

**RESULTS OF INITIAL CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS**

- A1 As part of the process of stakeholder involvement in shaping the Core Strategy proposals, a range of groups and organisations was consulted in January and February this year on potential spatial objectives and policy approaches.
- A2 The basis for this consultation was the 'Initial Consultation on Options' report that Cabinet considered on 16 December 2004 (all or parts of which were circulated to the consultees, as appropriate to their main interests). This was supported by a draft of the sustainability appraisal Scoping Report, the findings of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal and the background paper on the settlement hierarchy.
- A3 Consultees included statutory agencies and service providers; the County, Town and Parish Councils (for whom special seminars were arranged); neighbouring authorities; and groups representing local business, community and environmental interests. The options were also considered by Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Planning & Finance) on 8 February, and by Development Control Panel on 9 February. In addition all Members were invited to comment on an individual basis.
- A4 Responses were received from 44 groups and individuals. A summary of their comments is attached; this also indicates suggested responses on behalf of the Council, in terms of whether changes to the draft objectