD, how it will contribute to the future of South Cambridgeshire, the provision of new homes (including affordable), what the wider planning and transport context is, how to comment and what we particularly welcomed comments upon.
- 3.3. A Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report were completed and consulted upon for the emerging South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2014 which proposed the allocation of the new town site for development. This consultation took place between 19 July and 14 October 2013. These documents, along with other supporting documents were also made available to view during this consultation. As the draft SPD supports the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, there was no further need to undertake a separate Sustainability Appraisal or Habitats Regulations Assessment for this SPD document, although screening reports were completed and made available during the consultation.
- 3.4. The draft Bourn Airfield New Village SPD was consulted upon with the following accompanying documents:
- [Sustainability Appraisal & Habitats Regulations Screening Report](#)
  - [Equality Impact Assessment](#)
- 3.5. The documents were made available on the [Council's website](#) and paper copies were made available at the Council's offices and at Cambourne Library.
- 3.6. Comments could be made online using the [online consultation system](#) or by completing the consultation response form and either emailing or posting it to us at [planningpolicy@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@scambs.gov.uk) or South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, CB23 6EA.
- 3.7. In order to inform residents across the district, local community organisations and local businesses, the following methods of notification were used:
- a public notice in the local newspaper;
  - through the Council's webpages and social media; and
  - three local exhibitions, enabling people to talk to one of our planning officers about the SPD: The dates, location and times of these exhibitions are as follows:

**Thursday 27 June:**

Cambourne Village College, Sheepfold Lane Cambourne, CB23 6FR  
3.30-8.00pm\*

**Wednesday 3 July:**

Caldecote Village Hall, Furlong Way, Highfields Caldecote, CB23 7ZH  
3.00-7.30pm

**Wednesday 10 July:**

Sheltered Housing Communal Building, Hall Close, Bourn, CB23 2SN  
3.00-7.30pm

\* Transport officers from Cambridgeshire County Council, Greater Cambridge Partnership and Highways England were also in attendance at Cambourne.

**4. Issues raised during the public consultation**

- 4.1. 66 people visited the exhibitions. The main topics of discussion included transport, the need for a new medical centre, the relationship of the new village to existing villages, the proposed location of the Village Centre and flooding.
- 4.2. During the consultation, 312 representations were received, made by 71 respondents. Of the representations 36% were objections, 56% were comments and 8% were supports. 8 comments were also received to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Documents and the Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).
- 4.3. All of the SPD representations are available to be read in full on our [online consultation system](#). The main issues raised include:
  - Transport
  - Public transport
  - Spatial layout
  - Village centre
  - Local character / village separation
  - Schools
  - Health
  - Heritage
  - Employment
  - Sustainability
  - Delivery
- 4.4. The following sections identifies the representations received to each part of the SPD, summarises the main issues raised, provides a Council assessment of the issues and where necessary what proposed modifications to the SPD are indicated.

## Summary tables of main issues raised, Council assessment and proposed modifications

### 1. Introduction

#### Representations received:

Support: 1 Object: 3 Comment: 13

Total: 17

#### Main issues in representations:

67980, 68016, 68041, 68042, 68105, 68134, 68156, 68164, 68231, 68236, 68240, 68258, 68261, 68313, 68314, 68315, 68353

#### Support

- [DB Group \(Holdings\) Ltd](#) - essential the proposed new village takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. Requires particular consideration to adequate separation from noise sources, site and building layout / orientation, provision of acoustic barriers as a result of detailed assessments (to be provided at developer's expense), particularly with regard to noise and air quality.

#### Object

- Key Issue 4 – traffic management solutions must be considered from the outset to prevent rat running. Traffic numbers should be published.
- The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

#### Comment

- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Iron Age and Roman archaeological finds in the area. 20th Century military aviation heritage. Suggest the historic environment could contribute to Key Issues 1, 3 and 4. E.g. open space and recreation could support heritage trails and interpretation for archaeological and military heritage.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) - Key Issue 2 - agree with six stated key issues. Concern with how wording under (2) could be interpreted at determination of planning applications. Whilst South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) aspires to create a cleaner, greener and zero carbon future for all its communities, the latter term should not be regarded as a mandatory requirement. Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) should be consistent with Local Plan Policy SS/7 (10) and not require even higher standards. Outline planning application contains package of measures to satisfy this policy which have been discussed and agreed in principle with officers.

- [National Trust](#) - Key issue 2 – no objection to proposed development but concerned about shortfall in existing open space within easy access of development locations west of Cambridge.
- [National Trust](#) - Key issue 4 - concern for proposed segregated bus link, part of measures to address congestion along A428/A1303 corridor. Part of proposed busway route crosses Green Belt land to north of Coton over which The National Trust holds restrictive covenants. Objected on grounds of landscape and visual impact.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) - Key Issue 5 - sub-title should be amended to 'Relationship with existing employment site'. Language should be softened to encourage engagement and collaboration between the developer and existing employers on site but not make this a requirement of successful delivery of the wider Bourn Airfield site.
- [Cambourne Town Council](#) - Key Issues refers to Cambourne as a village – should be as a town.
- [Aitchison Developments Ltd](#) - relationship with existing employment site is recognised as a key issue and requires new village to ensure the employment site is integrated, including any redevelopment. This is supported. Redevelopment provides opportunities to meet the needs of new village, district's requirement and local economy. Vitaly important site can be developed independently. Appreciate need SPD to guide future development of new village but it should not impede existing employment site.
- [Bourn Parish Council](#) - SPD raises many key issues that need to be address but they are glossed over or ignored. Aspirational platitudes. Failure to analyse sufficiently problem with traffic generation.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) - (CP) Section 1.5 - CP acknowledge SCDC will not determine outline planning application until SPD adopted. Worked collaboratively during Local Plan process, outline planning application process, and in preparation of draft SPD. CP's extensive evidence base updated and shared with SCDC. Agree in principle on most matters. Comments where differences of approach or views, and wherever possible CP proposes to revise its plans where considered justified. Some areas CP consider their proposals have greater overall merit in design terms. Identified in document appended. SPD should provide flexibility to allow a range of design options to be explored, considered and determined through planning application process. Sought to demonstrate comprehensive approach – control 93% of site and liaised with Council, landowners / promoters of employment sites, owners of land to south, to demonstrate overall allocation and policy objectives, as well as third party interests will not be prejudiced by proposals. Delete the sentence: "Applications that fail to demonstrate a comprehensive approach to development, as set out in this document, will be refused planning permission". SPDs are material considerations and cannot set planning policy in this way.

- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Section 1.6 - Reference to Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Cambourne to Cambridge route is welcomed but at this stage needs to show commitment to a solution.
- [Environment Agency](#) - have no specific comment to make on the document.
- [Fenland District Council](#) - does not have any comments.
- [National Grid](#) - have no comment.

## Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed.

### Existing Employment Site

Note the concerns of existing employers not to impact on their current and proposed operational plans for their sites. SPD acknowledges their aspirations (Section 2.2) and sensitive relationship (Figure 21 Key Constraints). Nonetheless, it would be helpful to include a description of the range of uses within the existing employment site to provide context and additional text to ensure that the (noise) impacts are appropriately considered and addressed.

### Transport

The traffic implications of development were considered in detail during the Local Plan Examination. The SPD clearly sets out in its Strategic Objectives that priority will be given to sustainable modes, but all modes will be planned for. The developers of Bourn Airfield will be required to submit a Transport Assessment as part of the planning application to demonstrate and mitigate the transport impacts of the development; this will include details of traffic numbers. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes provision for traffic monitoring and mitigation for villages which may be impacted by traffic (Figure 55, Items 13 & 14).

Note the comments in relation to the GCP scheme. The Council will review and update the SPD text where appropriate to reflect the latest position in relation to other projects and plans.

### A428 Access & healthcare

A428 is addressed in section 2 and healthcare in section 5.2.

### Key Issues

Heritage issues are addressed in sections 2 and 5.3.

Key Issue 2 sets out the Council's aspirations to be cleaner, greener and zero carbon and does not in itself set out any requirements. The SPD elaborates in Chapter 5, Section 5 Responsive and Sustainable on how this issue will be addressed, providing guidance on the delivery of the requirements set out in Local Plan Policy SS/7.

Key Issue 3 - the new village will provide for the wellbeing of residents through its extensive provision for sport, outdoor recreation and allotments including an 89hectare Country Park. These areas are shown on the Spatial Framework Diagram.

Key Issue 4 - note the concerns about the wider segregated bus scheme in relation to landscape and visual impact where it crosses Green Belt land north of Coton. This does not relate to Bourn Airfield site and is not a matter for the SPD.

Key Issue 5 – it is considered that the wording of the SPD is appropriate to ensure the comprehensive planning and delivery of the Bourn Airfield site alongside the existing employment area. For accuracy agree that the Key Issue 5 heading could be amended to ‘Relationship with **existing** employment site’.

#### Reference to Cambourne

The reference to Cambourne as a village in the SPD is consistent with its current planning status as set out in the recently adopted Local Plan for example at policy S/8 ‘Rural Centres’. The SPD only refers to Cambourne as a village once, in the key to Figure 7 where it refers to ‘Cambourne Village Centre and supermarket’ (this is addressed in section 2). and in section 2.7 where it refers to three Cambourne villages, which reflects how the settlement was planned and developed.

#### Planning consent

Note the concerns from the site promoter and the collaboration undertaken to date. The SPD provides guidance on the interpretation of Policy SS/7 (and other Local Plan policies) and provides flexibility on their application. A lot of the detail and issues will be addressed through the planning application process, within the context of the guidance provided in the SPD. Agree that SPDs are capable of being material considerations and the wording in respect of the granting of planning permission should be amended.

### Proposed Modifications

1.3 Key Issues – Key Issue 5 - Amend heading to read:  
‘Relationship with the **existing** employment site.’

Section 1.5 Planning Consent for Development – Amend last sentence of second paragraph to read:

Applications ~~that fail to~~ **should** demonstrate a comprehensive approach to development, as set out in this document, ~~will be refused planning permission.~~

Section 1.6 Planning policy context - Under the heading ‘Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire’ update the second paragraph to read:

‘The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) is responsible for delivering the new route between Cambourne and Cambridge; the alignment will serve the new village. ~~Consultation on Phase 2 of the scheme has closed. The SPD has taken forward the option considered “preferred” at this stage, that will give the most sustainable outcome.~~ **The alignment through the new village (shown on the Spatial Framework Diagram) has been agreed in consultation with the GCP and Cambridgeshire County Council.**’

Section 1.6 Planning policy context - Under the heading ‘Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire’ delete the last sentence of the third paragraph:



~~'Whilst recent reports have found a 'compelling case' for the scheme, it is not yet confirmed.'~~

Section 2.3 Site features and surrounding context – See the proposed changes under section 2.'Site Context' below.

Figure 55 Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Item 13 – amend the text within the 'Description' column to read:

'Applicant to monitor traffic impacts on village routes, including **Bourn, Highfields Caldecote, Knapwell, and Hardwick** on an ongoing basis.'

Figure 55 Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Item 14 – amend the text within the 'Description' column to read:

'Traffic calming and other measures to be implemented in surrounding villages, including **Bourn, Highfields Caldecote, Knapwell, and Hardwick** if required. Monitoring strategy will reflect this need.'

Other general updating, including to reflect that public consultation has been undertaken, and to update latest position in relation to other projects and plans.

## 2. Site Context

### Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 32 Comment: 36

Total: 71

### Main issues in representations:

67744, 67930, 67979, 67981, 67983, 67988, 67989, 67949, 68005, 68011, 68017, 68029, 68030, 68031, 68039, 68040, 68044, 68052, 68058, 68059, 68067, 68069, 68070, 68072, 68074, 68075, 68077, 68078, 68082, 68084, 68085, 68107, 68109, 68110, 68123, 68132, 68135, 68136, 68317, 68138, 68139, 68140, 68141, 68142, 68157, 68158, 68166, 68191, 68216, 68218, 68222, 68224, 68229, 68243, 68248, 68249, 68250, 68254, 68262, 68263, 68275, 68278, 68279, 68280, 68287, 68290, 68293, 68294, 68297, 68345, 68346

### Support

- **Cambourne Town Council** - strong support for statement "the new settlement should provide complementary facilities to serve its residents rather than competing and should help to support the wider existing offer".
- **DB Group (Holdings) LTD** - Essential New Village takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. Require particular consideration being given to adequate distance separation from noise sources, site and building layout / orientation, provision of acoustic barriers as deemed necessary (to be provided at the developer's expense) as a result of detailed assessments in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance.

- **Natural England** - Section 2.5 welcome amendments to address previous advice, including acknowledgement of presence of a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) within 5 km of site boundary and requirement to consider impacts to designated sites beyond the site boundary.

## Object

- **Hardwick Parish Council** - Lack of medical centre and possible reliance on Cambourne to provide facilities; would mean car owners would have to drive, and residents without transport would have to walk to north side of site to get public transport to Cambourne. Idea to get people out of cars, but this would just increase traffic movements throughout day. Some residents objected to traffic calming because of possible queues, more pollution, and difficulty getting in and out of drives and onto junctions. Part of developers plan to mitigate problems if they arise. This particularly concerns rat runs through surrounding villages. Will be monitored and traffic calming considered. If no junction onto A428, there should be traffic management / restriction on A1303 from Bourn Broadway to Madingley Mulch roundabout. Developers need to make sure traffic is monitored, and a base line established before development so comparisons can be accurately made.
- **Knapwell Parish Meeting** - Section 2 – Why is equivalence (with Bourn for Knapwell) not being drawn with regard to being 'responsive to local context'. Knapwell village centre similar distance to Western Bourn Airfield entrance as Bourn village. Knapwell has Conservation Area, High Street displays many similar characteristics. Despite chicanes, frequent accidents and near misses, result of dangerous and inconsiderate driving. Serious accident in May 2019, High Street likely KSI blackspot. On primary north/south route between A14/Boxworth Services and A428/Bourn Airfield Western exit. Gross oversight and inaccuracy that no maps show dangerous staggered junction at Bourn Broadway/St Neots Road/Knapwell High Street. Site of regular accidents; suggests negative externalities have not been appropriately considered. Accidents are routine at Elsworth Road/Boxworth Road/ Connington Road junctions. Reference in SPD special S106 requirements in same vein as Bourn.

## 2.4 Access, Movement & Connectivity

- **Caxton Parish Council** - should be direct access onto A428, and, given that it is not clear from their consultation document how much industrial use is proposed, it should be sufficient to provide employment for the proposed housing.
- **Knapwell Parish Meeting** - would like to see mandated direct access onto A428. Safety concerns are unfounded based on equivalent examples already in region. Current modal and traffic models grossly underestimate likely reality, in context of only alternative being a bus to Grange Road. Many commuters not travelling into Cambridge, which presents a strategic necessity

for a more drastic infrastructure solution. Direct A428 access remains a viable option, most practical and sustainable solution to mitigate dangers and externalities of 3500 households, and their travel, on local village communities.

- [Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council](#) - Untenable to allow development without a fast and reliable public transport system between Cambourne and Cambridge - development will be opposed until such a transport system is in place. Residents travel in opposite direction to get to London via St Neots train station, leading to rush hour queues in the westerly direction of A428. Development should not be permitted until completion of A428 upgrade. Development of Bourn Airfield will result in a ribbon of development on A428.
- Scale of proposed development will result in rat-run traffic blighting nearby villages. Knapwell already suffers more traffic at peak times than it can cope with, and there have been several serious recent accidents. Obvious solution is its own access directly to A428.
- Failure to have egress and exit to A428 will force commuters to use local B roads increasing congestion, pollution, noise to surrounding villages and negatively impacting on health and quality of life of residents. Planners aware of this increase in traffic locally as planning for future road calming measures. Do proper planning of future congestion problems, now, by building connections to A428. Comments from Highways regarding proximity of egress and exits to Cambourne and Hardwick is not a consideration in other developments, e.g. on A14 Dry Drayton / Bar Hill / Lolworth, A1 Buckden / Stirtloe.
- A428 is main route into Cambridge. Need independent access onto A428 to alleviate excessive traffic along St Neots Road and through neighbouring villages. New connection for A428 to M11 at Girton essential, feeding traffic both South and North to main places of employment. Only one third of traffic heading east on Madingley Road travels into Cambridge for work. Has a traffic count been carried out at junction 13 (M11). Residents will use cars to shop, transport families, elderly and disabled - very low anticipated traffic movements are wrong. Expect excessive traffic movements on St Neots Road, Hardwick meaning more noise and increased carbon emissions. Contradictory statement on page 37 (no Access onto A428) and page 15 (maybe access available), which needs clarification. More traffic will be generated by new Park and Ride, environmental issues noise, 24hrs illumination, light pollution, removal of belt of trees next to A428 to provide new busway. Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) stipulates busway should have a 50 metre – 100 metre barrier to reduce noise and improve air quality. Hardwick is village with 2,400 residents, St Neots Road is village road not a motorway.
- Settlement needs direct access to A428 and should not have direct access to the Broadway.

- Does not explore direct grade access to A428 from new village as no strategic case for this requirement has been made. Is this an invitation that such a case should be made? Direct connection to A428 is essential. Rural minor roads providing access to east and west are not built to take traffic from development of 3500 dwellings. Comparisons can be drawn with Cambourne, an identical development; could not function without direct connection to A428 and has escape route to south and A1198. No southern access from Bourn Airfield - all traffic onto St Neots Road. SPD states "marginal room" to do so. Countryside have stated they would pay if Highways England dropped their principles. Multiple locations where Highways England principle not been applied including J13 and J14 of M11. Expected to see statement in SPD that ensures realistic traffic calculations with evidence put forward and risks examined. This should be embedded in Transport Statements and Travel Plans. Countryside calculations expect only 14 vehicles from development to St Neots Road, Hardwick, which we currently measure 3500 to 4000 vehicles a day. Alternative is implication that traffic estimates might be stated to "reverse into" decision to avoid direct connection to A428 which must be dismissed with evidence of course.
- SPD states A428 has direct connection to M11. It doesn't. Disappointing error. SPD states "A428 is connected to the M11 via the A1307". Error - A1303. Drivers working days and mental health is seriously affected by commute time delays of this road. Highways England should reconsider their stance on direct connection between A428 west and M11. Cambridge will be at the cross-roads of a major north south motorway and a major trunk road to west collective spend on upgrades over £3bn with only village connections between them.
- As resident of Hardwick village, I feel let down by planning process as regards impact on our village. Roads into Hardwick will be hugely busy as a result of this development and allowance has not been made for this. Link road to A428 needs to be included to combat traffic increase. Noise pollution, air pollution, destruction of existing hedgerows that combat these things are planned. Whilst want to welcome newcomers to area result will be resentment due to huge change in our daily commute.
- Developers have not got a realistic estimate of vehicles leaving site. Of the thousand vehicles expected at BP roundabout and first Hardwick roundabout only an estimated 7 extra vehicles would be using St Neots Road. Ludicrous underestimate and far more vehicles will use this route into Cambridge causing considerable congestion on St Neots Road and all local roads. Essential for development to have access onto A428.
- Objects to cars being sent onto Broadway rather than dual carriageway given the environmental cost of slow-moving traffic on minor roads is worse than that of a fast moving carriageway. Concerned about backlogs at junctions out

of new towns and onto St Neots Road. Question how drivers can be prevented from turning right into new town? Need to be a roundabout.

- Concerned about noise and congestion caused by roundabout and suggest implementation of a noise barrier and/or a new route away from Caldecote homes. A bus service is desperately needed in Caldecote.
- Will be around 8,000 dwellings in area with no easily accessible Park and Ride. Scotland Farm 2 miles away. Site offered next to Camborne roundabout. South Cambridgeshire District Council's (SCDC) committee raised concerns re accesses, but a general response was provided. Needs a site-specific response to address very real issue / problem. Lack of detail for access design. Access onto A428 - cost shouldn't be an issue when danger to life with proposed accesses; plenty of room on site frontage for east facing junction (west can use Cambourne), three Local Plan inspectors have said no traffic should use the Broadway.
- Inadequate access, direct A428 access needed.
- Traffic along St Neots Road where I live will be drastically increased. If the busway also goes ahead the line of mature trees will be removed. These trees are at least 60 years old. This is environmental vandalism, and will destroy our environment here. Trees absorb noise and pollution. Any replanting will have little or no effect for decades. Do not destroy our trees. A direct link from A428 - M11 is an obvious necessity as part of this scheme.
- Reference to High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) 'route potentially passing through northern part of site' misleading. This is core to development. Infrastructure Delivery Plan states it must be completed prior to Occupation. SPD needs to be clear which it is, as fundamental element to connectivity. Costs of Busway and risk that traffic figures are not reduced are so fundamental to this development that when SPD is redrafted, it needs to include a statement that planning authority must verify the data on which this busway need is predicated. Transport/Travel Plan must state realistic Trip Rates and traffic numbers must be used and any variations evidenced. Countryside Travel Plan and associated predictions on Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) and model shift from cars to buses, TRICS rates are far below current rates approved by SCDC and provide no evidence they can be met.
- [Knapwell Parish Meeting](#) - Section - 2.5 Nature Reserve, Wildlife Trust managed Overhall Grove is a designated SSSI, and recognised Ancient Woodland. Conservation Area. Village contains the RSPB's own national farm. Protected verges due to a range of extremely rare flora, including Sulphur Clover. These are not referenced in Sustainability and Habitats Appraisal, which requires further investigation. Request explicit reference in SPD to correct this oversight, with recognition that as such, specific measures are put in place to actively manage traffic volume in this sensitive Parish ecosystem.

## 2.8 Community Facilities and Services - Healthcare

- What provision for health services? Does not appear to be anything about this in the leaflet. When Bourn Airfield was proposed a GP surgery and provision for elderly were highlighted. GP surgery essential given pressure on current provision, already struggling, in the area.
- Context section is only place where provision of medical facilities is mentioned. Implication is that existing facilities in surrounding villages, with some upgrading of Monkfield practice, will suffice. Growing shortage of medical staff to supply existing practices in coming years, ongoing financial problems with Addenbrookes, slow responses of ambulance services it seems naive to think that a new community of proposed size could be adequately served by tweaks to local practices. Needs its own Practice.
- Development should have its own medical centre. One short paragraph stating that Monkfield Medical Practice in Cambourne would need to be expanded. For 9,000 new patients!!! Children and young parents need medical attention as well as older residents and proper provision must be provided for them on new site. Cannot provide thousands of new houses around Cambridgeshire without providing proper infrastructure and medical provision is absolutely essential.
- Healthcare - dedicated centre for development is needed as facilities in Cambourne will be at full capacity with proposed increase of the number of dwellings at the West of Cambourne. New school is very close to A428. Would this not be a potential problem with particulate pollution from dual carriageway (Oxford to Cambridge highway).
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

## Comment

- [Aitchison Developments Ltd](#) - Whilst existing employment site is identified within overall site context, SPD is silent on fact the site benefits from an extant permission (S/1020/13/FL), for demolition and replacement buildings to provide B1, B2 and B8 uses. Granted 17,723 sqm (190,768sqft) floorspace, comprising 16,850 sqm of B2 general industrial floorspace and 873sqm of ancillary B1 Offices. Should be acknowledged within the Site Context section.
- [Cambourne Town Council](#) - Section 2.1 - Cambourne is not a settlement, it is a town, and is first Town in South Cambridgeshire.
- [DB Group \(Holdings\) LTD](#) - Section 2.2 - DB Group confirms their intention to continue operating from their existing site. Proposed development of New Village must therefore ensure full account is taken of existing operations and future development will not hamper their expansion plans.
- [Greater Cambridge Partnership](#) - Section 2.2 - in liaison with Highways England to acquire land parcels at both east and west accesses to enable provision of improved junctions to address expected traffic flows.

- [Cambourne Town Council](#) - Section 2.3 - Figure 7 - Number 3 should be Cambourne Town Village Centre and Supermarket.
- [DB Group \(Holdings\) LTD](#) - Section 2.3 - description of established employment area should be expanded upon to include a full description of DB Group's operations. Given their industrial nature, essential to ensure future development that comes forward surrounding the site is appropriate.
- [Historic England](#) - Section 2.3 should be amended to include reference to Bourn Conservation Area which lies to south of site and three Registered Parks and Gardens nearby.

#### 2.4 Access, Movement & Connectivity

- [Barton & District Bridleways Group](#) - Active Travel (Cycling and Walking) - includes horse riding therefore should also be included in heading to ensure equestrianism is included throughout this section. Equestrians should not be excluded from long distance routes proposed by Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP). Bridleways should be clearly marked as being for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Development provides opportunity to create a Restricted Byway network, creating access for carriage drivers. Lack of access for carriage drivers not only in Cambridgeshire but throughout UK.
- [Cambridge Past Present Future](#) - Concerns about timing of substantial and individual proposals for infrastructure in area, including Local Transport Strategy, GCP proposals, and how a satisfactory plan can be agreed with all of these proposals in flux.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - SPD states that no access is required directly onto A428. County Council queried this with developer and developer made subsequent enquires with Highways England. Our understanding is that Highways England do not require this and have stated that a new access would not be desirable in policy or engineering terms.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - commitment to explore opportunities to create stronger linkages with Cambourne via Public Rights of Way (PROW) network is welcomed, but needs to be greater detail on which routes are suitable, which routes will need to be upgraded and any proposals to reclassify designation of a PROW e.g. Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT), Bridleway, Cycleway, Footpath etc. in order to ensure current provision is not adversely affected.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Access, Movement and Connectivity - Cycle connection improvements need to link to Cambourne, Caldecote and Bourn village properly not just to the Broadway and Highfields Road as there is not suitable cycle infrastructure connecting these villages currently. Figure 8 - Three existing vehicular accesses to site are shown on western edge. Should be made very clear only most northerly access will access whole site. Other two just for existing employment sites. Figure 8 - needs to show cycle links to Bourn and Caldecote as well as Cambourne.

- Cllr Tumi Hawkins** - One of main reasons for sustained objections to Bourn Airfield was projected impact of traffic on local roads. Q1 Who is responsible for making case for direct access to A428? Q2 Why was the case not made? Q3 If an attempt was made to make the case, what data was used and what was the outcome? Highways England absolve responsibility to fund a new junction. There is room, though marginal, therefore possibility exists and must not be ruled out. Numerous examples of junctions built with sort of distances here. Investigate option of direct access to A428 further with strategic partners with data made available by Coalition of Parish Councils and StopBAD on traffic calculations. Modelling done by County Highways must be properly investigated and debated.
- Greater Cambridge Partnership** - Section 2.4 - although final Coast to Coast (C2C) route through site has not been agreed yet, GCP and South Cambs are collaboratively working with Countryside to support preparation of SPD. GCP also in liaison with Highways England to acquire land parcels at both Eastern and Western ends of development which would enable provision of improved junctions intended to address expected levels of traffic flow. Traffic impact of site is included in C2C modelling assessments but should also be addressed in Transport Assessment for development.
- Highways England** - (1) For A1307, read A1303. (2) Developing plans to dual A428 between Black Cat and Caxton Gibbet. Will submit plans for planning consent to Planning Inspectorate on behalf of Secretary of State for Transport. Before submit, local community and stakeholders formally consulted on scheme and likely significant environmental impacts - consultation summer 2019. (3) Support SPD position for no direct access onto A428. Case for providing direct access onto Strategic Road Network is based on policy, need and deliverability. Policy set out in Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 02/2013 Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development. States proposals for new junctions or direct means of access may be identified and developed at plan-making stage where it can be established it is essential for delivery of strategic planned growth. Requires consideration of standard of road - for motorways and routes of near motorway standard development access is limited to use of existing junctions with all-purpose roads. Modifications to existing junctions will be agreed where these do not have an adverse impact on traffic flows and safety. In line with standards contained in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, for safety and operational reasons, direct connections to slip roads and/or connector roads will not be permitted. For other roads there is a graduated approach. A428 is part of the Cambridge to Oxford expressway. High status, and therefore in line with policy, presumption against a new junction. Position needs to be balanced with strategic need, and whilst Bourn Airfield can be considered a strategic site, its wider strategic importance is more limited. Consequently, case for a new junction is not made. In parallel to development of SPD, developers submitted an outline planning application. Highways



England as reviewed transport modelling submitted and is broadly content with its findings which indicate that from a capacity perspective, subject to some modification, local road network has sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast impact from development. Given the local road connects with A428 both east and west of site, evidence shows on capacity grounds there is no need for direct access with A428. In line with current design standards, it is marginal that there is sufficient room for new junction between existing A428 junctions. Even if feasible, where junctions are spaced too closely it creates unnecessary weaving with traffic changing lanes raising greater safety risks and increased congestion, which reduces overall capacity. Conclusion - case for new junction is not made, and so Highways England supports the position set out in SPD. (4) welcome emphasis on providing a well connected community and policies to encourage modal shift and take up of public transport. Opportunities for strategic walking and cycling connections and connections with proposed Cambourne to Cambridge High Quality public corridor will help to contribute to ensuring the Strategic Road Network has sufficient capacity to provide for longer distance movements and connectivity from this and other communities along corridor.

- [Shelford and District Bridleways Group](#) - Horse riding should be included in heading 'Active Travel (Cycling and Waling). Connecting existing Cambourne bridleway network with Byway 124/7 Knapwell, Bridleway 27/12 Boxworth and beyond should be a project for Section 106/ Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding. Bridleways marked in Figure 8 Access, Movement & Connectivity should be clearly marked as being for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.
- New development planned with little opportunity for local employment for residents, so most will need to travel to north Cambridge technology site, Addenbrookes, or to M11 for employment towards London. Majority of these only accessible by car and little new provision to enable access to these. Already over used roads of surrounding villages will be put under excessive pressure affecting environment and ecology in a detrimental way. New interchange on A428 much needed to stop these adverse effects to local communities and to enable efficient traffic movement. Other major routes have interchanges very close together so marginal space for an interchange is not a valid objection.
- Requests - Ban buses that are not providing timetabled services through Knapwell due to increased, noise, vibration, pollution, 75 tonne weight restriction, and road which is unmaintained and unsuitable width. Enforcement of 7.5 tonne weight limit by HGVs. Traffic travelling southbound from West exit onto Broadway has been identified as damaging to rural and residential character of Bourn, and the Broadway. Road north, including village of Knapwell is equally vulnerable to negative externalities. Periodic closures of A14 give worrying insight into potential impacts of increased traffic on safety

of Knapwell residents. Equal priority and precedence be given to manage North bound traffic under a S106 requirement to: - Minimise rat running. – Ongoing monitoring of traffic impacts. - Traffic calming and other measures. Knapwell High Street be added to maps, in particular, staggered junction, currently site of frequent serious accidents. Explicit direction be made under an S106 mandate to mitigate and manage their concerns.

- Direct access to A428. Improvement to Girton interchange re access to M11 and Cambridge. Dedicated healthcare centre. Relocate schools to less polluted area. Increase the area for local employment.
- Developers given unrealistic estimate of number of cars using site. Minimum number of cars with one per household would be 3,500. Majority of households have two cars giving a total of 7,000 cars onto St Neots Road. Would cause considerable congestion on St Neots Road and all local roads. Essential for development to have its own access to A428 providing a link to A428 (the Cambridge to Oxford highway) and with A14, A1, M11 and Cambridge. Girton interchange needs to be expanded to include a link to M11. At present cars have to go down Madingley Hill which can lead to a delay of over one hour.
- Proposals to improve public transport along A428 largely ignore impact on and needs of local villages. Does it make sense to push ahead with building houses on such a large scale until infrastructure issues are resolved and infrastructure promised by developers is in place. No strategic case for direct access to A428 - in absence of such access, traffic will flow along St Neots Road towards Cambridge/M11. Insufficient thought given to egress from new village for traffic joining A1198. Growth of housing agglomeration between West Cambourne and Highfield Caldecote provides rationale for a station if northern route for Bedford Cambridge rail link goes ahead. Should be south of A428; any location north of A428 rekindles interest in 'Harbourne' and encourages traffic from wider area to rat run through local villages.
- Bourn Airfield development needs a connection to A428 directly. Present plan, to operate via Caldecote roundabout is not sufficient and will result in queues at peak times.
- Lack of joined up thinking. Railway line (Cambridge-Bedford) is planned to go nowhere near. How can the planning office support this dis-integrated approach when the timing is so close?
- Direct access to A428 for the new village.
- [Historic England](#) - Section 2.5 Setting issues for heritage assets extend beyond purely visual impact. Wider setting issues such as noise, light etc, will need to be considered for these and other heritage assets in and near the site.
- [Historic England](#) - Section 2.7 Welcome reference to Bourn church, Bourn windmill and other landmarks as well as to Great Common Farmhouse. Maintaining sight lines and key views of such landmark buildings off site can

be an important way to enhance the legibility of site. Should be referenced in SPD at end of eighth paragraph on page 18. No reference is made to listed barn north of Grange. Reference should also be made to need to preserve and enhance listed buildings and their settings; through appropriate buffer of open space, landscaping etc.

## 2.8 Community Facilities and Services

- **Cambourne Town Council** - Section 2.8 - Figure 19 misses Upper Cambourne Co-Op from under other retail.
- **Cambourne Town Council** - Section 2.8 - pleased to see reference to "a range of facilities and services to complement, not compete with, existing local provision". An important recognition of need for new village not to compete with existing provision in Cambourne. Statement does not go far enough and should give reference to Bourn Airfield forming a distinct village within wider town of Cambourne.
- **Cambourne Town Council** - Section 2.8 - Sports and Leisure Facilities - SPD mentions Cambourne Sports and Social Club. This is a business that ceased to trade and the building is called Cambourne Sports Pavilion.
- **Cambourne Town Council** - Section 2.8 - concern that Monkfield Medical Practice cannot be extended to take Bourn Airfield development as it is already being extended to take extra dwellings in West Cambourne.
- **Cambourne Town Council** - Section 2.8 - Education - check measurements. Cambourne Village College is stated as less than 4.8km from site - it is more like 2.5 km or 3km by footpath.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Section 2.8 - Health -statements regarding current provision of Health Facilities, whilst correct may be too specific for SPD. i.e. likely that an offsite facility for "health services" is required, and likely to be at Monkfield Practice, and should be mitigated by development, precise location of such a facility is not known at this stage and further guidance should be sought from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Section 2.8 – Education - proposals for the provision of education facilities within the new village, i.e. 2 primary schools up to 7 forms of entry and a secondary school (6 forms of entry), meets the County Council's requirements and is therefore supported.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Section 2.8 - Sports and Leisure Facilities - Support, in principle, for shared and dual use of sports facilities. Should be noted that delivery will largely be dependent on securing agreement with school operator. Whilst Council can seek to influence this it is ultimately out of its control. Until an operator is selected and there is certainty that shared use can be delivered it is advised that Local Planning Authority maintains a fall-back position to ensure sport and playing field standards are met.
- Healthcare facilities full to capacity in area. Site would require its own to cater for 7,000 people minimum. Location of schools are too near A428 and would

be in a high pollution area. Area for local businesses is too small in relation to number of houses. A lot of people would have to travel from site each day.

- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Section 2.9 - Figure 21 Key Constraints maps WRC and Safeguarding Area which extends 400 metres. Would be helpful for SPD to note that any proposed development in this Safeguarding Area would be subject to Policy CS31 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (or comparable emerging policy).
- **National Trust** - Site context extends beyond surrounding features identified in SPD. Includes Wimpole Hall Estate, lying approximately 7km to south; closest National Trust property to Bourn. Site context extends beyond local authority's boundaries. Wider decision making framework set out by government for Oxford to Cambridge Arc includes A428/A1303 corridor within which Bourn Airfield sits, providing relevant context for SPD.

## Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed.

### Existing Employment / additional employment

Note the concerns of the existing employers seeking to ensure development will not impact on their current and proposed operational plans for their sites. The SPD acknowledges their aspirations (Section 2.2) and sensitive relationship (Fig 21 Key Constraints). Nonetheless, it would be helpful to include a description of the range of uses within the existing employment site to provide context.

It is also suggested that additional employment be provided so avoid the need for residents to travel to other locations. The SPD does provide for employment uses within the Village Centre, Neighbourhood Hub and mixed-use areas. In addition, a new mixed-use area is being proposed in the north west corner (see Section 4).

### Healthcare

Note the concerns about the need for an on-site medical centre. The SPD includes community health facility and space within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Item 41) to ensure the developers address this issue and allows for space for such a facility within the Village Centre. However, this is a detailed matter for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group to advise what form these facilities should take.

### Knapwell

Whilst it is acknowledged that Knapwell village is a similar distance as Bourn village to the Bourn Airfield site, it does not have such a direct relationship with the site. Nonetheless, the SPD could include references to Knapwell within the SPD site context, particularly recognising that northbound traffic may use this route. The maps should be amended to include the staggered junction at the top of the Broadway. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan makes reference to traffic monitoring and mitigation in surrounding villages. This could be clarified by the addition of a list of which villages this will apply to, including Knapwell.

### A428 access / traffic

Highways England has provided a clear position in its responses to the consultation that direct access onto A428 is not policy compliant or needed. This confirms advice received during preparation of the draft SPD. Their response states:

“Policy is set out in DfT Circular 02/2013 The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development.

The policy states proposals for the creation of new junctions or direct means of access may be identified and developed at the plan making stage in circumstances where it can be established that such new infrastructure is essential for the delivery of strategic planned growth.

Policy also requires consideration of the standard of road. For motorways and routes of near motorway standard development access is limited to the use of existing junctions with all-purpose roads. Modifications to existing junctions will be agreed where these do not have an adverse impact on traffic flows and safety. In line with the standards contained in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, for safety and operational reasons, direct connections to slip roads and/or connector roads will not be permitted. For other roads there is a graduated approach.

The A428 is part of the Cambridge to Oxford expressway which has a high status, and therefore in line with policy there is a presumption against a new junction at this location. This position needs to be balanced with strategic need, and whilst within the context of the local plan, Bourn Airfield New Village can be considered as a strategic site, its wider strategic importance is more limited. Consequently, the case for a new junction is not made.”

Transport modelling was undertaken to support the preparation of the Local Plan and did not identify a need for a new junction onto the A428. The modelling did identify a need for a dedicated high quality public transport route to link with jobs and services in and around Cambridge, within the Local Plan policy. The overarching vision for the adopted Local Plan, including for the new settlements, is to secure a modal shift away from use of the private car. This is also consistent with the recent declaration by the Council of a “climate emergency” alongside an adaptation to achieve net zero carbon for the district by 2050. Major new car-based infrastructure would not be compatible with that vision.

Notwithstanding the principle of whether a major new junction onto the A428 is necessary to serve the development, such provision would have significant land take implications and contribute to a car dominated independent gateway to the site from the A428. Without consideration of a potential design for the junction it is not possible to quantify the impacts in detail, or the likely timescales to obtain the necessary powers to deliver such a proposal. However a grade separated junction similar to Cambourne would require significant land and may generate additional noise, air quality and visual impacts. These factors would therefore most likely impact the quantum of development and potentially development viability, given that a new junction could cost in the order of £10 million to deliver. New / reconfigured access roads through the new village to the junction would significantly compromise

the Vision for Bourn Airfield (in particular giving priority to non-car modes), impact on the alignment of the HQPT route, the juxtaposition of land uses and place making, and the Council's corporate objectives of being green to the core and providing housing which is truly affordable.

Officers are not recommending any changes to include a junction onto A428. Changes to the text at section 2.4 could be made to elaborate on the existing text that says that "the SPD does not explore a direct, grade access to the A428" that explains the Local Plan process for context.

There is no policy requirement in the Local Plan 2018 for a new junction directly onto the A428. Transport modelling was prepared as part of the evidence underpinning the Local Plan and no need was identified for a new junction. Transport was given extensive consideration through the Local Plan process, in general terms and specifically in relation to the Bourn Airfield site. The highway authorities (Highways England and Cambridgeshire County Council) were consulted. The Inspector found the plan sound without the need for a new junction.

Highways England has advised that there is no strategic need for a new junction and that with the Cambridge to Oxford Expressway elevating the status of the road there will be a presumption against such a new junction.

With the ongoing A14 improvement works, there is currently a significant amount of displaced traffic using the A428 and other local routes to avoid the roadworks. Once these improvement works are substantially completed traffic should revert back to the A14 alleviating localised congestion and rat running. This factor was identified during the Local Plan process.

The developers of Bourn Airfield will be required to submit a Transport Assessment as part of the planning application to demonstrate and mitigate the transport impacts of the development. If highway capacity were identified as an issue through that process, the developers would be expected to provide financial contributions towards any highway improvements necessary for their proposal to be acceptable in transport terms.

The SPD accords with Local Plan Policy SS/7 by providing two accesses into the site, as shown on the Spatial Framework diagram (page 31) and described in Guiding Principle 1 A well connected place, including Spatial Fix A Main Points of Access and Primary Street (see pages 34-38).

It has been suggested that a new junction onto the A428 would be consistent with Local Plan Policy SS/7, which requires at least two accesses into the site. The policy requirement for at least two accesses is reflecting the principle that a strategic site of this scale should not have a single point of access onto the highway network.

Fix A, bullet 2 outlines that there will be enhancement of the existing junction between St Neots Road and the planning application will need to address the detailed operational requirements of the two accesses, which may require alterations to the Childerley roundabout.

The draft SPD is consistent with the Local Plan policy and the evidence supporting the plan and tested through the examination process. The role of an SPD as set out in regulations is to provide guidance about environmental, social, design and economic objectives which are relevant to a Local Plan allocation. A new junction onto the A428 would be a substantial additional requirement beyond those included within the detailed Local Plan policy and its impacts on the overall delivery of the new settlement in terms of timing and costs would be so fundamental that it would reasonably have been expected to have been considered through the Local Plan process.

### Public Transport

Note the general support for the approach to the HQPT route and stops from Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).

GCP have confirmed their intentions for delivery of Cambourne to Cambridge scheme by 2024. This is one part of a future network of public transport improvements being delivered by GCP and the Combined Authority (through a new Local Transport Plan), to reach a range of destinations in and around Cambridge and the County. In the longer term the Cambourne to Cambridge scheme will be extended to serve St Neots, improving access to the railway station. Further improvements may be delivered by the Combined Authority, such as a Cambridge Autonomous Metro.

Residents of Caldecote express a need for a bus service in the village. Revised the Spatial Framework Diagram to include a relocated eastern HQPT stop, closer to the village (see section 4). In addition, it is anticipated that the new village will be served by additional bus services using the secondary street (outlined in Section 1A of the SPD).

Whilst there is no Park and Ride proposed on the site the GCP Cambridge to Cambourne scheme is proposing a new facility closer to Cambridge. This scheme is being brought forward through a different process and is not a matter for the SPD.

Plans for East-West Rail are not sufficiently advanced to provide certainty on the proposed alignment of the new railway line and/or any new station proposals to include within the SPD. However, the SPD could provide additional context that if Cambourne station were the preferred option that it would be accessible from the new development via the high quality public transport service and extensive network of walking and cycling routes. East-West rail will be delivered over a long period and this can be addressed through the planning application process.

### Noise barrier

Residents of Caldecote express concern about the noise and congestion caused by the Childerley roundabout and suggest implementation of a noise barrier. Whilst the strategic landscaping along the northern boundary of the major development sites will include noise bunding the details of this in the vicinity of the Childerley roundabout are matters for resolution through the planning application process. (See section 4).

## Cambourne Town Council

Note the support for the statement "the new settlement should provide complementary facilities to serve its residents rather than competing and should help to support the wider existing offer".

The Vision for Bourn Airfield is to create a distinct new village with its own identity.

Note the points of clarification. Amendments are proposed to provide factual corrections to the maps and text in relation to retail, and sports and leisure, and education provision within Cambourne.

It is suggested that their 'village' centre be referred to as a 'town' centre. However, in planning policy terms Cambourne village centre does not qualify as town centre under the retail hierarchy in Local Plan Policy E/21; Cambourne is a Rural Centre with a village centre.

## Dual use of Secondary School sports pitches

Note that whilst Cambridgeshire County Council support the principle of dual use of sports pitches, it will be a matter for agreement with the new school provider(s). The SPD ensures adequate sports provision in the event that dual use is not agreed. However, to provide greater certainty the SPD could outline an alternative position were dual use to be acceptable., whereby the overall amount of pitches may be reduced and/or consolidated. Amendments are proposed to the Spatial Framework Diagram (see section 4) and text at Section 5.2.

## Historic Environment

Historic England have made some suggestions to augment the SPD text in relation to the historic environment, to include reference to Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and issues relating to their setting. Some amendments are proposed to section 2.7 Townscape and Built Environment to provide greater context and section 3F Integrating inherited assets.

## Waste Water Recycling Centre Safeguarding Area

Note Cambridgeshire County Council's suggestion to add reference to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan. However, this is unnecessary as no built development is proposed within the safeguarding area.

## Public Rights of Way (PROW)

Agree the section heading and Figure 8 should include reference to horse riders as they are referenced in the text. Section 4A refers to contributions towards enhancement of existing and creation of new PROW, and it is included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It is not appropriate to include greater detail on the improvements to the PROW network or the status (footpath, bridleway, byway etc.) of individual routes; the local planning authority would take this under advisement from the County Council's PROW team as part of the planning application and S106 agreement.



## Proposed Modifications

All maps (where appropriate) – to show the existing staggered road junction (at the top of the Broadway) towards Knapwell.

Section 2.1 The site and its location - Add the following text to the end of the first paragraph:

**'Knapwell village is situated to the north.'**

Section 2.3 Site features and surrounding context – Amend the wording of the second paragraph 2 to read:

'An ~~small~~ established employment area is sited within the north-eastern corner of the site accessed via Wellington Way. **The operations and processes which take place on the DB Group site include the following:**

- **Sand grading - filtering sand to provide different levels of fineness;**
- **Production of additives used in concrete mixes - blending of powders from silo storage;**
- **Warehousing - receipt and dispatch of goods either manufactured or purchased off site for resale.**

**The blending and grading process undertaken on site generates external noise, particularly in respect of the extraction system used to reduce material spillage and particles in the air. The site is also serviced by an average of 2 incoming and 3 outgoing HGV movements a day.'**

Section 2.4 Access, movement & connectivity - Amend the heading:

**'Active Travel (Cycling, walking and horse riding)'**

Section 2.4 Access, movement & connectivity – Amend the text in the second paragraph under the heading 'Public Transport' to read:

'There is currently no railway service within this area, the nearest stations being at St Neots and Cambridge North. **The Cambourne to Cambridge high quality public transport route will connect to Cambridge North station, and ultimately serve St Neots station in the longer term.**

~~Consultation closed in spring 2019 in respect of potential route options for the Bedford to Cambridge section of the East West Rail connection between Oxford and Cambridge, two of which could include a station at Cambourne. Due to the timing of this project and the lack of certainty over the final route little consideration can be given to this in this SPD, although there is clearly the potential for much greater public transport connectivity in the future. The SPD therefore would not prejudice any future connectivity proposals to the new village. If a new station is proposed at Cambourne it would be accessible to Bourn Airfield residents via the high quality public transport service and an extensive network of cycle and walking routes.'~~

Section 2.4 Access, movement & connectivity – Amend the text under the heading 'Road' to read:

**'St Neots Road, Broadway and, Highfields Road and Knapwell High Street** form the main local road network, connecting to neighbouring villages, linking to the A428 **and A14**, and providing potential access points to site. There are

multiple existing access points serving existing properties and from the roundabout in the north-eastern corner of the site, via Wellington Way. There is no direct vehicle route between the site and Cambourne, immediately to the west.

The A428 forms the main route into Cambridge and provides connections to the A14/A1 and the M11 via the ~~A1307~~ **A1303**. Junctions providing access to the A428 are located 2km to the east and west of the site. The road was substantially upgraded to a dual carriageway in 2008. Further work is due to take place between Black Cat and Caxton Gibbet to the west of Cambourne. ~~The consultation on detailed design will take place in Summer 2019.~~

The SPD does not explore a direct, grade access to the A428 from the new village as no strategic case for this requirement has been **made through the Local Plan process. Extensive transport modelling was undertaken to support the preparation of the Local Plan, taking into consideration all planned development. It did not identify a need for a new junction but did identify a need for a dedicated high quality public transport route to link with jobs and services in and around Cambridge. The overarching vision for the adopted Local Plan, including for the new settlements, is to secure a modal shift away from use of the private car. The Inspectors examining the Local Plan found this approach ‘sound’.** Highways England Policy ‘Circular 20/2013 The Strategic Road Network and Delivery of Sustainable Development’, sets out that a need must be established with no alternative solutions for the development of a new junction. In addition, in line with current design standards, Highways England have outlined there is marginal room for a new junction and junctions which are spaced too closely create unnecessary weaving with traffic changing lanes raising greater safety risks and increased congestion.’

Figure 8 Access, movement & connectivity – Amend the map labels to refer to: ‘Potential pedestrian, cycle **and horse riding** access’

Section 2.5 Landscape, ecology & Water – Amend seventh paragraph to read: ‘There are seven Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 5km of the site boundary (**including Overhall Grove SSSI and Ancient Woodland at Knapwell**), one of which is also designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC).’

Section 2.7 Townscape & Built Environment - Add the following text to this section: ‘**The site contains two Grade II listed barns dating from the C18th which form part of The Grange Farm buildings. The main house at The Grange dates from the C19th, and whilst it is of distinctive historic character, it is not listed or directly associated with the listed barns.**

**The existing runway and other elements associated form part of the legacy of the RAF Bourn Airfield, which is associated with the Battle of Britain. However, the site is undesignated, and few structures associated with the airfield remain. There are two extant gaps in the hedgerows on the edges of the site to the south and the west which**

were used to guide pilots to the runways during WWII. It will therefore be important to consider the relationship of the existing historic context when considering site lines within and from outside the site to facilitate good legibility and wayfinding.

The surrounding area has a mixed townscape character with several villages located nearby. In particular, Conservation Areas are located in Bourn village to the south and Knapwell village to the north. Bourn is a historic rural settlement with a distinctive and attractive townscape character. This includes traditional cottage houses built from a range of materials and includes distinctive thatched roofs.

Key buildings in the surrounding area include the church of St Helena & St Mary at Bourn, Bourn Windmill, and numerous notable large houses. Any proposal must ensure sensitive heritage assets are considered and mitigation is provided where necessary to avoid any significant affects.'

Section 2.8 Community facilities and services - Education – amend the distance from Cambourne Village College to read:

'Cambourne Village College is ~~less than 4.8km~~ **approximately 5.6km by road and 3.5km by bicycle**, from the site and Comberton Village College about 8km'.

Note that these measurements are taken from the approximate centre of the new village and not its edge.

Section 2.8 Community facilities and services - Under the heading 'Sports and leisure facilities' – replace reference to 'Cambourne Sports and Social Club' with 'Cambourne Sports Pavilion'.

Figure 19 Surrounding facilities and services – Add a retail symbol to denote the Co-Op in Upper Cambourne (next to the primary school).

Figure 55 Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Item 13 – amend the text within the 'Description' column to read:

'Applicant to monitor traffic impacts on village routes, including **Bourn, Highfields Caldecote, Knapwell, and Hardwick** on an ongoing basis.'

Figure 55 Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Item 14 – amend the text within the 'Description' column to read:

'Traffic calming and other measures to be implemented in surrounding villages, including **Bourn, Highfields Caldecote, Knapwell, and Hardwick** if required. Monitoring strategy will reflect this need.'

### 3. Vision and Objectives

#### Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 1 Comment: 8

Total: 12

## Main issues in representations:

67733, 68006, 68018, 68032, 68045, 68143, 68176, 68192, 68264, 68316, 68317, 68361

## Support

- **Aitchison Developments Ltd** - Support strategic objectives, particularly the desire to create a vibrant, prosperous and inclusive new village. Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) seeks to secure opportunities for local employment and entrepreneurship. Redevelopment of existing employment site will deliver jobs at heart of new village, well placed to provide access to jobs within reach of homes, Aitchison seeking to deliver successful high-tech business park comprising B1c and B8 uses. Will become asset to local economy, attracting investment and local employers, such that it could itself be identified as a Strategic Employment Location in future.
- **Cambridgeshire Police** - Sustainable housing and commercial development can be achieved to create safe and secure working, leisure and home environment. Developers should, at an early stage, seek advice from Cambridgeshire Police Designing out Crime Officers
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** - Six key objectives are laudable and would result in great placemaking if those principles were followed. Key to successful delivery of this new village is that it must be well planned as stated in objective 6.

## Object

- The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

## Comment

### Vision

- **Bourn Parish Council** - South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) aspires to be cleaner, greener and zero carbon. Therefore necessary for all elements of new village to integrate with natural environment, be innovatively designed and planned to meet and where possible exceed sustainability policy targets, and to secure net gains in biodiversity. Any adverse environmental impacts will not be supported unless they can be appropriately justified and mitigated. How will Council will reconcile aspirations with 3,500 houses where 70%+ will drive to work.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd (CP)** - While CP supports need to reduce carbon emissions, concerned this may introduce a target for development which is not supported by adopted local policy. Text should re-worded to make reference to a 'low carbon lifestyle' to be consistent with adopted Local Plan. Stating development is moving towards net zero sets an expectation which is beyond Local Plan requirements and principles of development set out in SPD.

## Strategic Objectives

- **Cambourne Town Council** Strategic Objectives – (1) How is this movement sustained once the fixed term bus subsidies have expired? (2) How will you encourage and support independent retailers? (3) How will you support access to fresh and healthy food? How will you provide for the wellbeing of isolated or marginalised residents? Community Development Fund/Worker? (5) How will you provide renewable energy and low emission travel beyond existing standards? (6) If the 'lifetime of the village' is a real objective, will lifetime homes and single storey dwellings be provided to accommodate residents through their life cycle and to provide housing for additional needs?
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** - Strategic Objectives - While fully supportive of delivering development which exceeds Local Plan standards this must be within what is feasible, viable and sound. Delivery of net zero buildings goes well beyond Local Plan requirements and has significant feasibility and viability issues. Recommend Objective 5 be amended: 'Incorporating low carbon buildings, renewable energy and low emissions travel, aiming to exceed existing Local Plan standards where technically feasible and viable'
- **Shelford and District Bridleways Group** - Objective 3 should indicate access to the countryside for all users.
- **Historic England** - Objective 4 should include greater reference to local character, identity and materials.
- **National Trust** Objective 5 - question how creating a cleaner, greener and zero-carbon future for local communities will be evidenced and monitored. Urge elaboration of a specific, measurable approach to monitoring which can be applied to all aspects of development, including traffic generation, utilising appropriate 'carbon accounting' techniques.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Support 6 Strategic Objectives, in particular inclusion of strategic objective on "Healthy, Active and Resilient" which encourages walking and cycling. Access to healthy food is welcomed. SPD should consider availability of fast food outlets in vicinity or options to limit A5 uses. Include recommendations and findings of Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) guidance on "Planning Healthy Weight Environments".

## Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed.

### Existing Employment

Note the redevelopment aspirations to deliver jobs within the existing employment area.

### Designing out Crime

These principles have been incorporated into the SPD, such as ensuring appropriate mixes of land uses to encourage use throughout the day, overlooking of public spaces, appropriate lighting. This will be addressed through the detailed design.

### A428 Access & healthcare

A428 is addressed in section 2 and healthcare in section 5.2.

### Healthy Food / Fast food outlets

SPD already addresses many of the Healthy-weight environment themes – movement & access, open space and recreation, access to healthy food, village centre and neighbourhood spaces, building design. Planning application also required to submit a Health Impact Assessment. There are no specific policy restrictions on the provision of fast food restaurants or their location in the Local Plan. Issues of proliferation and perceived clustering close to vulnerable facilities and land uses were not raised as issues when that plan was being prepared. Any future Local Plan changes in this regard would be taken into account when planning applications are being considered for the development of the village centre.

### Net zero carbon

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires policies to be “In line with the objectives and provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008.” Climate Change Act has been updated to include a target for the UK to be net zero by 2050. Given the timescales for delivery of Bourn Airfield, it is considered appropriate for the Vision to recognise the role that the site will have in helping to facilitate a move towards net zero carbon lifestyles. SPD does not seek to require development as a whole to be net zero carbon, but instead looks to encourage consideration of this target as a possible approach to being an exemplar of sustainable development, exceeding baseline policy requirements for sustainable construction, as required by Policy SS/7.

The developers will be required to submit a site wide Sustainability Strategy with their planning applications. This will be reviewed with each phase of development to ensure it keeps pace with national policy changes and technological updates. As it is required to demonstrate how the development will address sustainability issues, including carbon emissions, it will require monitoring to be undertaken and later phases of development to respond to any issues arising to ensure the development is policy compliant.

### Local character

SPD refers to local character, identity and materials within Section 3, particularly sections 3A Responding to Context and 3B Built Character.

### Access to countryside for all users

Objective 3 refers to “offering opportunities for physical recreation and social interaction for all”. This is not restricted to, but may include, access to the countryside. Section 4 addresses this objective in further detail, including section 4B Access to natural environments. The second bullet refers to “facilitate and encourage access to existing natural environments including...the wider countryside via connections to footpaths and bridleways.”

## Proposed Modifications

No modifications are proposed in response to representations on the Vision and Objectives

Reorder Objectives 3 and 4 within Section 5.1 (page 33) and Chapter 5 of the SPD text.

## 4. Spatial Framework

### Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 6 Comment: 16

Total: 25

### Main issues in representations:

67783, 67914, 67990, 68019, 68060, 68111, 68144, 68145, 68159, 68177, 68208, 68209, 68210, 68211, 68212, 68213, 68251, 68255, 68259, 68276, 68281, 68289, 68296, 68311, 68312

### Support

- [Aitchison Developments Ltd](#) - Support identification of existing employment site as providing future employment and need for new village to maintain direct access to strategic highway network to/from it. Fix A states primary street must "...provide direct vehicle access to the existing employment site." This is supported. Vital to **site's success**. **Error on Spatial Framework Plan - annotated access as a secondary** street and not a primary street.
- [Natural England](#) - Welcome that Spatial Framework Plan proposes a network of multifunctional green and blue spaces, with Strategic Landscape Areas including possible country park to the south, to improve local links and delivery of biodiversity and hydrological benefits. Also supportive of requirements for cycle and footpath links to Cambourne, Highfields, Caldecote and Bourn.
- [Wildlife Trust](#) - Supports spatial framework for Bourn Airfield development. Strategic landscape areas to south identified as a country park will be essential to delivering biodiversity net gain and providing an accessible and strategic natural greenspace for the new residents.

### Object

- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) - (a) one of High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) stops is far away from homes; route needs to be more central with stops closer to houses (b) primary road runs through most densely populated parts, guaranteeing maximum number of people will suffer from exposure to pollution and road danger caused by cars and village centre will be car dominated because primary road runs through it; swap road alignment with HQPT so village centre and houses are only served by secondary non-

through routes; (c) cycling network is too peripheral and doesn't appear to be well-connected to the interior of site; dense grid of closely spaced routes should criss cross site to be pervasive, direct and convenient.

- [Knapwell Parish Meeting](#) - Locating village 'centre' in North West corner provides an inherent Broadway-biased emphasis, which will bias traffic movement to this area of the development, and therefore the Broadway. Should as minimum be relocated to centre, or more preferably to East side to reflect stated intent to 'minimise rat-running through villages' south (Bourn) and North (Knapwell), and bias traffic movements to Highfields exit.
- Movement of bus stop from Childerley roundabout towards Cambourne will be huge blow to Highfields residents. Access to existing stop is dangerous, without any increased traffic accessing site. Existing stop close enough for Highfields residents. Will force many residents to use cars, contrary to aims.
- The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

### Comment

- [Cambourne Town Council](#) - Landscape buffer to Broadway is minimal. Okay to northwest where Cambourne is also close to Broadway, but southwestern parcel close to road should be moved back. Page 52 states that 'consideration of the existing country lane character of Broadway, and the potential value of retaining this' is needed, however, current buffer doesn't look to achieve this.
- [Cambourne Town Council](#) - Concerned regarding route of HQPT. Stops are a long way from lots of houses and village centre is pushed towards Cambourne and will not be central to the new community.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Spatial Framework Plan suggests north-south runway as a focus for green corridor. North-east to south-west runway is of greater significance to military use of site (main runway under prevailing weather conditions). Suggest consideration be given to this feature in terms of site's heritage.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Spatial Framework Plan - uses in Safeguarding Area surrounding Bourn Water Recycling Centre (WRC) includes strategic landscape which is acceptable. Also seems to be an area not defined in key (pale green horizontal hatching). Helpful if this was identified so that a view can be taken as to whether this is compatible with WRC.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - (CCC) Spatial Framework Plan - at earlier stages of SPD preparation CCC Education preferred Option B, which located secondary school and primary school south of spine road. Provided good balance between accessible links within site for pupils and external links for staff. A428 is further away and therefore noise and air quality impacts would be much less severe. Option A in draft SPD. Only acceptable if environmental



concerns can be adequately addressed, noting SPD proposes significant landscaping which may be bundled to reduce impacts of A428.

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** - generally support overall content, weight and balance of Executive Summary, including six strategic objectives, and stated main purpose of document (reference to the Spatial Framework on page ii). Support that SPD should establish the broad structure and indicative positions of key components of Spatial Framework. 'Spatial Framework Diagram' is a more accurate description of its form of presentation, should be used throughout SPD instead of 'plan'. Waterbeach SPD describes Spatial Framework as a diagram. Bourn Airfield should use same terminology.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** - Comparison of SPD Spatial Framework and Countryside's application - areas of difference: (1) HQPT alignment (moved eastwards). Secondary school building will not end vista from Runway Park. (2) Broadway access located within land outside applicant's control. (3) HQPT stop located in proximity to primary network junction, which would be difficult to achieve. (4) Local Centre located away from HQPT stop and would not benefit from footfall. (5) Formal sports provision split within four sites which improves catchment but will result in management issues and reduced changing/parking facilities. (6) Primary road network different alignment. (7) Green corridor follows different alignment. More direct pedestrian/cycle routes along it would be beneficial. (8) Additional green link shown. (9) Consistent runway corridor width. (10). Significant additional Country Park Area shown. (11) Country Park area outside applicant's control. (12). Primary school does not create an important event and focal element along primary route. (13) HQPT alignment discounts options running through St Neots roundabout. (14) HQPT stop moved westwards in front of existing DB Group cement manufacturing facility which would create poor gateway experience. (15) Mixed uses such as hotel might benefit from being closer to St. Neots roundabout. Primary road alignment slightly different. (16) Larger formal sports provision more appropriate along A120 corridor. As (5). (17) Pedestrian cycle link through Aitchison employment area lies outside applicant's control. (18) DOS7 green corridor was located along existing ditch and part of drainage strategy. SFP alignment arbitrary. (19) As (5). (20) Additional primary road link. (21). Primary road alignment along woodland edge would impact adversely on Wildlife site. (22) Larger primary school site is shown providing an additional form of entry. (23) Significant additional Country Park Area shown.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd (CP)** - Country Park - shows areas beyond Countryside's control / landownership of family who currently own and farm the land. Includes land at south of site, shown to be strategic landscape/country park. Given landownership constraints it is not possible for full area shown in SPD, and Local Plan, to be delivered by CP. CP propose amendments to extend Country Park to provide lateral connections within

revisions to outline planning application. Will enhance connections to adjoining settlements and existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network. Further detail set out in appended document.

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** – North West Corner - concerned the Spatial Framework Diagram proposes solely residential use in NW corner adjacent to expressway and Village Centre. Diagram should be revised to include this area as mixed use, and text to include a list of potential uses that would be acceptable, e.g. A1, A2, A3, A4, B1 (a)(b), C1, C2, C3, Da, D2. Such uses will be complementary to Village Centre and provide variety, flexibility and opportunities for community cohesion / interaction.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** – North East Corner - Spatial Framework Diagram excludes any indicative development within MDS in north-east gateway into site. Major Development Sites (MDS) defined on Local Plan Policies Map Inset I allocates development in this area. Local Plan process tested this proposal and was found sound. No reasons given in SPD to justify no development. SPD should be in conformity with adopted Local Plan. Important to create a sense of arrival into new village by a combination of built form within an appropriate landscape-led setting. Appropriate forms of development in this gateway will create critical mass to enhance viability for HQPT. Should be shown for mixed use to allow for hotel or retail/café to come forward to support HQPT halt. For design flexibility, diagram should be revised to accord with extent of MDS shown on Adopted Policies Map. Design document shows how this could be achieved whilst supporting aim for that space to remain open.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** - Western Access - Spatial Framework Diagram indicates a road that curves beyond land under CP control and SPD boundary. Explained by Fix A (1). SPD Diagram and words should be revised to provide greater flexibility for delivery - remove words “(subject to availability of third party land)” as they add confusion. CP planning application includes detailed proposals to conform with Policy SS/7, which can be delivered within land under its control or Highway Authority. Without certainty, reference to third party land should be deleted. Potential to consider an alternative design option should be a matter for consideration of planning application and s106 agreement, which could secure an alternative option if land becomes available. SPD should set out principles not detailed prescription. Notwithstanding, design appendix outlines how Countryside have sought to review access proposals in this location to seek to achieve aspirations of SPD but within land under its control.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** - Village centre - located slightly south of CP proposed centre. Understood this is in response to stakeholders’ feedback during drafting SPD, advocating a more centrally located village centre. Support principles of co-location of village centre with runway bus halt and secondary school as set out in SPD. Important for village centre to be

delivered west of a central location in order to provide for: early delivery, thus removing the need for transitional and temporary uses, encourage community cohesion with a hub clustered around activity rather than arbitrarily in centre, and enhance commercial viability. Bus halt is a fix, following consultation under a separate process from both SPD and planning application, and location on the Spatial Framework Diagram appears to have moved. CP broadly content with slightly revised indicative location in Framework Diagram, subject to minor amendments proposed in appended design document.

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd - Outdoor Sports** - CP understand merits in distribution across site in respect of phasing of delivery, sustainability, accessibility to facilities across site and for variety of uses to be provided. Sound reasons not to distribute the outdoor sports - benefits of clustering in respect of future maintenance, deliver a better quality of pavilion facilities to serve them which enhances potential use for non-sports activities, more efficient land use for residential development. Propose an alternative design solution: • Expansion of Broadway Fields for efficiency and improved village edge; • Expansion of northern formal sports pitch provision to form central focus and utilise enhanced facilities; • Eastern edge of development set back from Highfields Caldecote, in a more linear form, to create an increased length with a greater set back between two settlements; • Informal kickabout areas in North East gateway to enhance integration of two communities whilst maintaining separation; • Country Park increased in size with expansion of existing Highfields Caldecote recreation ground. Planning application was designed on basis of dual use, as had been previously agreed through extensive pre-application process. Pending agreement on dual use at secondary school, suggest this be shown hatched to denote that they are an 'either/or' provision.
- **DB Group (Holdings) Ltd** - Essential that Spatial Framework Plan takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. Requires particular consideration being given to adequate distance separation from noise sources, site and building layout / orientation, provision of acoustic barriers as deemed necessary in accordance with the PPG.
- **Greater Cambridge Partnership** - Supportive in principle of proposed route alignment shown, consistent with discussions to date with South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and Countryside. Note provision for a segregated route for Coast to Coast (C2C) route that avoids the Bourn roundabout. Consistent with one of three options for C2C currently being progressed, and can be further developed.
- Ensure maps (e.g. Figures 20 & 22) are consistent with Caldecote Village Design Guide SPD. In particular locations of connecting pathways and valued views.

## Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed.

### Existing Employment

The SPD text (at Fix A) is clear the primary street must "...provide direct vehicle access to the existing employment site." The Spatial Framework Diagram is consistent with this, showing the Primary Street running past the site, providing a direct access into the employment area.

Note the concerns of existing employers for the development of the new village not to impact on their current and proposed operational plans for their sites. The SPD acknowledges their aspirations (Section 2.2) and sensitive relationship to the new village (Figure 21 Key Constraints). Planning applications for the development of the employment area including from existing employers will be assessed against the policies and allocations of the adopted Local Plan taking into account all relevant material considerations.

### Mixed use areas

Land in the North West Corner adjoins the village centre and there is opportunity to allow a mix of uses to make better use of land in a sustainable location close to the village centre and HQPT stop. It is suitable for mixed use development including small scale employment, residential and other appropriate uses. This will allow flexibility for the new village to better accommodate future changes. It is less suitable for conventional family homes.

### Strategic Landscape

Note the support from Natural England and Wildlife Trust for provision of a network of multifunctional green and blue spaces and extensive areas of strategic landscaping for open space, recreational routes and biodiversity.

### HQPT alignment and stops

HQPT alignment through the site agreed with Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and County Council as most appropriate and future proofs CAM proposals. To address concerns about accessibility to the stops it is proposed to move the eastern HQPT stop eastwards, closer to Caldecote. Proposed amendments to development in the North Eastern corner will bring more residents closer to the stop, and a network of walking and cycling routes will provide good access. As a consequential change, the walking and cycling routes will need realigning to serve the relocated HQPT stop.

### Road alignment, Cycle provision

Whilst the car is not the preferred mode for travel within the site, it is important to accommodate travel by this mode. Nonetheless, more direct access will be provided for walkers and cyclists though a network of routes throughout the site (and connection to wider routes), with priority over vehicles at junctions and crossings.

### A428 Access & healthcare

A428 is addressed in section 2 and healthcare in section 5.2.

### Landscape buffer

The SPD proposes a substantial landscape buffer around all edges (Fix F). To protect the 'country lane' character of the Broadway a 30m buffer is proposed with the Broadway.

### Heritage

Suggestion that more can be made of the site's heritage, including the second runway. This is reflected in the alignment of green corridor from the schools to open space on the eastern boundary. There is scope to incorporate other measures such as heritage trails within the detailed design.

### Waste Water Recycling Centre

A safeguarding area is shown on the constraints map (Figure 21). The only land use proposed within this area is strategic landscaping.

### Location of schools

The SPD is clear that development will need to mitigate any potential impacts on schools including noise and air quality (Section 5G). This may include measures such as a buffer to the A428 using landscaped earth bunds, building orientation and suitably ventilated buildings.

### Spatial Framework Plan / Diagram

Agree that the SPD should refer to the Spatial Framework Diagram to reflect the fact that it is illustrative and to be consistent with the terminology used within the Waterbeach New Town SPD.

The Diagram has been checked for consistency with the Local Plan allocation and Caldecote Village Design Guide SPD. It is proposed to amend the indicative locations of walking and cycling connection to Caldecote.

### Countryside proposals

Note that there are differences between the draft SPD and the submitted Countryside planning application. A number of proposed changes to the SPD are proposed in response to representations. It is anticipated that following adoption of the SPD that the Countryside planning application would be amended to make it more consistent with the SPD and then be subject to further public consultation.

The Major Development Site (MDS) identified on the adopted Local Plan Policies Map includes a relatively narrow area of land in the north east part of the site. Local Plan Policy SS/7 states that the built area of the new settlement will be contained within the MDS. The draft SPD for consultation did not identify any built development in this narrow area. Officers consider that in policy terms some development could be appropriate in this north east area within the MDS but that given the sensitivity of this location and its role as both a gateway to the new village and separation between it and Highfields Caldecote, the appropriate approach to this area should be considered through a design-led approach as part of the planning application process. No change is therefore proposed to the Spatial Framework Diagram.

### Sports – dual use

See section 5.2.

## Proposed Modifications

References to 'Spatial Framework Plan' should read 'Spatial Framework Diagram'

Refinements to the Spatial Framework Diagram include:

### North West Corner:

- Show mixed use area in North West corner (orange)

### North East Corner:

- Amend the alignment of the road slightly northwards, closer to the A428.
- Move the eastern HQPT stop slightly eastwards.
- Realign the walking / cycling routes from the existing employment site and Caldecote to serve the relocated HQPT stop.
- Move the primary school slightly to the east to front the primary road.

### Village Centre:

- Revise the shape of the Village Centre to be more elliptical, towards the centre of the site.

### Sports Pitches:

- Extend the area of the northern sports pitches to include additional land to the south, up to the primary street.
- Enlarge the sports pitches in the south western corner to include additional land to the north.
- Show the extensions to the northern and south western corner pitches as hatched for potential sports pitches or residential (dependent upon whether it is possible to secure dual / shared use of school sports pitch provision).
- Delete the pitches on the eastern boundary and replace with a reshaped rectangular area of additional strategic landscaping along the eastern boundary.
- Delete the western pitches and show as residential use.

### Secondary Road alignment:

- Amend the secondary road alignment on the eastern side so that it does not pass so close to the Bucket Hill Plantation.

### Walking and Cycling routes:

- Ensure consistency with Caldecote Village Design Guide SPD on routes connecting to Caldecote.

### Wider context:

- Show the staggered junction at the top of the Broadway towards Knapwell.

#### Formatting:

- Remove the stripes from the south western open space, white land and woodland.

(With consequential updating to other Figures within the SPD to reflect these amendments).

4D Outdoor and indoor sports provision - amend the third paragraph to read:  
**'It is common practice in South Cambridgeshire for there to be dual use of secondary school sports pitches. The Council and the Local Education Authority (LEA) would encourage this at Bourn Airfield.** Shared and dual use of sports facilities at schools, including pitches and changing rooms, ~~may be possible.~~ This should be explored with the Local Education Authority (LEA) **school provider.** Where this is proposed, the applicants will be required to demonstrate that such agreements with the LEA can be delivered.'

#### Fix H Provision for outdoor sports

- Amend the first and second paragraphs to read:  
**'To meet full requirements Policy SC/7 approximately** ~~Approximately~~ 15.5ha of outdoor sports facilities should be provided and broadly at the locations shown on the ~~Spatial Framework plan~~ **Figure 48.**

**The Council and the Local Education Authority (LEA) would encourage dual / shared use of sports pitches with schools at Bourn Airfield.** Formal sports provision ~~does not~~ **can** include additional sports fields and facilities provided with the secondary and primary schools **where agreed with future school provider(s)** ~~Opportunities for shared use of school sports facilities could be considered subject to discussion with future providers.~~

**If dual / shared use of the school pitches is agreed with the school provider(s) the hatched areas may, subject to an assessment of local need, be used for alternative uses, including residential.'**

- Delete the last sentence of first bullet:  
~~Opportunities to share facilities with the adjacent schools should be explored.~~
- Delete text at second bullet (Area 2):  
~~'A park type environment integrated with surrounding landscapes, providing a range of grass pitches and potential for tennis Courts and other recreational sports.'~~
- Amend third bullet:  
~~'Smaller scale areas of fields located to the western edge of the site with grass pitches primarily for informal recreation.~~ **Formal outdoor sports provision to the south western edge of the site, which could include provision for cricket.'**
- Delete fourth bullet:

~~'Smaller scale areas of fields located to the eastern edge of the site with grass pitches primarily for informal recreation.'~~

#### Fig 48 provision for outdoor sports

- Revise the outdoor sports areas 1 and 3 (with land not needed in the event of dual use shown as hatched) consistent with the revisions to Fix H and the Spatial Framework Diagram.
- Remove areas 2 and 4.

## 5. Creating the Place Section 1: A Well-Connected Place

### Representations received:

Support: 1 Object: 38 Comment: 34

Total: 73

### Main issues in representations:

67738, 67784, 67913, 67917, 67967, 67968, 67984, 67985, 67999, 68004, 68007, 68008, 68012, 68013, 68014, 68026, 68027, 68043, 68049, 68051, 68053, 68054, 68057, 68061, 68068, 68071, 68073, 68076, 68086, 68091, 68106, 68115, 68116, 68129, 68130, 68133, 68149, 68151, 68178, 68179, 68193, 68194, 68196, 68197, 68207, 68215, 68220, 68225, 68244, 68245, 68248, 68265, 68266, 68267, 68269, 68277, 68295, 68318, 68319, 68320, 68347, 68348, 68349, 68350, 68351, 68352, 68354, 68355, 68356, 68358, 68359, 68362

### Support

- Wanted to say how important plans to include equestrians are, and as riders how much we appreciate inclusion. Lot of horse riders in area, creating proposed bridleways will link up adjacent villages and create much wider network of off-road riding, which allows for much safer hacking. Provision of soft surfaces to ride on, along with places to mount will be hugely beneficial and valued additions to access itself. We look forward to hopefully riding these tracks one day!

### Object

- **British Horse Society** Section 1A - Horse riding should be included in surrounding bridleway network, not just implying these are for pedestrians and cyclists. Section 1B - These should be Non-Motorised User routes.
- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** - Section 1A Support: 'Site access points from the surrounding road network which are safe and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists'. Oppose: 'A Primary Street which forms the spine of the site for all users...serves the village centre'. Primary road running through middle of site will expose more people to air pollution and road danger. Instead, primary road should run along northern fringe of site, in order to protect people from pollution and road danger caused by excessive motor traffic. Oppose:



'Secondary streets which provide direct access to other areas of the site and are designed to accommodate potential bus routes'. Streets designed as bus routes tend to encourage higher speeds and more dangerous manoeuvres by car drivers. Therefore, (a) the dedicated 'high-quality' public transport route should run more centrally through site, (b) secondary streets that may host bus routes should be carefully selected in advance, and (c) bus gates should be used wherever needed to prevent rat-running by car drivers. Add: 'walking and cycling routes, whether they be on-street or off-street, should be the locus of social activity around buildings, therefore building frontages should always face and open up towards any adjacent walking or cycle route.'

- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) - Section 1B Add: the cycle parking in new buildings must follow the design specifications laid out in policy TI/3 and either a cycle parking guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) when it is published by South Cambridgeshire District Council, or until such time, the guide (and its successors) currently published by Cambridge City Council.
- [Bourn Parish Council](#) Section 1C – SPD states details for Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Cambourne to Cambridge scheme are not yet finalised. Also, no detail for the Mayor's metro aspirations. SPD should explain what High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) will be, passenger numbers, destinations, connectivity with other routes, and how many cars will be taken off road. Very concerned insufficient consideration to public transport connectivity. Suggest GCP finalised before SPD approved.
- [Bourn Parish Council](#) Section 1C – SPD states small scale parking facilities adjacent to HQPT stops. Concerned will encourage more car use. More detail / explanation needed.
- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) Section 1C - Oppose: 'small-scale passenger parking facilities could also be provided on the site adjacent to the HQPT stops'. Even small-scale parking harms the surrounding walking and shopping environment. Only blue badge parking and cycle parking would be acceptable here. For all others, the Park and Ride service is available off-site.
- [Knapwell Parish Meeting](#) Section 1C - One of strategic objectives is stated as the avoidance of coalescence, ensuring Bourn Airfield is a 'distinct new village'. Providing direct transport links to Cambourne and Bourn Broadway from west side of a new development fundamentally undermines this strategic statement. Locating village 'centre' in North West corner fundamentally undermines this strategic statement.
- Section 1C - Access to HQPT refers to travel to Cambridge city which really understates where residents will need to travel to. Falls short of delivering connection of public transport to rail, business parks, biomedical centres, retail parks and places that people would otherwise use their cars. Dependence on shift to public transport is to risk that St Neots Road can carry car traffic if shift does not materialise. TRICS rates would suggest traffic numbers pro rata with Cambourne, 30,000 vehicles in/out per day, around

2000 vehicles departing per morning peak. Traffic heading east is 77%, with no connection to A428, will more double traffic heading down St Neots Road, Hardwick. This without traffic from developments in St Neots and Cambourne West. To offer retrospective fixes if monitoring shows roads are inadequate means further long periods of misery while A428 connections are built. Experience of Cambourne shows task ahead. For proof that Public transport even within site is not solution, evidence full carpark that serves Morrisons, Medical centre, Library and other retail outlets.

- [Bourn Parish Council](#) Section 1D - Seriously concerned about traffic generated. Based on Cambourne, will generate 2,695 car journeys. Even with 10-30% shift to public transport, 2,142 cars. In addition, planning application for employment site, with up to 800 parking spaces. Where is comprehensive approach to assessing traffic movement for both planning applications?
- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) Section 1D - Oppose: 'Parking should be designed in accordance with the guidelines set out in Policy TI/3 and the associated table at Figure 11: Parking Provision, with an aspiration for low car ownership.' Policy TI/3 encourages high car ownership rates and is in direct conflict with aspiration for low car ownership. Principle should be rewritten to allow for lower levels of car parking provision. 'Limiting the number of through-routes' is not strong enough, it should be written as 'There will be no through-routes for vehicles through residential areas' to prevent rat-running.' 'Informal pedestrian crossings' does not give priority to pedestrians. To give priority there must be more formal, Zebra pedestrian crossings. Add: 'Streets should incorporate planted verges adjacent to the carriageway, especially streets with driveways, in order to allow room for dropped kerbs and street furniture while ensuring that footways and/or cycleways can be built unobstructed and without adverse camber.'
- Section 1D - plan will necessitate increased traffic and additional busway down St Neots Rd. Line of mature trees will be chopped down. How can you justify that now, when we know how trees affect our health and environment? Trees have been absorbing noise and pollution for decades. Adding MORE traffic, but removing mature trees is irresponsible. Fences are no substitute.
- Section 1D - State "private vehicles are the least preferred transport" is to ignore fact that a good proportion of traffic will be heading east, towards M11 and access south. SPD should state what evidence is available to support how traffic can be accommodated by public transport? State that private cars are essential for only "some" people simply wrong. Ignores everyday life. Aspiration of development with no cars ignores fact pretty much all residents will have 1 if not 2 cars and will use them. SPD should state that evidence is required on all figures presented in Travel Plan and Transport Assessment to ensure Developers can be taken to task. Monitoring is insufficient as it provides developer with an open invitation to be economical with Plan on which development is based. Connection to A428 is a MUST and traffic

figures based upon Cambourne trip rates and traffic pattern support this. Direct connection up and over A428 will allow Busway to run on north of A428 avoiding destruction of village life in Hardwick.

- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) - Fix A Add: 'All the new or reconfigured junctions must be designed with safe and convenient walking and cycling routes.'  
Oppose: 'The development will create a primary street linking the main access points, which must...serve the village centre'. Terrible mistake to put primary street through village centre, it will create a car-dominated environment and discourage people from walking to and around shops. Village centre should be accessed by car through secondary streets and should never be possible to use village centre as driving through-route. Add: 'The primary street should be routed as far to the north and distant from houses as possible, keeping it close to the existing road infrastructure and keeping pollution, noise and road danger away from residents.'
- [Guilden Morden Parish Council](#) - Fix A - future transport arrangements should include the new Bourn Airfield development.
- [Hardwick Evangelical Church](#) Fix A - recognise need for new housing. Would like new development to be as good as possible for those who come to live there, and already live in surrounding villages. Potential car journeys generated are forced onto local roads because no direct access to A428 is major concern. You're expecting traffic queues out of village. Please re-visit major omission for all our sakes.
- [Toft Parish Council](#) Fix A - very concerned about access and egress to site as undoubtedly it will impact traffic through Toft and surrounding villages.
- Fix A there should absolutely be no access to Broadway from new settlement given the great detriment the increase of traffic through village would cause.
- Fix A - Direct access to A428 essential: some residents will have to catch another bus within city; others will work outside Cambridge in surrounding villages and beyond. Rush hour traffic is major issue in Cambourne, Toft, Hardwick, Comberton and Bourn and new development will further exacerbate. Highways England drastically underestimated amount of traffic usage on these smaller roads including extra traffic from new development. Developers need to finance resolution of these very significant issues.
- Fix A - Will cause huge increase in traffic down St Neots Rd, Hardwick. Busy at rush times, affecting getting in and out of our properties. Increase in noise and air pollution coming straight past our doors. No chance of leaving windows open either. Will affect our health and ruin our environment.
- Fix A - should be direct access onto A428. If traffic comes directly onto Childerley roundabout it will cause congestion on St Neots Road and Highfields Road through Caldecote. HQPT system must be kept completely separate from Childerley roundabout and St Neots Road. No traffic lights, no possibility of cars entering by mistake.

- Fix A – Caldecote residents extremely concerned about inevitable massive increase in traffic numbers, vast majority of which will be funnelled onto Caldecote roundabout and narrow local roads. Congestion at peak times resulting in long tail backs in all directions, gridlock in villages such as Hardwick and Madingley Road to Cambridge. Commercial vehicles from Aitchinson development will create further pressure on roundabout which is too small for volume of vehicles. Drivers will become impatient and take risks. Vehicles entering and leaving petrol station will complicate further. Accidents already occurred. Likely to rat run through Caldecote (impact safety and amenity of residents) to access B1046 into Cambridge, M11 via Barton, Addenbrookes or A1198 for Royston and station, in order to avoid hold ups. Little employment, not self-sufficient for jobs. Efforts mitigating impact on Caldecote will be ineffective. Speed cushions and narrowing road with blind bends does not stop vehicles hurtling round bends in middle of road. Little faith in transport surveys conducted by client friendly commercial transport consultants. Suggestion development will be 'well connected ... locally' seems optimistic. Only viable solution is to have direct access onto A428 and rethink of transport provision, ensuring Caldecote receives some bus provision and people are able to access it safely.
- Fix A - Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, development will have unacceptable negative impact on surrounding villages and its future residents.
- Fix A - Number of cars use village as a rat run; been serious road traffic accident, reported thefts from road side and buildings are experiencing cracks due to thundering of lorries.
- Fix A - Getting traffic to and away from new development is not being considered thoroughly enough, given current thinking means a huge load is weighted on The Broadway, making Bourn and surrounding villages rat runs that Knapwell and Dry Drayton have become. Exits should lead on to A428; the lives, environment and safety of existing villagers are more important than too many junctions on A428.
- Fix A Object strongly to access on Broadway given rat-race to Royston and how speed limit is ignored. Road across to Broadway will be an accident hazard.
- Fix A - live on the Broadway and traffic already speeds down, through village. BAD states that people will be unable to turn left onto the Broadway. However, residents will be able to go round a roundabout and turn right down the Broadway. Traffic calming is therefore a necessity.
- Fix A - Object on grounds that it does not provide sufficient ingress/ egress for residents and does not sufficiently mitigate impact on St Neots Road and surrounding villages. Direct access to A428 is needed.
- Fix A "good transport connections will be important in making the new village successful". Agree. Why then is village not connected directly to A428? Why

will you make residents travel through lower capacity roads to get out of village? Object for these reasons. Current road layout will inevitably lead to more traffic on minor roads including those through local villages rather than getting best use out of major road A428. Needs changing now before layout is set in stone.

- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) Fix B - Contradiction between 'A shared pedestrian and cycle route' and 'Segregated pedestrian and cycle routes'. Unclear which is meant where. Delete the word 'shared' and instead replace it with 'segregated'. Add: 'Cycle routes along urban streets must be adjacent to a separate, dedicated footway. Away from streets, cycle routes should be built with a separate, dedicated footway unless it can be convincingly demonstrated that pedestrian usage will be sufficiently low to allow sharing. For design and construction, use standards found in manuals such as *Designing for Cycle Traffic* by John Parkin.' Add: 'Strategic walking and cycling routes must have continuity and priority over motor traffic at side-road crossings and driveways.' Add: 'Routes must be fully accessible to people with disabilities who are using mobility aids such as mobility scooters, adapted cycles and wheelchairs.'
- [Hardwick Evangelical Church](#) Fix B - if serious about walking, cycling and public transport, make these things easiest and most accessible - put busway and cycle way through middle (currently route of "primary street") and move "village centre" and community building to middle of rather than northeastern corner. Current plan encourages driving locally.
- [Shelford and District Bridleways Group](#) Fix B - No NMU routes are being considered for woodland. Walking and pedestrian access is implied in wording - any links to the bridleway network need to be NMU. Enhancement needs to be defined - tarmac surfaces on bridleways are not enhancements. Figure 28 does not include routes discussed at meeting with BHS.
- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) Fix C - Oppose: 'combined walking and cycling path with a minimum 3m width'. Segregated combined walking and cycling path must be at least 4.5m wide. 3m much too narrow for segregation, would allow only 1.5m for footway and 1.5m for single direction cycleway, without enough space for a bi-directional cycleway. Add: 'There must be a safe buffer between the busway and the cycleway of at least 2m grass verge.' 'There must be safe and convenient crossing points designed with cycling-friendly curvature such that people walking and cycling approach the crossing in a direction perpendicular to the movement of buses, with clear and very long visibility splays in both directions, and ideally with a 3m-deep refuge island between the bus lanes.' 'No chicanes or guardrails are to be used, because these block visibility, exclude some people with disabilities from using the path, pose an obstacle that will cause injuries, create a dangerous distraction from moving buses, and cause conflict between users of the path.'

- Fix C - creation of massive loads of stress for new residents who will have to commute as no local work. Bus into centre of Cambridge will not answer needs of people working at Science Park, Addenbrookes or outside of Cambridge.
- Fix C - laudable that high quality public transport route is provided, although doubts many will undertake trek from southern reaches to use it and will probably drive. Bus stop will be moved further from Caldecote roundabout, and Caldecote residents - already walk one / two miles. Adequate and safely accessible bus service must be provided to serve communities whose freedom of movement will be severely curtailed by effects of congestion.
- Fix C - plans include moving bus stop serving Highfields towards Cambourne. Unacceptable and blatant disregard of existing village requirements! Site not directly connected to A428 and proposed access routes are woefully inadequate. Traffic entering and leaving site will use Highfields and Hardwick as rat runs should there be any issue with between Childerley roundabout and A428 and this simple fact appears to have been brushed aside!
- [Bourn Parish Council](#) - Access to Broadway contentious. Compromise position to ensure northbound only. Anxious to see layout of northbound only junction. Third party land needs to be secured before planning permission is granted. More detail needed on St Neots Road / Broadway junction design – roundabout would nullify effectiveness. HQPT, cycle and walking junction needs to be kept free of vehicles in perpetuity.
- [Hardwick Parish Council](#) - disappointing to note SPD endorses much of outline application with particular regard to transport infrastructure, and seems disregarded recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Village meeting attended by 60 residents, main topic of debate was transport infrastructure, and particularly provision of an all ways junction onto A428. Traffic figures considerably under estimate traffic movements, when compared to surveys carried out for other developments. No left turn at Broadway, and two lanes for a short distance at Caldecote roundabout for traffic from east, is a poor solution. Proper access needs to happen before building commences, mitigation of problem after this is too late. If Broadway is kept as country road by preventing traffic from settlement turning left, why is St Neots Road is not classified same. Can't be too late to lobby Highways England for junction onto A428. Developers admitted that providing a junction would mean less facilities on settlement, should this be at surrounding villages expense and quality of life or their bottom line?
- Bourn Parish Council - Concerned at use of Childerley roundabout and the Broadway as main access points. Clear that local roads will be severely affected. Already rat runs, will be exacerbated. Robust assessment of new junction onto A428 needed. Department for Transport (DfT) circular refers to delivery of strategic planned growth – surely 3,000 houses fits criteria. Countless examples of closely spaced junctions. Argument doesn't hold

weight. Questions over who should have made the case, what steps did South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) take to assess case? No opportunity for debate or consultation.

- Access for traffic directly onto A428 would allow easy access to/from village without having to drive along old A428. Lack of direct access will create excessive traffic through surrounding villages. Village centre offset to north west meaning residents in south will have a long way to get to amenities and will use their cars. Better to relocate to a more central location so all villagers could easily walk to shops etc. Vehicular access onto Broadway will cause congestion and traffic through Bourn village, even with restricted left turn. Busway only travels along top of village. Better to route it through centre making it easier to access by all residents and not have to drive to reach.
- Residents will not just work in central Cambridge. Provision of a single access point to A428 via the St Neots road is totally inadequate for community of this size. Needs direct link to A428. Bus proposal will serve a single point in City requiring further bus rides to get to and from where people actually work. Will lead to rat-running through Bourn Valley villages and traffic calming entire local road network to address is too ridiculous for words.

#### Comment

- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Section 1A - inclusion of dementia friendly design principles is welcomed.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) Section 1A - inclusion of "...street network that integrates movement and place" is welcomed. Greater clarification is needed on commitments to deliver segregated cycle routes and segregated pedestrian routes. SPD is unclear if separate routes will be delivered or if shared surfaces will dominate. Term "alongside streets" needs to be defined/clarified to understand the level of segregated routes which will be expected to be provided. Figure 28 appears to show a gap in provision to South West corner of site, this may be due to lack of residential housing in this area or provision of green space, either way reasoning should be made clear.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Section 1A Point 1 should read, "This should prevent access onto the Broadway for southbound traffic and also northbound traffic from the Broadway south to prevent rat running through the existing village of Bourn as per policy SS/7".
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) (CP) Section 1A - fully aware of key importance of junction onto the Broadway as an entrance to new village but also in light of its interaction with existing community at Bourn. Key area of focus during pre-application discussions and application process itself with key stakeholders and local community. CP have revisited proposals (shown in design appendix) to respond to aspirations but within land currently available and shown within Local Plan allocation. Through application process CP prepared to consider contingency arrangement only on basis it was fully

accepted by SCDC there were no constraints in delivery, pursuant to responses received from Cambridge County Council (CCC). Currently no certainty that land will be transferred. Spatial framework should be based on land included within Local Plan allocation. Existing junction of St Neots Road and the Broadway, CP note that capacity assessments are not showing any improvements are required.

- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Section 1B should make reference to upcoming "South Cambridgeshire Cycle Design Toolkit".
- Section 1B - schools should be located in car-free zones, so as to encourage walking, cycling and "park and stride".
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) Section 1D - commitment to provide "seating suitable for all age groups" is welcomed.
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) - Section 1D states new village will not be served by direct access from A428. This is making new policy, contrary to requirements of an SPD. Must be removed. Ruling out an option at this stage is completely unacceptable.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) Section 1D - content with this section. 2nd bullet point may be a commercial point for consideration. However, it does not specify what this is. Note that not having direct access to A428 is reinforced here, consistent with meeting on 10th May 2019. Third paragraph - fully support implementation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Practical considerations and constraints must be considered with respect to installation, particularly points on residential streets given such infrastructure will not be responsibility of Countryside to install or manage. Whilst clear and growing demand for electric vehicles (EVs), relative percentage of EVs is still small and demand is not present. Recommend policy is updated; 'should include appropriate provision for electric vehicle charging at all car parking locations, including provision of charging points, infrastructure or sockets within private dwellings.'
- [Aitchison Developments Ltd](#) Fix A important to ensure SPD is not too prescriptive and binding such that becomes unnecessary burden at decision making stage, that could ultimately prejudice delivery of this existing employment site. Figure 27 identifies main points of access and primary street but fails to reflect requirement imposed by Fix A for primary street to "serve the village centre and provide direct vehicle access to the existing employment site.". Amend to reflect Fix A and show existing employment site being served by primary street.
- [Cambourne Town Council](#) Fix A - consideration should be given to direct access to A428. Missed opportunity not to do this. 1st bullet - worried that if third party land may be needed to achieve this option, it raises the question of its deliverability and potential need to consider direct access onto A428.
- [Cambourne Town Council](#) Fix A - consideration should be given to direct access to A428 to avoid conflict with HQPT at point 1 and 3.



- Cambridgeshire County Council - Fix A Point 1 should read "This should also prevent northbound traffic from the south accessing the site. To prevent rat running through the existing village of Bourn. It should be made clear that the junction design should restrict these left turn out and right turn in movements even if additional third party land is not able to be secured".
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) - Fix A western access from Broadway should be configured to give direct access to A428. Existing Childerley Roundabout must not just be enhanced, it must be reconfigured as it is 'planned' main access to site. Will be more dangerous than it already is, if not properly reconfigured. Existing pedestrian crossing too close to roundabout and been near misses with cars coming too fast from Hardwick direction into Highfields Road. Busy junction in morning peak hours already and visibility must be improved. Recommend SPD to require Childerley roundabout Highfields Road/St Neots road to be reconfigured and made safe, not just enhanced.
- Fix A - Green areas are being planned between houses and A428 to combat noise and encourage wildlife at Bourn. At Hardwick this barrier and wildlife area will be removed unless traffic uses A428. Essential an exit directly on to A428 is built otherwise noise and pollution from traffic along St. Neots Road will be disastrous.
- Fix A Needs to consider measures to mitigate traffic impact on surrounding villages and roads (Policy SS/7 8.c.i) - especially traffic heading south.
- [Aitchison Developments Ltd](#) - Fix B identifies strategic pedestrian and cycle network cutting through existing employment site to link proposed public transport corridor to north with residential areas to south. Not objected to in principle, and indeed is provided within Development proposals for site, spatial fix needs to be applied flexibly to allow proposed employment layout to make most efficient use of space available.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) Fix B - Figure 28 - colour difference between traffic free and alongside streets pedestrian/cycle routes is not very clear. Different colours would be clearer.
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) - Fix B Include access to Highfields Road at top of West Drive. No possibility of access to Furlong Way (impossible to cross village sports field). Leaves access only to Grafton Drive through proposed development granted planning at appeal. Recommend add: Cycling and walking access provision to existing employment site including DB Group and Diageo site.
- Fix B - Document in general, needs to clarify relationship with Caldecote Village SPD, and how any differences get resolved. Ideally they should be made consistent. E.g. current draft of Caldecote Village SPD proposes slightly different placement of strategic pedestrian routes vs. Figure 22 and Figure 28.
- [Cambourne Town Council](#) Fix C - concerned regarding route of HQPT. Stops a long way from a lot of houses and it means the village centre is pushed

towards Cambourne. Concerned proposal does not provide an integrated transport network for Bourn Airfield.

- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) Fix C - current position on route of rapid transit scheme has come out of numerous discussions with developer team and GCP. Concluded best located in north of site near A428 to best balance various needs of project (catchment, speed, engineering requirements etc.). Longer term, Mayor's innovative mass modes of transit - useful if land could be safeguarded, where practicably possible, to allow future evolution of the project. Ultimately, will need to offer high speed and reliability, should benefit from good catchment. Route as shown appears to meet needs of GCP.
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) Fix C - Whilst appreciate need for fast public transport, it is doubtful that any bus will be able to reach speeds of 55/60mph within development site. Negates the need to fix the bus route at top of site. Recommend shelter for waiting passengers should be enclosed to protect from inclement weather. Cycle stores be covered to provide protection and security. Use of multi-storey cycling pods be considered. See examples.
- Fix C - Bus stop locations must not be to detriment of Caldecote residents.
- [Barton & District Bridleways Group](#) - Access to countryside for all users should be included in this section. Not included in any of the other Strategic Objectives. Under 'Well Connected Places' heading, horse riding should be included. Last bullet point page 35 should be non motorised user routes. 4th bullet point page 39 - NMU routes should be considered for woodland? 5th bullet point page 39 - wording with title as is, only gives walking and pedestrian access to existing bridleway network and word 'path' in this context currently relates only to shared pedestrian and cycle access. Any links to bridleway network need to be NMU. 'Enhancement' also needs to be defined - putting a tarmac surface on a bridleway is not an enhancement.
- [Bourn Parish Council](#) - SPD sets out key access and movement principles, alongside a package of critical transport infrastructure, to support a shift from car to sustainable transport modes for journeys internal and external. Need more than platitudes. Need to know assumptions on how many people will use which modes and your targets. How many motorists will leave their cars to use more sustainable modes? What percentage of motorists will switch to more sustainable modes? What numbers will determine whether shift has been success or failure? What mitigation in place to deal with failure to shift sufficient number of motorists from cars?
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) - Chapter 5 agree the broad principles of setting a series of overarching guiding principles and key spatial fixes which are required to deliver on site. Purpose of SPD is to provide guidance in the form of a framework to guide preparation or determination of planning applications. 'Spatial Fixes' identified to reinforce 'Guiding Principles' are currently very specific and prescriptive. Waterbeach SPD sets out separately key Structuring Elements or 'Fixes' and Guiding principles, and style of

language is less prescriptive and inflexible. Bourn SPD sets out Guiding Principles and Spatial 'Fixes' which are mixed up throughout Section 5. Revise draft SPD accordingly. Unclear whether diagrams are intended to be treated as Guiding Principles or Spatial Fixes - page layouts should be reordered to avoid any confusion.

- **Network Rail** - concern that there doesn't appear to be much consideration of impact on infrastructure in general. Focusing on walking, cycling, in village where a proportion of people living in area are assumed to work locally. Recommend some assessment is made and consideration given to where people would work? Concern that significant numbers will add additional pressure to road and rail network. Significant impact on St Neots and Cambridge stations and would like to know if any consideration has been given as to whether there is enough parking at these stations? Includes references to 'high quality public transport' but unclear what this means. Public transport links to stations rather than private car preferable as to not add pressure on local road network or on passenger parking. Should refer to East West Rail company for further input.
- There must be no direct access from Bourn airfield into Bourn village and no access onto the Broadway from this new development.
- Planning north of London is continuing piecemeal; different planning bodies within transport, housing and employment from Government down, own agendas. Uncoordinated, eventually leading to chaos. Live in Hardwick. Doctor and dentist ten minute drive in Comberton. Bus takes an hour by Citi 4 and number 18. Wishful thinking to expect many new residents to use bus, however swift. Residents will have a multiplicity of destinations inevitably involving impractical journeys using at least two buses. At least five or six thousand cars. No connection planned between A428 and M11 at Girton or direct connection to A428. Six planning objectives yet fail miserably on first aim: "A well-connected place". Traffic should be able to connect with national road network at earliest opportunity. Result will be thousands of cars trying to get onto faster road, meandering about on local minor roads seeking to avoid congestion. Adjacent villages have problems making right turn eastwards, across traffic, to leave for Cambridge. Causes traffic to pile up at village exit. Highways Agency has doubts about transport plans for development.

## **Councils' Assessment**

Support welcomed.

### **Structure of Chapter 5**

The SPD is intended to provide guidance to inform the planning application process. As guidance there is flexibility in its interpretation. In contrast to the Waterbeach New Town SPD, which included these elements (Spatial Fixes and Guiding Principles) in separate chapters, this SPD seeks to combine the issues to provide clearer guidance (addressing each issue in one section) and thus avoid repetition. Agree

that it is unclear whether diagrams are intended to be treated as Guiding Principles or Spatial Fixes - this should be clarified.

#### Walking, cycling and horse-riding routes

Note the support for inclusion of new and improved routes for equestrians, and Cambridgeshire County Council's support for the inclusion of "...street network that integrates movement and place", including the inclusion of seating suitable for all ages and dementia friendly design.

The SPD text is clear that there will be a network of walking, cycling and horse riding routes within the site and connecting to the wider network. Agree the Fix B heading and Figure 28 should be amended to include horse riding. It has been suggested that a circular Restricted Byway be included, which would allow access by carriage drivers. Bridleways, by their designation, are permissible routes for equestrians. This does not need stating all through the SPD.

Note the concerns about enhancement of routes and potential impact on equestrians from hard surfaces. The nature of any enhancement will be determined in consultation with the County Council's PROW team; and may include improving access arrangements and signage, clearing vegetation etc.

Note the comments about segregated and shared paths. In general terms the preference is for segregated routes where possible, as these are more inclusive to all users. This should be made clearer.

Note concern over the clarity of the colours used in Figure 28 to denote traffic free and routes alongside streets pedestrian/cycle. This should be made clearer.

Note the comments in relation to the specifications for cycle path alongside the Cambridge to Cambourne HQPT scheme; this is a matter of detail for Greater Cambridge Partnership who is delivering the scheme.

#### Traffic routes / access

Whilst the car is not the preferred mode for travel within the site, it is important to accommodate travel by this mode. Nonetheless, more direct access will be provided for walkers and cyclists though a network of routes throughout the site (and connection to wider routes), with priority over vehicles at junctions and crossings. Similarly, appropriate access is needed for buses on the secondary route. Routes through the remainder of the development will prioritise access by non-motorised modes and discourage through traffic.

Direct access onto the A428 is addressed in section 2.

Concern is expressed in relation to the Broadway and Childerley roundabout accesses into the site. The SPD is clear these accesses will need enhancement to provide appropriate highway capacity. The nature of the enhancement and/or any restrictions on traffic movements (at the Broadway) can be addressed through the detailed design. It is possible to restrict traffic movements through the use of splitter islands or similar. This is a matter for planning application process, informed by the Transport Assessment. It is agreed that third party land is not needed to ensure the

site access onto the Broadway is policy compliant. Whilst there is agreement between Highways England and Cambridgeshire County Council to make the land transfer, there is uncertainty around the timing of its availability. Should the land become available in a timely manner any improvement to the junction design can be addressed through the detailed design. Reference to third party land should be removed from the SPD.

Concerns is expressed in relation and potential for rat running traffic through villages. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is clear that traffic monitoring will be undertaken on village routes as well as appropriate mitigation, such as traffic calming, provided if required. To provide clarity these items could include a list of villages that this would apply to.

Cambridgeshire County Council are suggesting further restrictions to traffic movements along the Broadway which go beyond the scope of the SPD. These will be matters for the detailed design, informed by the Transport Assessment.

The SPD is clear that the existing employment site will be served by direct access from the Primary Street, as shown on the Spatial Framework Diagram.

Concern is expressed about the assumptions for modal shift away from the car and whether appropriate mitigation will be provided. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan outlines the monitoring and mitigation measures required for local villages. The detail will be addressed through the planning application process. The developer is required to submit a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to demonstrate the proposal is acceptable in transport terms.

#### HQPT route and facilities

Note the comments that the HQPT route should go through the centre of the development. The alignment reflects discussions with GCP, who generally support for the approach to the HQPT route and stops within the SPD as meeting their aspirations and specifications. It is important to bear in mind that in the longer-term further improvements may be delivered by the Combined Authority, such as a Cambridge Autonomous Metro; this alignment future proofs such proposals.

It is proposed to move the eastern HQPT eastwards to make it more accessible to Caldecote residents. (See sections 2 and 4)

Note the comments in relation to the specifications for and impacts of the Cambridge to Cambourne HQPT scheme; this is a matter of detail for Greater Cambridge Partnership who is delivering the scheme.

#### Parking

SPD requires cycle parking to be provided in accordance with the requirements of Policy TI/3.

The SPD clearly states there is an aspiration for low car ownership (section 1D). Nonetheless some car parking will need to be provided at key destinations, to provide access to services and facilities, including for the disabled. In accordance

with Policy TI/3 a design-led approach will be used to determine the appropriate amount and, where possible, encourage shared use of parking to minimise provision.

Note the concerns about the practicalities for introducing electric charging points. This can be addressed through project delivery, for example through the Transport and/or Infrastructure Review Group(s) outlined in section 6.3 to facilitate delivery of the development.

### Coalescence

Whilst the new village is being developed as a distinct new settlement with its own identity with a range of facilities and services, it is important that appropriate transport connections are provided to ensure appropriate connectivity with nearby communities, centres of attraction and places of work. This is particularly important for non-car modes to enable nearby residents to access the facilities and services in the new village whilst minimising unnecessary car journeys onto the road network.

### Caldecote Village Design Guide SPD

It is proposed to include additional text in Section 1.6 to outline the relationship between the two SPDs. The alignment of walking and cycling connections between Bourn Airfield and Caldecote have been checked for consistency (see section 4).

Village Centre location – addressed in sections 4 and 5.2.

Public transport – addressed in section 2

## Proposed Modifications

Section 1.6 Planning policy context - add a new header and paragraph on Caldecote Village Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document as follows:

### **‘Caldecote Village Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document**

**The Caldecote Village Design Guide covers the lands immediately east and south east of Bourn Airfield, therefore, any proposal should consider the guide to help achieve wider aspirations of neighbouring settlements. One of the key design priorities outlined is to ensure that the relationship with the new settlement at Bourn Airfield is positive and allows good off-road connections whilst maintaining distinct settlements. The importance of good quality pedestrian and cyclist connections to Bourn Airfield are also important, with proposed connections outlined in the Connections Map (Figure 11, page 15). Furthermore, the need to ensure appropriate edges are provided to preserve the character of Caldecote are set out, which is directly of relevance for any proposals.’**

Section 5.1 Overview – Add a new paragraph to read:

**‘The Figures contained in this section are indicative and the exact alignment of routes and the precise location of buildings and land uses will be determined through the planning application process.’**

Section 1D Managing private and service vehicles – Delete the last paragraph:

~~‘The new village will not be served by direct access from the A428.’~~

Section 1D Managing private and service vehicles - Add a new paragraph:

**'The developers will monitor traffic impacts on village routes and, where necessary, take appropriate action to mitigate any traffic impacts with traffic calming and other measures.'**

Fix A Main points of access and primary street

- Amend note 1 to read:  
'A western access from the Broadway which reconfigures the existing highway to provide priority to the primary street entering the site and ensure there will be no direct vehicular access for southbound traffic from the new village (~~subject to availability of third party land~~). **The detailed design should explore the use of physical islands to prevent traffic movements to the south.**
- Amend note 3 to read:  
'Enhancement to the existing junction of St Neots Road and the Broadway, **incorporating physical measures to restrict the ability of northbound traffic to make a U turn at the junction to head south on the Broadway towards Bourn village.**'

Fix B Strategic walking and cycling connections:

- Amend the Fix B heading to read:  
'Strategic walking ~~and~~, cycling **and horse riding** connections'
- Separate the first bullet into two bullets as follows:
  - 'A shared pedestrian and cycle route along both sides of the primary street and secondary streets, except where a parallel traffic-free route is provided directly alongside.
  - Segregated pedestrian and cycle routes should also be included to ensure an inclusive design and safety for blind and partially sighted people.'
- Add a new bullet:  
**'Routes must be fully accessible to people with disabilities who are using mobility aids such as mobility scooters, adapted cycles and wheelchairs.'**

Figure 28 Strategic walking and cycling connections:

- Amend the Key to refer to bridleways / horse riding routes.
- Ensure routes to Caldecote are consistent with Caldecote Village Design Guide SPD.
- Revise the colours used to denote the different types of routes (particularly for 'traffic free' and 'alongside streets' routes) to improve visual presentation.

Figure 55 Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Item 13 – amend the text within the ‘Description’ column to read:

‘Applicant to monitor traffic impacts on village routes, including Bourn, **Highfields Caldecote, Knapwell, and Hardwick** on an ongoing basis.’

Figure 55 Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Item 14 – amend the text within the ‘Description’ column to read:

‘Traffic calming and other measures to be implemented in surrounding villages, **including Bourn, Highfields Caldecote, Knapwell, and Hardwick** if required. Monitoring strategy will reflect this need.’

## 5. Creating the Place Section 2: Vibrant, Prosperous and Inclusive

### Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 6 Comment: 10

Total: 16

### Main issues in representations:

67950, 67966, 68020, 68036, 68038, 68047, 68108, 68146, 68180, 68198, 68217, 68221, 68247, 68321, 68322, 68357

### Support

None

### Object

#### Village Centre Location

- **Hardwick Parish Council** - position of Village Centre needs addressing. Being in NW corner it is nearer Cambourne and will be difficult to reach by walking from the south of development. Better position is as near as possible to actual centre, so shops etc. could be more easily reached by everyone and improve their quality of life.
- Proposed village centre is not in centre of development; distanced from East and South houses, thus creating poor village community spirit.

#### Health care provision

- **Hardwick Evangelical Church** - Lack of health care facility in new development of this size, and expectation that this will be provided for by expanding the provision in Cambourne is short-sighted. Contradicts Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which states, "It is essential that the new village has its own sense of public life and community: a place where people live, work, learn and socialise, which provides for residents' changing needs throughout their lives, and for residents with different incomes, abilities and needs." Current plan forces most needy out of the development to find help.



- [Toft Parish Council](#) - is very concerned about the lack of Healthcare provision in development.
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

### Comment

- [Aitchison Developments Ltd](#) - In seeking to achieve a vibrant, prosperous and inclusive new village, SPD suggests that redevelopment of vacant and underutilised land within existing employment site could be redeveloped to provide premises for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). Important the site is not restricted in terms of the type/range of employment occupiers, as this will constrain the market. Furthermore, SPD proposes small scale employment uses at Neighbourhood Hub.
- [Cambourne Town Council](#) - There should be separate provision for youth; a facility not incorporated in the allocation for community space.
- [Cambridge Past Present and Future](#) - Concerns about adherence to Policy H10 Affordable Housing provision. SPD states it must be 40% "unless it can be demonstrated that an exception should be made". Unclear how exceptional circumstances criteria will be triggered and what level of measurable evidence is necessary. Council must be more specific about weight of evidence necessary to justify this exception.
- Unclear strategy for the provision of healthcare facilities (e.g. doctors, dentist) for residents.

### Village Centre Location

- [Bourn Parish Council](#) - concerned about locating Village Centre in NW corner: (1) motorists attracted to use the Broadway, (2) design argument for locating at end of second (main) runway, (3) people in south and east of site disadvantaged and difficult to access. Propose alternative location to include more residents within 800m.
- [Cambridge Past Present and Future](#) - location in NW corner of development means it will be difficult for all to access. 'Neighbourhood hub' may not have sufficient provision to serve its purpose and it would be better to combine the two in a more central position.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) Fix D - Village centre in north western corner of site. Transport Assessment Team previously recommended should be more central as some of site is not within 800m walk. Option may not be as sustainable transport wise. Excellent cycle links are essential to try to improve connectivity and discourage car use for travel within site.
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) - village centre is shown at northwest corner, not geographical centre as preferred by stakeholder workshops attendees, so it is within 800m walking distance to most of village. Mitigation is to create a secondary neighbourhood hub, which could affect viability of one or both

centres. In competition with Cambourne. New village 'sold' to residents as a standalone community with its own facilities. Recommend: 1. Located centrally - Option C. 2. North-South runway can be feature in its own right without tying it to village centre.

- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd Section 2](#) - generally content but there should be flexibility in terms of providing an average density of 40 dwellings per hectare in order to reflect potential changing circumstances. Could include varying market and economic conditions, ability to have a dual use of secondary school sports pitches and resulting impact on total net development area and quantum of non-residential uses which come forward as development is built out.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd Fix D](#) - generally content but opportunity to broaden range of uses to allow a more flexible mix, including other employment-generating uses (B Use Class) and to create a balanced centre. Similarly, range of uses in Neighbourhood Hub could be broadened to accommodate other uses as well as 'modest retail and food and drink premises', provided the range and scale does not undermine the viability of primary centre.
- If new community is to be encouraged to walk or cycle, it is essential the "Centre" be more central, to be within easy reach of majority of residents. Will put schools a good distance from pollution generated by vehicles on roads to north of site and reduce car journeys within village. Facilities in Centre needs to include a health centre. Getting an appointment with doctors in local surgeries is extremely difficult. Little scope for them to take on more patients.

## Councils' Assessment

### Location of Village Centre

The Spatial Framework plan in the SPD (page 31) provides an indicative layout for the new village, and shows the village centre towards the north west of the site. The accompanying text (Fix D Village centre and neighbourhood centre, page 44) outlines that the location should be as close to the centre of the site as possible, ideally within 800m walking distance of most of the site. It also explains the juxtaposition of land uses in relation to the village centre, runway park, HQPT stop and primary access road in order to create a vibrant community heart to the new village. Given that certain elements are in a fixed location, i.e. the runway park and the existing bus gate into Cambourne, this has led to a location which is not central to the whole site. Nonetheless, the majority of built development is within 800m, and the highest footfall will be closer to the village centre where development will be to a higher density than the edges of the site. This can be seen by reference to Figures 32 and 42 and the Spatial Framework Diagram where it is apparent that the areas of built development beyond 800m of the village centre are primarily the employment site to the east and the lower density housing located towards the southern fringe of the development. In this regard it can be noted that many villages in South Cambridgeshire do not have a village centre in the spatial centre of the village such as at Sawston, Histon and Impington, Cambourne and Bar Hill. A second, smaller,

neighbourhood centre is proposed in the south west of the site to provide additional services and facilities to remoter parts of the site and there will be an area of mixed use at the eastern High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) stop to provide for some day to day convenience needs.

Nevertheless whilst continuing to anchor the village centre at the western HQPT stop it will be possible to show the village centre as an oval oriented south east from the HQPT stop to draw it further towards the spatial centre of the new village and this is proposed as a change to the Spatial Framework Diagram and other relevant figures.

### Health Care Provision

The SPD is predicated on the new village being a healthy, active and resilient place (Strategic Objective 3, page 27); and to this end it makes extensive provision for open space, sports and off-road routes for walking, cycling and riding.

Local Plan Policy SS/7 Section (6e) requires the appropriate provision of health facilities to serve the needs of the new village. Should provision be made on-site it would be entirely appropriate for the facility to be provided in the village centre as is provided for by the SPD in section 2c on page 43.

Note the concerns about the need for an on-site medical centre. The SPD includes reference to a community health facility within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Item 41) to ensure the developers address this issue and allows for space for such a facility within the Village Centre. However, this is a detailed matter for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CPCCG) to advise what form these facilities should take and it is not a matter which can be fixed by this SPD. Note that neither the NHS or the CPCCG responded to the consultation on the draft SPD.

### Existing Employment Site

Disagree that the SPD should make explicit provision for large enterprises on the underutilised land within the existing employment area Guiding Principle 2A (on page 41 of the SPD). This is because it has not been demonstrated that such enterprises could be accommodated on the existing employment site whilst making appropriate provision for cycle and pedestrian routes close to and across the existing site. If it can be demonstrated that such enterprises can be suitably accommodated the SPD reference to small and medium sized enterprises would not provide an impediment.

### Separate Provision for Youth

Note the preference for a stand-alone youth facility. Neither the Local Plan policy SS/7 or the draft SPD specify how such provision should be made whether as a stand-alone facility or as part of a larger community facility and this is a matter best addressed through the negotiations on the s106 planning obligation package.

### Affordable Housing

The approach to affordable housing in the draft SPD is entirely consistent with that set out in Local Plan policy H/10 'Affordable Housing'.

### Average Site Density

Reference to an average net density of 40 dwellings per hectare is consistent with Local Plan policy H/8 'Housing Density' which states that new settlements should achieve this average density of development. The policy in part 2 already provides for flexibility in regard to this standard where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development or other local circumstances.

### Neighbourhood Hub Uses

The list of uses appropriate to the Neighbourhood Hub is set out on page 45 of the draft SPD. In addition to modest retail and food and drink premises and community meeting places it already refers to the provision of small-scale employment uses. Other proposals can be considered on their merits through future planning applications to ensure compatibility with adjoining land uses.

### Dual use of school sports pitches

The Council and the Local Education Authority (LEA) would encourage dual / shared use of sports pitches with schools at Bourn Airfield. It is common practice across Greater Cambridge and can have benefits for school providers and Parish Councils. This provision is subject to agreement with the school provider(s). The SPD identifies enough land for sports pitches to meet the Policy requirement. Additional clarity is provided in the event that agreement can be reached on the dual use of pitches, whereby the amount of pitches may be reduced.

## Proposed Modifications

Amend the Spatial Framework Diagram and Figure 32, to show the village centre as an oval anchored at the western HQPT stop and running south easterly down the primary street towards the village centre.

## 5. Creating the Place Section 3: Locally Distinctive

### Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 3 Comment: 17

Total: 22

### Main issues in representations:

67785, 67915, 67986, 67991, 68009, 68021, 68033, 68034, 68035, 68037, 68062, 68112, 68113, 68131, 68160, 68181, 68199, 68200, 68257, 68307, 68323, 68360

### Support

- **Natural England** - Fully support open spaces and landscape character requirements in section 3E. Support integration of new village with its landscape, incorporating and enhancing existing features and network of landscaped green, natural and multifunctional open spaces within and surrounding development. Support requirement for strategic landscaping

including a county park. Requirements for a network of green corridors and other open spaces within easy walking distance of all residents is fully endorsed. Quantum and quality of open space is key to delivering numerous environmental services. To achieve benefits and avoid impacts to designated sites we advocate provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANGS). Identification of a management body and funding mechanism for long term maintenance will be critical. Quantum of informal open space is not clearly stated but suggests SANGS level (78ha.) is achievable – further detail would confirm this. Greenspace provision will ensure no adverse impact on nearby designated sites already under considerable pressure from visitors and help achieve net biodiversity gain in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 170 and Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) 25 Year Environment Plan.

- [Wildlife Trust](#) - Support Fix F. Provides an integrated green infrastructure network through and around the development site, that will provide a range of walking and recreational routes on-site that have potential to meet much of demand for recreational routes, without impacting other nearby more sensitive habitats and sites. However, likely to be contingent on delivery of a country park type space within strategic landscape area to south.

### Object

- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) - Fix E: diagram shows highest density of dwellings is clustered around primary street. Appears to maximise exposure of people to road danger, pollution and noise. Oppose this arrangement of primary street and dwellings.
- Proposed 3-4 storey buildings are totally unsuitable and out of keeping for a rural village environment.
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

### Comment

- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) 3E Open spaces and landscape character, 2nd bullet - Play space should not be placed at eastern edge. Private gardens on West Drive, Highfields Caldecote back onto Eastern boundary. Potential noise and light pollution from lighting on the fields and paths.
- Section 3E needs more details of the general character of country park and design approach. Large bland areas of open flat grass should be avoided. Instead space should be broken up/punctuated with native trees, bushes and wildflower meadows in a way which complements natural views. E.g. more like Wimpole Country Estate and not Trumpington Meadows Country Park.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) - CP content with this section, except under Guiding Principle 3F Integrating inherited assets. In first sentence the words 'where possible' should be added, i.e. 'the site has a number of existing

features which should where possible be preserved and/or incorporated into the development in order to protect existing character and contribute to the distinctiveness of the new village’.

- [Bourn Parish Council](#) Fix E – Would like more detail on the nature of high-density housing including height and storey limits.
- [Aitchison Developments Ltd](#) - Fix F identifies formal green landscape which creates a legible and direct route through employment site. Not objected to and is provided for within proposals for site. Fix needs to be applied flexibly to allow the proposed employment layout to make most efficient use of space available.
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) Fix F Eastern Edge – SPD has not properly addressed issue of strategic landscaping and is missing a substantial part of it. Only 30m of woodland belt and not within site. No woodland to fill existing gap. Contradicts Policy SS/7 and Members’ intentions. Highfields gardens provide 'Countryside separation'. Recommend: (1) 50m woodland belt. (2) Gap filled both within and outside settlement boundary to same depth. (3) footpath within woodland is acceptable, location of playing fields is not, risk of noise and lighting pollution.
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) Fix F North East Green Gap - SPD proposing planting that contradicts Draft Caldecote Village Design Guide. Openness must be maintained. No tree planting on southern boundary, enhance existing hedge. No playspace due to proximity of houses, to avoid noise nuisance and light pollution to residents.
- [DB Group \(Holdings\) Ltd](#) Fix F Employment Site Edge - Essential the employment site edge takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. Require particular consideration is given to adequate distance separation from noise sources and the provision of acoustic barriers along this edge as deemed necessary (at the developer's expense) following detailed assessment in accordance with PPG.
- [DB Group \(Holdings\) Ltd](#) Fix F Employment Site Link - Essential to ensure a safe route can be created which ensures that pedestrians and cyclists are separated from industrial operations vehicular traffic. Important DB Group retains flexibility for unfettered access to its site to enable existing operations, short term future expansion plans and company's continued long-term growth.
- [Cambridge Past Present and Future](#) - Concerns about major open space being N/S axis of the old airfield. Needs further explanation - is it to be 'greened'? Potential for it to be an exemplar of amenity, but SPD needs more precision on how this space is to be handled.
- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Iron Age and Roman archaeological finds in the area. 20th C military aviation heritage. Suggest the historic environment could contribute to Key Issues 1, 3 and 4. E.g. open space and recreation could support heritage trails and interpretation for archaeological and military heritage.

- [Historic England](#) - Relatively little is mentioned on archaeology. Greater reference should be made to this.
- [Historic England](#) - Care should be taken with regard to location of taller buildings and ensuring they do not compete with or dominate listed buildings of other landmark buildings offsite.
- [Historic England](#) - Proposals to reflect the former airfield could also be extended to include the use of tools such as street naming to reflect this former use and provide local identity and connection with the past.
- [Shelford and District Bridleways Group](#) - Horse riding is not included in definition of active travel, equestrians are excluded from these opportunities.
- Disgrace to the memory of those who died flying from Bourn Airfield with no proper named cenotaph.
- Medium and high-density housing should remain away from site perimeter. Large hotel at main entrance would be same as Cambourne and so sites would actually be very similar. To be avoided if an independent identity is a 'real' consideration. Screening of hotel complex from Highfields is important so as not to detract from existing village outlook.

## Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed.

### Housing Density

It is entirely appropriate that the higher and medium density housing should be located towards the centre of the new village and the HQPT stops and away from the village edges, both in terms of making effective use of land in the most accessible locations and minimising any visual impact on nearby settlements and from long distance views. The average net density of the residential element of the new settlement should be consistent with Local Plan policy H/8 'Housing Density' which refers to such settlements achieving an average net density of 40 dwellings per hectare. This approach allows for areas of lower and higher density housing across a large site to reflect accessibility, amenity and visibility considerations.

### Building Heights

Most of the development in the new village and all the development on the village edge will comprise two storey buildings. In the village centre, at other key locations on the primary street and fronting onto open spaces in the higher density areas shown on Figure 42 buildings of up to 3 or 4 storeys will help to make effective use of land in the most accessible locations, help to create a sense of place and help to define these locations from surrounding residential areas. Such an approach is consistent with the policies of the Local Plan and with national planning policies set out in the NPPF.

### Existing Employment Area

Adjoining uses and noise – The draft SPD identifies the issue of noise from the existing employment area as a key issue (page 5 issue 5), and the draft SPD at section 5g page 68 states that development proposals will be expected to mitigate

the impacts of noise on the environment. Policy SS/7 section 7 part d) requires that the new village will incorporate necessary mitigation to sensitive boundaries with regard to noise, including the A428, using landscaped earth bunds. To further refine the draft SPD in regard to noise it is proposed that the draft SPD under Fix F on pages 54 and 55 to refer to appropriate noise mitigation in regard to the following green edges – edge 3 ‘Eastern Edge’ where it adjoins the employment area, and edge 5 ‘Employment Site Edge’; as shown on Figure 43.

Links across – Note the support for the principle of a direct link across the existing employment area and the need for flexibility in its application.

Unfettered access – note the comment regarding the need for unfettered safe access to the existing employment area. The draft SPD on page 38 requires a direct vehicle access to the existing employment site.

#### [A428 Access](#)

A428 is addressed in section 2.

#### [Health](#)

See the assessment given under section 5.2.

#### [Archaeology / Heritage](#)

Policy guidance on archaeology and the setting of listed buildings is provided for by Local Plan Policy NH/14 ‘Heritage Assets’ and by national policy and practice guidance. In this regard the draft SPD identifies the listed buildings close to the major development site and states that consideration of setting and the intervisibility between new development and the listed buildings must be given proper consideration (section 3F page 52).

Agree that the SPD could include appropriate wording to encourage the provision of heritage trails on site to mark its history including as a WWII airfield. It already refers to interpretation of the site’s history under the ‘runway park corridor’ text on page 55.

#### [Eastern Edge and North East Corner](#)

The treatment of the eastern boundary of the new village is consistent with Local Plan policy SS/7 ‘New Village at Bourn Airfield’. This requires strategic landscaping along the eastern boundary both within and outside the major development site and the retention and creation of a continuous woodland belt along the boundary of at least 30 metres in width. It can be noted that the existing woodland belt varies in width from approximately 35 metres to 70 metres. The Strategic Framework Diagram also shows that the woodland will be supplemented by a belt of informal open space within the new village which will add extra width to the buffer between the new and existing villages and provide a valuable area of informal open space for the benefit of residents. In regard to the separation between the two villages it can also be noted that there is a gap of around 250 metres between the edge of the new village and the village framework boundary of Highfields Caldecote along the great majority of the boundary. This primarily consists of grass paddocks, woodland and scrubland and also contains a small number of residential properties located outside the village framework boundary. Following the review of sport pitch provision referred to in the Schools section 5.2, sports pitches would not be needed on the eastern boundary.



This provides an opportunity for a reshaped rectangular area of additional strategic landscaping along the eastern boundary.

The SPD does not identify the north east corner for play facilities. This will be a matter of detail for the planning application stage at which time matters such as residential amenity impacts will be taken into consideration.

#### Inherited Assets (Guiding principle 3F)

The wording of Guiding Principle 3F is considered to be sufficiently flexible without further change.

#### Runway Park

The runway park is clearly described as having a 'formal linear park landscape' – nothing in the draft SPD suggests that this could be achieved as a concrete runway.

#### Horse Riding

References to active travel on page 14 are made in the context of seeking to increase the proportion of work commuting trips made by cycle and on foot. Elsewhere the draft SPD makes extensive provision to address the reasonable needs of equestrians.

#### Cenotaph

The provision of a cenotaph on site is not a matter for the SPD. If a local group were to seek the provision of a suitable war memorial this could be incorporated into the development during the implementation of the village centre in the vicinity of the runway park and secured through the planning application process.

### Proposed Modifications

Section 3C Scale, Height and Massing - amend fifth bullet to read:

'The mixed-use areas in the north east **and north west** of the site could include a hotel of up to 4 storeys, where this is designed to form a distinctive landmark / ~~gateway~~ feature.'

Section 3F Integrating inherited assets - add the following text to the start of this section:

**'The site contains various heritage assets that can be utilised to create a sense of place for future residents and visitors. The potential to create a parkland within the footprints of the existing runway corridors, exploiting views created by the breaks in surrounding tree lines particularly to the south should be explored and any archaeological assets should be retained within open space where possible to enhance the character of green spaces.'**

**The arrangement and height of buildings and streets should seek to maximise the extensive views available of the countryside to the south and not dominate any strategic historical sightlines or landmark buildings in the surrounding area.'**

Section 3F Integrating inherited assets - amend third bullet to read:  
'Introduction of memorial/interpretive features and, public art **and heritage trails** to recognise and link the development to its past use.'

Fix F Green edges and corridors - amend '3 Eastern Edge' to read:  
'3 Eastern Edge - Provision of a buffer including land within the Major Development Site, to include new and enhanced woodland planting to create a continuous woodland buffer of at least 30m in width to fully screen views between the village and adjacent properties. An additional strategic landscape area **with naturalistic and park landscape elements** is to be created alongside the new and enhanced woodland, providing further landscape setting to the new village, and ensuring separation from Highfields Caldecote to the east.'

Fix F Green edges and corridors - amend the '5 Employment Site Edge' text to read:  
'5 Employment site edge - Provision of a new or enhanced hedgerow planting buffer between the existing employment site and proposed surrounding development, which may incorporate noise bunding, except where opportunities exist to create urban frontage onto surrounding streets.'

Figure 43 Green edges and corridors - show the land adjacent to the number '3' as strategic landscape (formerly sports pitches).

Section 5G Noise, light and air quality - Add an additional bullet point:  
**'Planning applications should be accompanied by a Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment, and the new village will be required to mitigate the impact of noise and air quality from existing employment uses by virtue of suitable design. For example, a buffer using acoustic screens if appropriate, building layout and orientation and suitably ventilated buildings.'**

## 5. Creating the Place Section 4: Healthy, Active and Resilient

### Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 4 Comment: 14

Total: 20

### Main issues in representations:

67965, 67992, 67993, 68003, 68010, 68015, 68063, 68128, 68147, 68148, 68201, 68223, 68226, 68227, 68268, 68306, 68324, 68325, 68326, 68327

### Support

- [Wildlife Trust](#) supports Guiding Principle 4B Access to Natural Environments.
- Support network of green spaces and routes throughout the development for informal recreation. Would like development of open green spaces carried out initially. Proposed bridleways will be asset to immediate and wider equine

community, once joined up with existing bridleways, and together with cycling and walkways will make development attractive to prospective residents; green spaces to relax and exercise in will create clear minds, healthy bodies and improve well-being and will avoid need to travel to find informal recreation areas.

## Object

- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) Guiding Principle 4C: safe routes for children should ensure all schools, parks and village centre reachable on foot or cycle using off-street paths or quiet streets. Oppose 'level carriageways' and 'shared surfaces', unless motor traffic levels are reduced to a bare minimum.
- [Cambridge Cycle Campaign](#) Fix G: Oppose 'appropriate barriers' and 'soft surfaces' as discriminatory against people using adapted cycles. Only access controls we support are well-spaced bollards. Normal, utility cycle routes cannot have soft surfaces as not all-weather, all-year round surfaces. All routes must be fully accessible.
- Allotments must be easily accessible from the Major Development Site.
- Existing healthcare facilities in Bourn and Cambourne cannot accommodate the increased demand. this will be detrimental for both new residents and existing patients.

## Comment

- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd \(CP\)](#) Guiding Principle 4D final bullet should more positively encourage shared use. Clustering sports pitches allows for economies of scale, more efficient use of land, better quality facilities in terms of size of pavilion, changing and other related facilities and efficiencies in terms of maintenance. May reduce total space needed. Final sentence on demonstrating agreement is overly prescriptive. CP set out its outdoor sports proposals on basis that Education Authority were supportive of principle at pre-application stage. Multiple benefits to locating sports pitches adjacent to eastern boundary - additional buffer between communities, access to sports pitches more evenly spread throughout, and increased open space in important ecological corridor. Proposed amendments, including potential for hatched areas to provide certainty in both eventualities, are set out in full in design appendix.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) Guiding Principle 4F – first bullet very inflexible, and largely outside the control of the developer, and as such the bullet should be revised to: 'Should provide opportunities for a range...'
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) Fix G - these principles have been taken into account and enhanced in the revised proposals shown in the attached document.
- Wildlife Trust generally supports Fix G Recreational walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Appears to be a lack of circular routes connecting back into Bourn Airfield from Caldecote-Highfields or Bourn. Provision of missing

links important, otherwise there may be unintended damaging consequences of promoting access, such as an increase in visitor numbers to Hardwick Wood SSSI beyond its carrying capacity.

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Fix H - Whilst wording provides flexibility and allows for dual use, CP concerned Fix H could be cited as a reason not to reduce overall playing field land area of 15.5 ha and/or to allow for residential development on two areas shown mid east and mid west for 'outdoor sports facilities' on the Spatial Framework. Suggest two outdoor sports sites should be shown in different colour or hatched to denote that they are an either/or depending on dual use agreement. Approach would provide greater certainty for all parties.
- **Barton and District Bridleways Group** Appreciate creation and inclusion of equestrian routes but do not understand need for separate walking and cycling routes where there is a bridleway available to all users? Support Figure 47 Recreational walking, cycling and horse riding. Include a circular Restricted Byway open to carriage drivers - bold and progressive step, much same as hugely popular Cambourne peripheral bridleway.
- **Barton and District Bridleways Group** support references to bridleway creation in woodland settings, although it appears to conflict with comments referred to in other sections.
- **Barton and District Bridleways Group** Various reasons to include equestrians – contributes to rural economy, rely on safe network, costs no more, share paths less than 3m, no injuries by horse, inadequate bridleway network, activity for females, mental and physical benefits, vulnerable road user. East of England one of highest equestrian accident rates. SPD helps link fragmented network and enables route from Cambourne to Coton. Support inclusion of equestrians in plans for new/improved accesses. Perimeter track should be Restricted Byway suitable for carriage drivers.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Easily accessible sports pitches enables growth of sports teams that support forming an identity and bring people together, reducing isolation. Outdoor bowls extends age range that gets together. Greater need for formal pitches than informal due to number of teams generated by new development.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Careful thought needed on shared and dual use sports facilities. Use during week by school and weekends by clubs could lead to over-use and leave unplayable. Additional burden on budget of school (maintenance), which income would not cover. Schools would need additional staff to monitor use and booking. New school would have difficulty funding this.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** SPD should show clear intentions regarding controlling fast food outlets.

- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins SPD](#) places a small area of fields on eastern edge. Grass pitches for informal recreation is unsuitable in this location as it would cause noise nuisance and light pollution to Highfields Caldecote.
- [Shelford and District Bridleways Group](#) Concern with the wording of SPD and exclusion of horse riders this creates.
- [Sport England](#) (1) Support s106 contribution towards indoor provision in Cambourne, enhancement of leisure centre, provision of swimming pool and other expansion proposed. (2) Support limited public access to indoor facilities at school, to help to take pressure off Cambourne. (3) Informal recreation and physical activity - welcome promotion of Sport England's 'Active Design' guidance. (4) Formal pitch provision - could be mixed approach to on-/off-site provision and contributions. (5) All new facilities must meet Sport England's technical guidance.

## Councils' Assessment

Welcome support.

### Safe routes for children

Strategic Objective 1 seeks to create a new village which facilitates safe movement within the site and to and from surrounding villages. A range of segregated and off-road pedestrians and cycle routes will be provided and pedestrians and cyclists will be prioritised over vehicles. (see section 5.1 of the SPD).

### Recreational Walking Cycling and Horse-Riding Routes

The SPD provides for circular routes within the site and connections to existing routes beyond the site boundary. However, the creation of circular routes beyond the site are not a matter for the SPD.

The SPD makes extensive provision for equestrian uses and does not preclude the provision of a circular Restricted Byway open to carriage drivers. This is a matter of detail to be considered and taken under advisement of the County Council's PROW team as part of the planning application and S106 agreement.

### Health

See the assessment given under section 5.2.

### Healthy Food / Fast Food

Guiding principle 4F 'Access to Healthy Food' is aspirational and its implementation will be subject to the limits of the planning system. Whilst the detailed use of retail premises cannot be controlled by the planning system it is reasonable to expect the provision of space for a farmer's market and for allotments.

There are no specific policy restrictions on the provision of fast food restaurants or their location in the Local Plan. Issues of proliferation and perceived clustering close to vulnerable facilities and land uses were not raised as issues when that plan was being prepared. Any future Local Plan changes in this regard would be taken into

account when planning applications are being considered in and for the development of the village centre.

### Allotments

Agree that all allotments should be easily accessible from the major development site (MDS). But this does not mean they have to be all included within the major development site. The approach set out in bullet point 3 on page 60 is considered to be reasonable with smaller 'gardens' located within the Major Development Sites (MDS) and larger ones outside the MDS. This is similar to the approach successfully followed in Cambourne.

### Sports Pitches

Comments noted. See section 5.2.

### Eastern Edge

Agree that the proposed small area of sports pitches on the eastern boundary should be deleted and provided elsewhere. Also see the assessment given under section 5.2.

## Proposed Modifications

Fix G Recreational walking, cycling and horse riding routes - amend the third bullet point to read:

'Routes should be constructed to a multi-user standard for all users and include appropriate ~~barriers~~ **access controls**, ~~soft~~-surfaces, mounting blocks, sight lines and safe road crossing designs.'

Fix H provision for outdoor sport:

- Amend the first and second paragraphs to read:  
**'To meet full requirements Policy SC/7 approximately** ~~Approximately~~ 15.5ha of outdoor sports facilities should be provided and broadly at the locations shown on the ~~Spatial Framework plan~~ **Figure 48.**

**The Council and the Local Education Authority (LEA) would encourage dual / shared use of sports pitches with schools at Bourn Airfield.** Formal sports provision ~~does not~~ **can** include ~~additional~~ sports fields and facilities provided with the secondary and primary schools **where agreed with future school provider(s)** ~~Opportunities for shared use of school sports facilities could be considered subject to discussion with future providers.~~

**If dual / shared use of the school pitches is agreed with the school provider(s) the hatched areas may, subject to an assessment of local need, be used for alternative uses, including residential.'**

- Delete the last sentence of first bullet:  
~~Opportunities to share facilities with the adjacent schools should be explored.~~
- Delete text at second bullet (Area 2):

~~'A park type environment integrated with surrounding landscapes, providing a range of grass pitches and potential for tennis Courts and other recreational sports.'~~

- Amend third bullet:

~~'Smaller scale areas of fields located to the western edge of the site with grass pitches primarily for informal recreation.'~~ **Formal outdoor sports provision to the south western edge of the site, which could include provision for cricket.'**

- Delete fourth bullet:

~~'Smaller scale areas of fields located to the eastern edge of the site with grass pitches primarily for informal recreation.'~~

## 5. Creating the Place Section 5: Responsive and Sustainable

### Representations received:

Support: 7 Object: 9 Comment: 6

Total: 22

### Main issues in representations:

67786, 67982, 67987, 67994, 67995, 67996, 68022, 68046, 68055, 68056, 68095, 68114, 68124, 68163, 68162, 68202, 68219, 68252, 68260, 68328, 68329, 68230

### Support

- **Natural England** Section 5A support detail which seeks to ensure protection and enhancement of natural environment through requirement of a programme of ecological survey and monitoring, restoration of key habitat and corridors and creation of new habitat. We welcome implementation of our suggested amendments to ensure mitigation of impacts to most ecologically sensitive environments within and beyond site boundary.
- **Wildlife Trust** supports guiding principle 5A Biodiversity and Habitats, including the principle of achieving a measurable net gain in biodiversity.
- **Wildlife Trust** supports guiding principles 5B Flood Risk & Resilience; 5C Integrating Sustainable Drainage; and 5D Sustainable Buildings, including commitments to integrating biodiversity into SUDS, inclusion of water efficiency measures and a step change in energy efficiency and renewable energy provision
- **Wildlife Trust** supports Fix I - Protected Biodiversity Areas & Corridors.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Supportive of Sustainable Drainage methods proposed. We encourage applicant to engage with Lead Local Flood Authority throughout the design and submission stages.

- [Natural England](#) Note and welcome requirements relating to protected biodiversity areas and corridors (Page 69), delivering multi-functional SUDS (section 5C) and larger open spaces with naturalistic environments within 400m of everyone's home.

## Object

- [DB Group \(Holdings\) Ltd](#) Section 5G bullet points fail to mention the need for the proposed development to take full account of existing employment development. An additional bullet point should be added which reads as follows: "Planning applications should be accompanied by a Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment, and the new village will be required to mitigate the impact of noise and air quality from existing employment uses by virtue of suitable design. For example, a buffer using acoustic screens if appropriate, building layout and orientation and suitably ventilated buildings."
- Nursery, school and college are on or nearby main roads - this means added pollutants for young - in direct conflict with Cambridge County Council signing UK100 clean energy pledge and protection of young.
- Concerned there will be increased noise from light industry, impacting the neighbourhood and personal wellbeing.
- Use of mass air source heat pumps is not acceptable due to low pitch hum emitted, especially during cold weather. Sound carries at night especially. Noise pollution. Hotel contribute to background noise from air conditioning etc. Serious and careful consideration to problems associated with new technologies is a must! Added to noise from vehicles to industrial site is highly likely to cause undue distress to residents of nearby local villages.
- SPD seeks to minimise skyglow and be minimum required to ensure public safety, for crime prevention, living, working and recreational purposes. Require all lighting be of full cut-off design and set goals for maximum acceptable illumination levels. Work with Commission for Dark Skies to ensure site lighting sets and meets sensible thought-out standards.
- Serious concerns this development will cause flooding; home and garage was flooded in 2013 and concerned about a reoccurrence.
- Much has been made of Sustainability and Environmental Issues through preparation of SPD. Cannot be claimed in this Development if it is negated by causing problems for Neighbouring villages. Destroying mature greenery that protects St Neots Road, Hardwick from A428 is hardly example of delivering sustainable development.
- Be prepared for a very public fight over the line of trees in St Neots Road!!! I have contacted Extinction Rebellion and am taking further legal and professional advice.
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, development will have unacceptable negative impact on surrounding villages and its future residents.



## Comment

- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) Section 5D - support deployment of Solar PV along northern bank. Exact renewable energy generation and carbon reduction is subject to detailed design and carbon emissions factors at time of construction - recommend remove figures. Flexibility required to respond to future changes in technology which should be recognised with addition of bullet point: ‘• Given the construction programme, it is recognised that flexibility will be necessary with the carbon reduction strategy to respond to changes in technology and energy markets.’ Given the long-term nature of development it is considered these statements be re-worded as key design considerations rather than specific requirements as future detailed design of development may require alternative strategies as technology changes. Requirement for a sustainable show home in each development parcel goes beyond Policy CC/3. Text should be amended to be consistent with Local Plan.
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) Section 5E First paragraph - wording inconsistent with Policy CC/3 with regard to reduced emissions not onsite energy, across development as a whole. Recommend reworded to; ‘the new village aspires to be an exemplar and developers should explore, on a site-wide basis, opportunities to incorporate on-site renewable energy low carbon energy generation with a view to exceeding the baseline requirement for a 10% reduction in anticipated carbon emissions through the installation of an integrated system on homes and non-residential buildings or site wide solutions as set out in Policy CC/3’. Paragraph 3 - requires site wide energy solutions including combined heat and power (CHP). Decarbonisation of electricity network. Predicted electricity emissions will fall below gas, favouring electricity based heating systems and remove carbon benefit of gas based CHP. Development of heat networks requires a critical mass of heat requirements. Low energy homes, beyond Building Regulations, reduces heat density. Occupational hours of schools mean these buildings are not generally considered in practice to be high energy users. Without gas CHP, currently no proven large scale technologies that are commercially and technically viable replacements. Recommend text amended: ‘Site-wide energy solutions and/ or the deployment of energy networks should be considered and implemented where feasible and viable.’
- [Countryside Properties \(UK\) Ltd](#) Fix I support these key elements of placemaking, which have been adopted in the landscape led illustrative masterplan and green and blue infrastructure strategies.
- [Cllr Tumi Hawkins](#) Key Issues 2 seeks to ensure existing biodiversity and habitats are retained where possible and opportunities taken to secure enhancements and/or form new habitats to achieve an overall net gain. Green Infrastructure element of SPD is weak and should be strengthened by referring to Building With Nature standards.

- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Require any noise and air quality mitigation required to deliver both schools along A428 boundary is fully evaluated as part of planning application. Mitigation in the form of landscaping and bunds cannot encroach on land reserved for education purposes.
- **National Trust** Commitment to net gain as Guiding Principle helpful, but no specific measurable requirement as a Spatial Fix. SPD should set out further detail in terms of delivery of new priority habitat as integral component of green infrastructure provision, consistent with Government's commitment to mandating measurable biodiversity gain. Also consistent with the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and Developing with Nature Toolkit. Intention to seek minimum 20%. National Trust shares this ambition. 20% appropriate target for Bourn Airfield.
- Healthy air quality for Bourn is being created at the expense of Hardwick.

## Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed

### Noise

Heat Pumps - While the concerns related to noise from air source heat pumps are noted, any proposals for the wide-spread use of heat pumps would need to include consideration of any associated amenity issues including noise, in line with relevant policies in the adopted Local Plan. If noise is found to be an issue, then mitigation would be required, which could include the use of acoustically attenuated enclosures for heat pumps and other noise generating plant.

The draft SPD identifies the issue of noise from the existing employment area as a key issue (page 5, issue 5), and the draft SPD at section 5g page 68 states that development proposals will be expected to mitigate the impacts of noise on the environment. Policy SS/7 section 7, part d) requires that the new village will incorporate necessary mitigation to sensitive boundaries with regard to noise, including the A428, using landscaped earth bunds. To further refine the draft SPD in regard to noise it is proposed that the draft SPD under Fix F on pages 54 and 55 to refer to appropriate noise mitigation in regard to the following green edges – edge 3 'Eastern Edge' where it adjoins the employment area, and edge 5 'Employment Site Edge'; as shown on Figure 43. To this end agree that planning applications should be accompanied by Noise Impact Assessments which will also inform the implementation of Local Plan Policy SC/10 'Noise Pollution'.

### Schools (Air quality and noise)

The SPD at Guiding Principle 5G 'Noise light and air quality' states that planning applications should be accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment that any impacts be mitigated by suitable design (including landscaped bunds, building orientation and suitably ventilated buildings. This assessment will inform the implementation of Local Plan Policy SC/12 'Air Quality'. Agree that planning applications should be accompanied by Noise Impact Assessments which will also inform the implementation of Local Plan Policy SC/10 'Noise Pollution'.

### Lighting

The SPD at Guiding Principle 5G 'Noise light and air quality' states that external lighting will be designed to minimise skyglow and light spillage having regard to residential amenity and safety, sensitive habitats and crime prevention. Lighting proposals will be also be assessed against Local Plan Policy SC/9 'Lighting'.

### Flood Risk

The site lies within the lowest category of flood risk (flood zone 1). The SPD at Guiding Principle 5B requires that the design and siting of new development should be set out in a way which minimises the risk of flooding both on site and beyond. Development proposals are to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment which takes account of Local Plan Policy CC/9 'Managing Flood Risk'.

### Loss of Trees near Hardwick

Concerns raised about the impacts off-site in respect of the Cambourne to Cambridge HQPT scheme are outside the scope of the SPD and are properly matters for the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

### A428 Access

See section 2.

### Renewable Energy

Solar PV along the north bank – It is recognised that the exact amount of panels that could be deployed along the north bank is still subject to detailed design and that the figures referenced in the SPD are indicative only. As such, we would have no objections to rewording this section as suggested.

### Energy Strategy

With regards to the request for additional wording to recognise that there may be the need for flexibility to consider future technologies, it is considered that the SPD is sufficiently flexible in that it notes that consideration should not be limited to the technologies and methods listed in the SPD, which were taken from the sustainability strategy and other information submitted as part of the outline application for the site. The Council will be open to alternative technologies available at the time of individual reserved matters applications which can be used to meet, and where possible exceed, policy requirements.

With regards to sustainable show homes, it is recognised that the requirements of Local Plan policy are that a sustainable show home should be provided for schemes where a show home is to be provided. There may be cases where show homes are not be provided for each development parcel and as such, it is proposed to revise the wording of this paragraph so that it is more in keeping with the requirements of Policy CC/5.

Regarding rewording the first paragraph of section 5E to make it more consistent with policy, the proposed new wording is considered acceptable.

With regards to the concerns raised about the use of CHP, particularly in light of the falling carbon intensity of electricity, the Council does recognise that there is a need to move away from gas as a source of heating. The draft Greater Cambridge

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD promotes the use of the draft SAP10 carbon intensity figures which puts electricity on a much more even playing field with gas. That is not to say that heat networks should not be investigated, more that the technology that powers that heat network may change, and we are starting to see schemes come forward for heat networks driven by heat pumps. While the densities in some parts of the Bourn Airfield development may be too low to support heat networks, we would still be keen to ensure that due consideration is given to the potential for heat networks for higher density parts of the scheme. As such, revised wording for this paragraph is suggested.

### Biodiversity

Fix I of the SPD concerns biodiversity. It requires the protection of existing biodiversity areas and with net gains incorporated through the wider site layout and landscape treatments designed to create enhanced biodiversity.

## Proposed Modifications

Section 5D sustainable buildings - amend the fourth bullet point to read:

~~'Incorporation of a solar photovoltaic array on the North Bank. which has the potential to generate 750 MWh/year and reduce emissions by 400 tonnes CO2 a year.'~~

Section 5D sustainable buildings - amend the following paragraph to read:

~~'Each~~ **Where a developer is proposing to provide a show home, should construct a sustainable showhome will also be provided** ~~in each development parcel location to demonstrate environmentally sustainable options to be made available for purchasers to incorporate in their homes, if desired, in addition to the measures required by Policy CC/3.'~~

Section 5E Site wide energy strategy - amend the first paragraph to read:

~~'Policy SS/7 requires that the new village will incorporate and deliver opportunities to exceed sustainable design and construction standards set out in the Local Plan. The new village aspires to be an exemplar and developers should explore, on a site-wide basis, opportunities to incorporate on-site renewable and low-carbon energy generation with a view to exceeding the baseline requirement for 10% on-site renewable energy as set out in Policy CC/3. The new village aspires to be an exemplar and developers should explore, on a site-wide basis, opportunities to incorporate on-site renewable and low-carbon energy generation with a view to exceeding the baseline requirement for 10% on-site renewable energy as set out in Policy CC/3. Solutions could include solar photo voltaic arrays in suitable locations and solar panels above car parking and within Runway Park.'~~

**'Policy SS/7 requires that the new village will incorporate and deliver opportunities to exceed sustainable design and construction standards set out in the Local Plan. The new village aspires to be an exemplar and developers should explore, on a site-wide basis, opportunities to incorporate on-site renewable energy low carbon energy generation with a view to exceeding the baseline requirement for a 10% reduction in anticipated carbon emissions through the installation of an integrated system on homes and non-residential buildings or site wide solutions as set out in Policy CC/3'**

Section 5E Site wide energy strategy - amend the final paragraph to read:

~~'Site-wide energy solutions including Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Heat networks, for example, may be viable in higher density parts of the site, or~~

**'Site-wide energy solutions and/ or the deployment of energy networks should be considered and implemented where feasible and viable. Site-wide energy solutions including Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Heat networks, for example, may be viable in higher density parts of the site, or**

where uses are mixed in a way that allows heating infrastructure to be shared or utilised at different times of day. This should particularly be explored in relation to large energy users such as schools.’

Section 5G Noise, light and air quality - add an additional bullet point:

**‘Planning applications should be accompanied by a Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment, and the new village will be required to mitigate the impact of noise and air quality from existing employment uses by virtue of suitable design. For example, a buffer using acoustic screens if appropriate, building layout and orientation and suitably ventilated buildings.’**

## 5. Creating the Place Section 6: Cohesive, well-planned and well governed

### Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 2

Total: 3

### Main issues in representations:

68023, 68331, 68336

### Support

None

### Object

The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

### Comment

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 6C - text acknowledges this is beyond the scope of SPD yet it is included as a Guiding Principle. Requires preparation of Community Development Strategy but does not indicate when it should be provided. Unnecessary detail which repeats Local Plan Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs. SPD should be simplified in this respect
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd (CP)** Section 6D - considers this too prescriptive and suggest that it is shortened. It is suggested that after the word ‘should’ be qualified by adding the words: ‘should explore opportunities for ...’. CP propose the early delivery of village centre, which will reduce the need, if any, to provide transitional or temporary uses.

### Councils’ Assessment

A428 is addressed in section 2 and healthcare in section 5.2.

The SPD provides additional guidance on and signposts to relevant policies in the Local Plan in order to ensure the comprehensive approach to masterplanning and development of the new village. Inclusion of reference to Policy SC/4 is consistent with the approach within other sections of the SPD, to ensure that the issues are given due consideration.

It is agreed that the section on transitional and temporary uses could be worded more flexibly. The first paragraph refers to the development may need to create temporary buildings and uses in the early stages. It goes on to state that the development 'should provide' which is more prescriptive.

## Proposed Modifications

Section 6D Transitional and temporary uses - amend the second paragraph to read:  
'The development should provide explore opportunities for...'

## 6. Delivering the Place

### Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 7 Comment: 18  
Total: 28

### Main issues in representations:

67916, 67997, 67998, 68025, 68048, 68064, 68096, 68152, 68153, 68154, 68155, 68161, 68189, 68204, 68205, 68206, 68228, 68253, 68256, 68270, 68271, 68288, 68291, 68292, 68332, 68333, 68334, 68335

### Support

- [Cambourne Town Council](#) Indoor Sports Facilities (Item 31) Support expansion of existing sports centre to provide a more sustainable indoor and swimming facility for both communities. Should be contribution for ongoing maintenance.
- [National Trust](#) Early implementation of accessible open space important to ensure its immediate availability to new residents to avoid pressure on nearby sensitive designated sites. We welcome that phasing requirements detailed on section 6.5 seeks to ensure this.
- [Wildlife Trust](#) Figure 57 Indicative Land Budget - Support inclusion of 89ha country park and strategic green infrastructure. Approximately 36% of SPD area. With other more formal open spaces, total green infrastructure approaches 50%. Quantum provides significant scope to achieve biodiversity net gain through creation of high quality habitats and multi-functional and formal open spaces. Any significant reduction is likely to lead to measurable net losses in biodiversity or require off-site biodiversity offsetting.

## Object

- The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

## Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** Walking and cycling network within site and connections to nearby villages and Cambridge (Item 1) - non-specific trigger that could result in delivery being delayed too long. Must be delivered before occupation to ensure good habits are developed, and sustainable transport modes are natural and obvious ways to get around from day one.
- **Knapwell Parish Council** Public Transport Infrastructure (Items 5 to 8) ban buses routing through the village before starting their services, due to increased noise, vibration, pollution. Enforce 7.5T weight limit.
- **Knapwell Parish Council** Highway Infrastructure (Items 11 to 15) road north to Knapwell equally vulnerable. A14 traffic. Need for S106 monies for the High Street (similar to Bourn) - minimise rat running, monitoring and traffic calming.
- Highway Infrastructure (Items 10 to 15) Infrastructure dependent on Transport Assessment (TA). Scrutiny of TA needs to be mandated. Countryside's plans do not bear scrutiny. Trip rates and modal shift from cars to buses not experienced anywhere and not evidenced. Traffic levels local roads cannot support. Costs rightly allocated to Developer and Cambridge County Council. Price of inadequate delivery will be for villages. Must include Village representation throughout, setting triggers, ongoing monitoring, agreement to physical remedial measures and timing of such. Too easy for Developer to under-provide.

## Comment

- **Cambridgeshire County Council** SPD identifies the potential to explore the sharing of sports provision with schools by providing community access. This is welcomed, however any reduction should not be at the expenses of other informal or formal green space.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Planning Application Requirements section should also include the need for a Health Impact Assessment to be submitted as part of any site wide outline application as per South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Policy.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 6.6 – development will need to comply with the Minerals & Waste Plan, including the submission of a Waste Minimisation Audit and Strategy to demonstrate measures to minimise waste, and steps to recover and recycle waste.
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** Figure 57: Indicative land Use Budget shows employment area 13.3ha. Figure 21: Key Constraints and Figure 55: Infrastructure Delivery Plan shows only the existing employment site. SPD is not clear if that is the

only employment site to be provided. New village should provide more employment sites, as per Local Plan policy.

- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** Section 6.5 outlines the principles which will apply and be secured via the planning application process. SPD is specifying off site mitigation to traffic problems that will be created by the site. Unacceptable. Passes responsibility to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC). As worded, accepts there will be impacts on neighbouring villages. Site can mitigate its own problems with direct A428 access. CCC committee accepted in principle.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd (CP)** Section 6.3 CP are generally content with this.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 6.4 – revisions to landscaping on eastern boundary lost 1ha developable area. If dual use of sports pitches agreed could gain 4-8ha. developable area. Dual use essential to provide flexibility in facilitating lower net density or increase in capacity, and broaden house types. Figure 55 – schools should state gross area.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 6.6 Concerned SPD has stricter requirements for preparation and submission of planning applications, compared with Waterbeach SPD. Should be a consistent approach.
- **National Trust** Figure 57 Indicative Land Budget -welcome 89ha for a Country Park within the site. Notwithstanding proposed onsite provision, development should take account of interface between new communities and their wider surroundings. Likely increase in off-site recreational visits to adjacent outdoor recreation sites; National Trust's Wimpole Hall Estate. Welcome opportunity to engage with local authority, developers and community representatives to encourage sustainable travel patterns and responsible recreational activity.

#### Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- **Aitchison Developments Ltd** Employment space (Item 44) employment space will be delivered through each phase. Overwhelming need it to come forward at the earliest opportunity. Figure 58 Potential early phases plan indicates redevelopment of existing employment site in the early phases of delivery. Supported and reflects development intentions.
- **Barton and District Bridleways Group** Non Motorised User Infrastructure. Item 1 Improved walking and cycling network - Refers to riding in the text so horse riding should be included in the first column. Item 2 Cycleway Improvement - What provision is being made for equestrians on this route? Item 3 Rights of Way Network - Does not include access for carriage drivers.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Foul Water Network (Item 23) – welcome recognition of Bourn Water Recycling Centre as potential constraint. Within 400m safeguarding area there is a presumption against development which would be occupied by people. Require submission of an Odour Assessment.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Burial Grounds (Item 33) Approximately 300m<sup>2</sup> of land is too low. The 0.83 ha to be provided in the funding column would allow 30 years of



burials based on the guidance in Arnold-Baker on Local Council Administration. Generally, you allow for a 30-year supply: 2.058 acres / 0.83ha.

- **Cambourne Town Council** Special Educational Needs (Item 38) contributions for Cambourne and Bourn Airfield should be pooled and used to provide a special school in Cambourne or Bourn Airfield to better cater for the local need, more sustainable, and reduce carbon footprint.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Health (Item 41) Question the capacity of Sackville House to take 1000sqm and additional parking. Monkfield Medical Practice already being extended for West Cambourne. Concern whether it can be expanded further for total population 28,800.
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** Health (Item 41) Provision for health is woefully inadequate. Cambourne surgery is already over capacity and takes weeks to get appointments. Extension is not sufficient for additional 9000+ residents. No capacity at other local surgeries for example at Bourn. Recommend: require provision of a standalone doctor's surgery.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Comments on a number of items: Transport Infrastructure - Items 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 & 16 - CP are content with these. (4) Trigger is pre-occupation and not specified which bus stops. (13) This is correct and CP have no issue with this. Waste, Water, Energy and Telecoms - No comments except for item (27) Potential feasibility and viability issues with the deployment of CHP. Recommend is updated: 'which could include a heat network where feasible and viable'. Affordable Housing - CP are content with this. Community Facilities – (31) Does not refer to potential dual use at schools. (36) School site areas are high. Suggest flexibility is added. Need flexibility over need for a 4FE school. (36) 'Provider/partner' - be clearer that it is CCC and/or approved academy operator. (40) Inflexible, especially given rate of change in nursery sector. (41) 'Description' and 'provider' - include more caveats e.g. Subject to NHS/CCG agreement etc. (42) Include caveats relating to market conditions/viability. (44) Refer to existing employment and be more flexible. (45) Correct measure to use when applying it to number of dwellings is "per dwelling" figure, not per household - correct figure to use is 2.7 not 2.8. (45) Developer should not be required to make contribution toward artificial pitch if they are already being provided on-site in-kind. (48) Should this reference a community trust as a potential 'partner/provider'?
- **Wildlife Trust** omits provision for the long-term, sustainable management of the strategic green infrastructure including biodiversity areas, green corridors, and country park within the strategic landscape area. Failure to address would undermine Local Plan policy and many good Fixes and Guiding Principles relating to the natural environment within SPD.
- Country Park is missing from Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Triggers, phasing and funding must be described.

## Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed.

### Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

#### Cycling/walking

Agree that the comprehensive pedestrian and cycle network on the site should be established in the early stages of the development and should be prior to occupation to ensure that good habits are established and that this should be clearly set out in the IDP.

Horse riding is included within the description of improving the cycle and walking network, but it could also be included in the title of infrastructure scheme Item 1.

The cycleway improvement along the old A428 from Madingley Mulch roundabout and Cambourne is being proposed by the County Council as a possible cycleway improvement, with no mention of equestrian use on this route. Further details would be determined as part of the Transport Assessment.

Improvements to public rights of way network refers to horse riding along bridleways. Further details would be determined as part of the Transport Assessment and in consultation with the County Council's Public Rights of Way team.

#### Public Transport

The routes of buses when they are not in service is outside the scope of this SPD.

#### Highway Infrastructure

Highway mitigation measures will be identified through the Transport Assessment and S106 process and with agreement with Highways Officers at Cambridgeshire County Council.

#### Employment

The employment phases have been identified as part of the early phases in Section 6.5 and Figure 58 of the SPD. This can be reflected in the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP).

#### Burial Grounds

There is a discrepancy in the IDP between the description column and the funding column as to the amount of land that would be required for burial ground space. The IDP will be amended so that it is clear that 0.83ha is to be provided within the site.

#### Special Education Needs

An off-site contribution is required by Cambridgeshire County Council to support places at a special school in Northstowe. There is insufficient need for a facility just to support the Cambourne/Bourn Airfield area.

#### Health

Agree with the Primary Care Commissioning Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group who have observed that the nature of future provision is still under consideration and with comments that Sackville House is incapable of further expansion beyond that needed to support Cambourne West.

### Foul Water Network

Figure 21 of the SPD shows the constraint from Bourn Water Recycling Centre and this would be taken into account in the consideration of the future planning applications.

### Renewable Energy Infrastructure

The IDP (at Item 27) states that renewable energy measures could include combined heat and power. This is already sufficiently flexible and the feasibility and viability would be considered as part of the future planning application.

### Indoor Sports Facilities

Add reference to potential for dual use to item 31 of the IDP.

### Schools

The County Council advised on the level of primary school provision based upon the multipliers they use and the IDP can't offer any flexibility on this.

Under school provider for primary and secondary schools the IDP could be clearer that it is CCC and / or approved academy operator.

### Nursery

The intention is not to constrain flexibility in future provision within a shared use building. Make clear that an opportunity should be created for a commercial rent facility rather than by way of direct provision.

### Retail and services

The new development will need appropriate retail and services to serve the new population and so would not want to add in caveats to the IDP that suggest that this may not be viable.

### Outdoor sports pitches

The IDP should refer to sports pavilions as well as to outdoor sports pitches.

Use of a 2.8 ha per household standard for South Cambridgeshire is consistent with current usage and was used for the Waterbeach SPD.

Agree that it would be inequitable to expect a contribution towards an artificial grass pitch if one is provided directly by the developer. Amend the wording of item 45 to allow for this flexibility.

### Maintenance of green spaces

Agree that the IDP should also refer to the maintenance of the strategic open spaces, landscape areas and the country park. Also that the provider / partner should also include community trusts.

### Country Park

Agree that the country park should be included within the IDP.

## Proposed Modifications

- Item 1:
  - Amend the text within 'Infrastructure Scheme' column to read: 'Improved cycle, ~~and~~ walking **and riding** network.'
  - Amend the text within the 'Triggers' column, so that it reads: '~~Triggers to be agreed via S106 discussions~~ **Prior to occupation**. To be **identified through the Transport Assessment process**.'
  
- Item 29 – amend the text within the 'Description' column to read: 'Provision of **two** multi-purpose community buildings. **One of these would include changing rooms and a 2 court sports hall and performance space**. These could **also** include services such as a library (see below), information and advice services, health services, adult learning services and **an office and room for a children's centre**.'
  
- Item 33 - amend the text within the 'Description' column to read: 'Requirement of Policy SC/4 of the South Cambridgeshire ~~District~~ **Local Plan** (2018). Approximately ~~300m<sup>2</sup>~~ **0.83ha** of land is likely to be required.'
  
- Item 36 and Item 37 – amend the text within the 'Provider/partner' column to read: '**CCC and/or approved academy operator**.'
  
- Item 44 - amend the text within the 'Triggers' column to read: 'Delivered through each phase. **Likely to be in the early phases**.'
  
- Item 45:
  - Amend text within the 'Infrastructure Scheme' column to include additional wording at the end: '**and sports pavilions**'
  - Amend the 'Description' column: to read: 'South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) requires 1.6ha of outdoor sport space per 1,000 people. Therefore, assuming a population of 9,800 residents (3,500 dwellings x 2.8 people per household) there is a requirement for 15.68ha (**subject to the possible dual use of school sports space**). ~~There will also be~~ **This could include** a contribution for artificial grass pitches.'
  
- Add a new row in the IDP concerning the provision of Strategic Open Spaces, including the Country Park, as follows:
 

Infrastructure Scheme – Strategic Open Space  
 Description – Provision of strategic open space, including a country park, runway park and other areas of informal recreation.

Provider / partner – Developer  
Triggers – Delivered through each phase  
On/Off site – On  
Land Holding – Taylor family / Countryside  
Funding – Direct  
Mechanism – Developers to provide. Also contribution for ongoing maintenance and governance.

- **Item 48:**
  - Amend the text within 'Infrastructure Scheme' column to read:  
'Maintenance of public open space, play areas, sports pitches, and water attenuation features, **strategic open spaces and landscape areas, and the country park**'
  - Amend the text within 'Provider/partner' column to read:  
'SCDC / CCC / Developer / **Community trust**'

## Supporting Documents

# Sustainability Appraisal / Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report

## Representations received:

Support: 1 Object: 3 Comment: 1  
Total: 5

## Main issues in representations:

### Support

- **Natural England** Welcome amended SA / HRA Screening Report includes more through consideration of potential impacts on Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) through increased recreational pressure and to SAC barbastelle bats supporting habitat. Generally agree with assessment that SPD unlikely to have any significant effect on SAC, including barbastelle bats and supporting habitat. Agree with conclusions that Plan can be screened out of requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA).

### Object

- **Knapwell Parish meeting** Nature Reserve, Wildlife Trust managed Overhall Grove is a designated SSSI, and recognised Ancient Woodland. Conservation Area. Village contains the RSPB's own national farm. Protected verges due to a range of extremely rare flora, including Sulphur Clover. These are not referenced in the Sustainability and Habitats Appraisal, which requires further investigation. Request explicit reference in SPD to correct this oversight, with

recognition that as such, specific measures are put in place to actively manage traffic volume in this sensitive Parish ecosystem.

#### Comment

- **Historic England** we would concur with your assessment that the document is unlikely to result in any significant environmental effects and will simply provide additional guidance on existing Policies contained within a Adopted Development Plan Document which has already been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal/SEA. As a result, we would advise that it is not necessary to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of this particular SPD.

### Councils' Assessment

Support welcomed.

The Council welcomes the comments from Natural England and Historic England that they agree that the SPD is unlikely to have any significant environmental effects and that it is not necessary to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the SPD.

The SA refers to three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) in close proximity to the site, which fall within the Impact Risk Zones used by Natural England. Overhall Grove SSSI is further away and falls outside this zone so it is less likely that there would be any impact. An amendment has been proposed to section 2.5 of the SPD to refer to the Overhall Grove SSSI and Ancient Woodland at Knapwell. At the time of any planning applications Natural England would be consulted and could raise any concerns they have about impact on SSSIs or any protected verges.

### Proposed Modifications

No modifications are proposed in response to representations on the Sustainability Appraisal / Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report.

## Equalities Impact Assessment

#### Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 2 Comment: 0  
Total:2

#### Main issues in representations:

Support  
None

Object

- **Knapwell Parish Meeting** Knapwell residents have responded to previous consultations concerning Bourn Airfield, and Local Plan, to highlight range of concerns but do not see evidence of their voice being acknowledged in consultation summary reports or draft SPD. Obligation B4 not been adequately met by Planning Policy Team and wish to offer opportunity to engage and rectify this prior to publication of the final SPD. Wish to work in partnership with development team to minimise negative external impact on local historic local communities and specifically historic rural and residential nature of Knapwell, which, due to further development of Boxworth services A14 junction will be exposed to high levels of infrastructure damage, community impact and dangers if it is perceived to be the direct route to and from A14 households at Bourn airfield. Heartened to see clear acknowledgement in draft SPD of likely impact of traffic resulting from 3500 homes on character of the Broadway, and to Bourn village - a constructive finding. Frustrated to see that, despite raising concerns in previous consultations, there is no acknowledgement of Knapwell being directly affected by every negative impact that has been highlighted in draft SPD on Bourn, and Broadway.
- States stakeholders have been consulted. Hardwick has not been consulted as a community stakeholder, or invited to workshops, although clearly very affected. Wrong and disrespectful to a neighbour that will be recipient of development's east-bound traffic and from an infrastructure perspective a new busway proposal that will see our village road turned into an urban stretch of 8 lanes of tarmac. Did anyone read our Village Plan that concluded Hardwick wants to "maintain its character with many trees, greenery and tidy streets - a lovely peaceful village home to come back to after a day at work or school". Proposed busway will require removal of all mature trees and greenery which protect us visually from A428 (proposed effect is available from Greater Cambridge Partnership).

#### Comment

None

#### Councils' Assessment

The Council acknowledges the objections and feeling that local communities have not been listened too. The allocation of a new village at Bourn Airfield was established through Policy SS/7 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) and the SPD provides further detail about how this policy will be implemented balancing social, economic and environmental requirements, minimising impacts and maximising opportunities. Some amendments have been proposed to the SPD Figures (to show the staggered junction at the top of the Broadway) and text to address Knapwell Parish Council's concerns.

The Council invited the coalition of Parish Councils to the stakeholder workshops, held during the preparation of the SPD, to represent the interests of wider Parish Councils, including Hardwick.

### **Proposed Modifications**

No modifications are proposed in response to representations on the Equalities Impact Assessment.



## **Appendix 1 Issues raised in the preparation of the draft SPD**

### **Main issues raised**

#### **1. Social issues**

**The local centre needs to be located so that it is easily accessible by walking.**

##### **How issue was addressed**

The SPD proposes a village centre and a neighbourhood hub, to provide two easily accessible locations for services and facilities in the new village. The location of the village centre is towards the north of the site, and this location was chosen for several reasons. It is situated next to the proposed secondary school / primary school, the high-quality public transport stop and the runway park. The neighbourhood hub is located further south, served by the secondary street, green corridors and collocated with the other primary school and public open spaces.

**Community hub should have convenience shopping and a pub and café for social activities.**

##### **How issue was addressed**

Section 2c of the SPD is clear that the village centre and neighbourhood hub will be locations for the co-location of community facilities and other facilities such as retail or cafes which could be run commercially or by the community. This will add to the vibrancy and character of the village.

**Bourn Airfield should have its own identity, but the relationship with Cambourne and other surrounding villages is key.**

##### **How issue was addressed**

The SPD is clear in the Vision, that Bourn Airfield will be distinct new village which acknowledges its historic past but with its own contemporary identity. It is situated in close proximity to Cambourne, Highfields Caldecote and Bourn and it makes sense that residents will want to travel between these settlements and use the services and facilities elsewhere. The SPD is clear that sustainable modes of travel such as walking and cycling are the preferred modes of travel for local trips. There will also be bus links between the villages and the high-quality public transport link.

**Establish governance through a Parish Council as soon as possible to help the new community establish and resolve issues early on.**

##### **How issue was addressed**

It is beyond the scope of the SPD to make detailed arrangements for governance, however Section 6C of the SPD does suggest a possible approach to this.

**Need for well integrated affordable housing.**

##### **How issue was addressed**

The SPD proposes mixed neighbourhoods with a wide range of housing types and tenures including affordable housing.

New health facilities will be needed for the new population, but the exact nature of these will require liaison with the NHS.

#### How issue was addressed

Chapter 6 of the SPD sets out the infrastructure requirements for the new village. Developers will fund new health facilities as part of the s106 agreement. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group were contacted and they advised that the use of developer funding will be agreed later in the process based upon strategies which are currently being developed.

#### **Sports provision should be separate to education and provided early to assist with place-making.**

#### How issue was addressed

The SPD sets out the full requirement of outdoor and indoor sports provision that developers will need to provide in line with policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and relevant strategies. There is potential for shared and dual use of sports facilities at schools, but this will be for developers to explore with the Local Education Authority. Phasing of the development will be key to provide some sports provision / open space early in the development as it is agreed that this will assist with place-making.

## 2. Environmental issues

#### **The development should seek a renewable energy usage of greater than 50% and use of low carbon technologies**

#### How issue was addressed

One of the Objectives of the SPD is that the new village should be built so that it is responsive to climate change and incorporates low or net zero carbon buildings, renewable energy and low-emission travel that aim to exceed existing standards within the Local Plan.

#### **Concern over air quality and noise impacts from the A428. The schools should not be located next to a major road due to health impacts.**

#### How issue was addressed

The SPD proposes a landscaped buffer from the edge of the A428 to the nearest residential properties, school premises and playing fields of between 50m to 100m in width, subject to detailed assessment. Within this area there will be significant landscaping which may be bunded to reduce the visual, noise and air quality impacts of the A428. Advice from air quality and noise experts within the Council have suggested the impacts of the road could be mitigated by the detailed orientation and design of the buildings, in addition to the delivery of a significant landscape belt.

Existing runway provides a vista that deserves preserving and shallow 'valley' should be preserved and incorporated.

#### How issue was addressed

The runway corridor and valley corridor are identified in the SPD as important green corridors which will be protected and enhanced. The runway park will be designed to incorporate and celebrate the long-distance views and history of the site as a WWII airfield.

There should be visual separation between Bourn Airfield and other settlements. Opportunity for strategic landscaping.

#### How issue was addressed

The SPD will improve existing landscaping within and along all site boundaries including to the A428, along the Broadway and between the new village and Highfields Caldecote. The SPD proposes strategic landscape areas in the southern part of the site (this will be a Country Park) and to the east providing separation with Highfields Caldecote and Bourn village.

### **Opportunity to provide extensive walking, cycling and equestrian network and links.**

#### How issue was addressed

The SPD proposes a network of walking, cycling and horse-riding routes within the site and linking to other routes outside the site and connecting to nearby settlements at Cambourne, Highfields Caldecote and towards Bourn (see Fix G and Figure 47). Green routes will provide opportunities for non-motorised vehicles to move around and through the settlement in a safe and attractive environment. These links also provide green routes to provide biodiversity gains.

Debate over the route of the high-quality public transport route. The issues raised were:

- Shouldn't act as a barrier to movement
- The two stops should be easily accessible by walking and cycling – concerns if they are both in the North of the site.
- Need to maintain speed through the site on a relatively straight route, as it provides a rapid service.

#### How issue was addressed

A number of discussions have been held with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and other stakeholders on the merits of alternative alignments. The priority objective for the route is that it should be segregated to permit travel at around 55 mph for as much of the route as possible, whilst maintaining access to convenient bus stops.

Given this need for segregation from other traffic and users between stops, the implications in terms of a barrier effect across the development could be significant. It has therefore been determined that the most appropriate alignment for the route is to the north of site, away from the majority of built development and areas where

people would be expecting to move around freely. Two stops have been located to serve the village centre, and the existing employment area and potentially residents from Highfields Caldecote.

#### **Debate over access permitted to the Broadway. The issues raised were:**

- Sensitivity of the historic route to an increase in traffic
- There should not be no vehicle access southbound on the Broadway
- There should only be bus and emergency vehicle access to the Broadway
- Control of access to the Broadway is unsuitable
- There should be traffic calming measures on the Broadway

#### **How issue was addressed**

Policy SS/7 in the Local Plan is clear that there will be no direct vehicular access to the Broadway for southbound traffic from the new village (except buses and bicycles). The SPD provides additional detail and the Spatial Framework plan shows a new priority alignment into the new village from the Broadway which ensure no access from the village southbound on the Broadway. There is additional land outside the SPD boundary at the junction which could improve the junction layout subject to detailed design.

The SPD shows that the junction on the Broadway will allow the high-quality public transport route and pedestrian / cycle route priority crossing into Cambourne. Also enhancement to the existing junction between St Neots Road and the Broadway.

#### **Possibility of direct access on to the A428**

##### **How issue was addressed**

Officers have discussed this with Highways England. The advice received was there is no strategic need for a new junction and, with the Cambridge to Oxford Expressway elevating the status of the route, there will be a presumption against such a new junction. There are already a number of junctions along this section of the A428, including existing junctions close by which are capable of serving the development. In design terms there is marginal room for a new junction and further junctions could create unnecessary weaving with traffic changing lanes, compromising traffic flow and safety. Notwithstanding the highway advice, a grade separated junction would be expensive to deliver, require extensive land take, and would severely compromise the creation of a high-quality new village.

#### **Connections to local bus services are required to ensure sustainable travel practices are adopted by earliest residents.**

##### **How issue was addressed**

The SPD recognises the potential to integrate local bus routes with the HQPT stops. There will also be the need for additional local bus stops within the new village. This will require an operational strategy with bus operators in due course.

### **3. Economic issues**

**A strategy may be required to ensure the scale and mix of employment is in keeping with adjoining villages and demand.**

How issue was addressed

The employment area in the north east of the site is to continue in this use and the SPD integrates this area within the spatial framework. The SPD also recognises that there will be opportunities for new small premises for local entrepreneurs and that there could be redevelopment of the vacant and underutilised land within the existing employment site to provide premises for small and medium enterprises (see Guiding Principles No 2).

**Need to agree a delivery strategy for non-residential components of the place. Retail provision should be local scale and not detract from Cambourne High Street viability.**

How issue was addressed

The SPD sets out the guiding principles for retail premises within the new village (see Guiding Principles No 2). This includes a small supermarket and a range of other units with space for small and temporary / pop-up premises for local entrepreneurs. It also refers to food and drink premises, including places which are open in the evening such as a potential local pub. The scale of these facilities would not detract from Cambourne High Street and would be mainly serving the new development itself.

### 3. Emerging Vision

**Vision should draw out the wider strategic objective of 'providing homes to support the wider economy'.**

How issue was addressed

Added to the Vision.

**The draft Vision fits well with the public health agenda and encouraging healthy lifestyles.**

How issue was addressed

Noted.

**It is important to retain the employment that exists on the site and have a range of uses so that it will not become a dormitory place.**

How issue was addressed

The Vision is clear that the new village will provide employment and a range of facilities and services.

The new village needs a strong heart (community focus) rather than a centre (commercial).

How issue was addressed

The Vision is clear that the village will have a vibrant and strong heart based upon community. The Vision also says that it needs a range of facilities and services to complement and not compete with existing provision. Both of these are important.

**Community representatives thought that Bourn Airfield should have its own identity but still have strong connections with Cambourne. Bourn Airfield will not be self-sustaining so there will need to be interconnectivity with the larger settlement of Cambourne.**

[How issue was addressed](#)

The Vision sets out that Bourn Airfield will be a distinct new village with its own identity, whilst acknowledging that its range of facilities and services will complement and not compete with existing local provision.

**Acknowledgment of the new SCDC administration's aspirations for zero carbon / zero emissions but recognition that there is no hook in the Local Plan or National Planning Policy Framework to require it at Bourn Airfield. Nonetheless SCDC want to be ambitious in the aim.**

[How issue was addressed](#)

The Vision acknowledges the aspiration to move towards zero carbon lifestyles through an innovative approach to planning, design and construction.

**Some concern that whilst there is support for modal change, the car might still be people's choice. Walking, cycling and public transport as the 'Primary mode' (as stated in vision) may not be achievable. Employment developments will be more likely to use motorised transport. This is not about being anti-car but managing trips and people's perceptions. Suggestion that 'primary' should be replaced by 'significant'.**

[How issue was addressed](#)

The Vision refers to walking, cycling and public transport as the preferred mode of choice for travel for people within the new village and beyond.

Some concern that the vision is a bit wordy and preferred the 'strapline' approach. It needs to be ambitious but realistically achievable.

[How issue was addressed](#)

Noted. It was felt that the Vision should set out some detail about the ambition for the new village in relation to social, economic and environmental aspects, rather than just a strapline.

#### [4. Emerging Objectives](#)

The Objectives needed to elaborate on the mix of houses (including affordable housing, self-build, key worker housing) and provision of a range of types and sizes to meet the local needs of the area generally.

[How issue was addressed](#)

Strategic objective 2 refers to a range of housing types to meet the local housing needs and refers to low cost and affordable housing. This level of detail is acceptable for an objective. More detail on housing types and tenures is then included within Section 2B of the draft SPD.

Queries about whether reference to “a new guided busway route” was the most appropriate terminology in light of the Mayor’s CAM proposals. Suggested replacement with “a new rapid transit route”. It was also acknowledged that the policy focusses on links to Cambridge. However, it also needs to consider wider links to St Neots, and wider cycling links to surrounding villages.

#### How issue was addressed

Strategic objective 1 refers to this scheme as a new high-quality public transport (HQPT) route and refers to connections along the A428 corridor and to St Neots and Cambridge.

To reduce car reliance, it was suggested the objectives need to include modal share targets.

#### How issue was addressed

This has not been included, but strategic objective 1 is clear that sustainable movement is a priority both within the site and to and from the site.

Bridleways and horse riding should be included in the objectives.

#### How issue was addressed

This is too specific for the strategic objectives, but the importance of bridleways is recognised in Section 1 of Chapter 5 of the draft SPD ‘Creating the Place’.

## **Appendix 2 Consultees**

The following organisations were directly notified of the draft Bourn Airfield New Village SPD in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) via email, or post where no email address is available. Individuals are not listed. It should be noted that other individuals and organisations will also be contacted that do not appear on this list.

3CT Haverhill Community Transport  
A2 Dominion Housing Group  
Abbotsley Parish Council  
Abellio Greater Anglia  
Abington Pigotts Parish Council  
Accent Nene Housing Society Limited  
Advisory Council for the Education of Gypsy and other Travellers (ACERT)  
Aitchison Developments Ltd  
Affinity Water  
Age UK Cambridgeshire  
Airport Operators Association  
Anglia Ruskin University - Cambridge Campus  
Anglian Water Services Limited  
Arrington Parish Council  
Ashdon Parish Council  
Ashwell Parish Council  
Babraham Parish Council  
Balsham Parish Council  
Bar Hill Parish Council  
Barley Parish Council  
Barrington Parish Council  
Barrington Parish Council  
Bartlow Parish Council  
Barton Parish Council  
Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council  
Bedford Borough Council  
Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board  
Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association  
Bidwells  
Bluntisham Parish Council  
Bottisham Parish Council  
Bourn Parish Council  
Bovis Homes (South East)  
Boxworth Parish Council  
Braintree District Council  
Brinkley Parish Council  
British Gas  
British Horse Society  
British Romany Union  
Building Research Establishment  
Caldecote Parish Council  
Cam Valley Forum  
Cambourne Town Council



Cambridge and County Developments (formerly Cambridge Housing Society)  
Cambridge Area Bus Users  
Cambridge Campaign for Better Transport  
Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service  
Cambridge Cycling Campaign  
Cambridge Dial a Ride  
Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum  
Cambridge Federation of Tenants Leaseholders and Residents Assoc.  
Cambridge Forum of Disabled People  
Cambridge GET Group  
Cambridge Inter-Faith Group  
Cambridge Past Present and Future  
Cambridge Peterborough and South Lincolnshire (CPSL) Mind  
Cambridge Race Equality & Diversity Service  
Cambridge Regional College  
Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Cambridge Water (South Staffs Water)  
Cambridge Women's Resource Centre (CWRC)  
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority  
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust  
Cambridgeshire ACRE  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Association of Local Councils  
Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce  
Cambridgeshire Community Foundation  
Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Cambridgeshire County Councillors for South Cambridgeshire district  
Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council  
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service  
Cambridgeshire Football Association  
Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum  
Cambs Fire Service (Operational Support Directorate)  
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)  
Care Network  
Carlton Cum Willingham Parish Council  
Castle Camps Parish Council  
Caxton Parish Council  
Central Bedfordshire Council  
Centre 33  
Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the Univ. of Cambridge  
Childerley Parish Council  
Chrishall Parish Council  
Church Commissioners  
Circle Anglia Housing Trust  
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)  
Clarion Housing Group  
Comberton Parish Council  
Confederation of British Industry - East of England  
Conington Parish Council  
Conservators of the River Cam

Cottenham Parish Council  
Country Land & Business Association  
Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd  
Croydon Parish Council  
DB Group (Holdings) Ltd  
DB Schenker Rail (UK)  
Defence Lands Ops North  
Department for Business Innovation and Skills  
Department for Transport  
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Design Council CABE  
Disability Cambridgeshire  
Dry Drayton Parish Council  
Dunton Parish Council  
Duxford Parish Council  
Earith Parish Council  
East Cambridgeshire District Council  
Education Funding Agency  
Elmdon and Wendon Lofts Parish Council  
Ellsworth Parish Council  
Eltisley Parish Council  
Ely Diocesan Board  
Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards  
Environment Agency  
EON UK plc  
Essex County Council  
Everton Parish Council  
Eynesbury Hardwicke Parish Council  
Federation of Small Businesses  
Fen Ditton Parish Council  
Fen Drayton Parish Council  
Fenland District Council  
Fenstanton Parish Council  
Fields in Trust  
Flagship Homes  
Forestry Commission England  
Fowlmere Parish Council  
Foxton Parish Council  
Freight Transport Association  
Friends of the Earth  
Friends, Families and Travellers Community Base  
Fulbourn Parish Council  
Gallagher Estates  
Girton Parish Council  
Godmanchester Town Council  
Grantchester Parish Council  
Graveley Parish Council  
Great Abington Parish Council  
Great and Little Chishill Parish Council  
Great and Little Eversden Parish Council

Great Bradley Parish Council  
Great Chesterford Parish Council  
Great Gransden Parish Council  
Great Ouse Boating Association  
Great Shelford Parish Council  
Great Thurlow Parish Council  
Great Wilbraham Parish Council  
Greater Cambridge Partnership  
Guilden Morden Parish Council  
Haddenham Parish Council  
Hadstock Parish Council  
Hardwick Parish Council  
Harlton Parish Council  
Harston Parish Council  
Haslingfield Parish Council  
Hastoe Housing Association  
Hatley Parish Council  
Haverhill Town Council  
Hazardous Installations Inspectorate  
Helions Bumpstead Parish Council  
Hertfordshire County Council  
Heydon Parish Council  
Highways England  
Hildersham Parish Council  
Hilton Parish Council  
Hinxton Parish Council  
Histon & Impington Parish Council  
Historic England  
Holywell-cum-Needlingworth Parish Council  
Home Builders Federation  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Horningsea Parish Council  
Horseheath Parish Council  
Hundred Houses Society Limited  
Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport (HACT)  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
Hunts Health - Local Commissioning Group  
Iceni Homes  
Ickleton Parish Council  
Institute of Directors - Eastern Branch  
IWM Duxford  
Kelshall Parish Council  
Kier Partnership Homes Limited  
King Street Housing Society  
Kingston Parish Council  
Knapwell Parish Meeting  
Landbeach Parish Council  
Linton Parish Council  
Litlington Parish Council  
Little Abington Parish Council

Little Shelford Parish Council  
Little Thurlow Parish Council  
Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council  
Littlebury Parish Council  
Local Nature Partnership  
Lode Parish Council  
Lolworth Parish Council  
Longstanton Parish Council  
Longstowe Parish Council  
Luminus Group  
Marine Management Organisation  
Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited  
Melbourn Parish Council  
Meldreth Parish Council  
Middle Level Commissioners  
Milton Parish Council  
MPs for South East Cambridgeshire, South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge  
National Association of Health Workers with Travellers  
National Grid  
National House Building Council  
National Housing Federation  
National Travellers Action Group  
Natural England  
Network Rail  
Network Regulation  
Newton Parish Council  
Newton Parish Council  
NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group  
NHS England (Midlands & East)  
NHS Property Services Ltd (Midlands & East)  
North Hertfordshire District Council  
Nuthampstead Parish Council  
Oakington and Westwick Parish Council  
Office of Rail and Road  
Offord Cluny and Offord Darcy Parish Council  
Openreach  
Orchard Park Community Council  
Ormiston Children's and Family Trust  
Orwell Parish Council  
Over and Willingham Internal Drainage Board  
Over Parish Council  
Pampisford Parish Council  
Papworth Everard Parish Council  
Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting  
Paradigm Housing Group  
Persimmon Homes East Midlands Limited  
Peterborough City Council  
Planning Inspectorate  
Post Office Property

Potton Town Council  
Ramblers' Association [Cambridge Group]  
Rampton Parish Council  
Renewable UK  
Road Haulage Association  
Romany Institute  
Royal Mail Group  
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)  
Royston Community Transport  
Royston Town Council  
Sanctuary Housing Association  
Sawston Parish Council  
Scottish and Southern Electricity Group  
Shelter  
Shingay-cum-Wendy Parish Council  
Shudy Camps Parish Council  
Shudy Camps Parish Council  
Skills Funding Agency  
Smithy Fen Residents Association  
South Cambridgeshire District Council  
South Cambridgeshire District Councillors  
South Cambridgeshire Youth Council  
Sport England  
St Ives Town Council  
St Neots Rural Parish Council  
Stagecoach East  
Stapleford Parish Council  
Steeple Morden Parish Council  
Stow-cum-Quy Parish Council  
Strethall Parish Council  
Stretham Parish Council  
Suffolk County Council  
Sustrans (East of England)  
Swaffham Bulbeck Parish Council  
Swaffham Prior Parish Council  
Swavesey Internal Drainage Board  
Swavesey Parish Council  
Tadlow Parish Council  
Taylor Wimpey East Anglia  
Teversham Parish Council  
The Amusement Catering Equip. Society (ACES)  
The Association of Circus Proprietors  
The Association of Independent Showmen (AIS)  
The Cambridgeshire Cottage Housing Society  
The camToo Project  
The Crown Estate  
The Equality and Human Rights Commission  
The Gypsy Council (GCECWCR)  
The Kite Trust  
The Lawn Tennis Association

The Magog Trust  
The National Trust  
The Papworth Trust  
The Showman's Guild of Great Britain  
The Society of Independent Roundabout Proprietors  
The Theatres Trust  
The Traveller Law Reform Project  
The Traveller Movement  
The Varrier Jones Foundation  
The Wildlife Trust  
Three  
The Wildlife Trust  
Thriplow Parish Council  
Toft Parish Council  
Toseland Parish Council  
Travel for Work Partnership  
Traveller Solidarity Network  
UK Power Networks  
University of Cambridge - Vice Chancellor's Office  
Uttlesford District Council  
Visit East Anglia Limited  
Vodafone and O2  
Waresley Parish Council  
West Suffolk (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils)  
West Wrating Parish Council  
Weston Colville Parish Council  
Whaddon Parish Council  
Whippet Coaches Limited  
Whittlesford Parish Council  
Wicken and Upware Parish Council  
Wilburton Parish Council  
Willingham Parish Council  
Wimpole Parish Council  
Withersfield Parish Council  
Wood Plc  
Woodland Trust  
Wrestlingworth and Cockayne Hatley Parish Council  
Yelling Parish Council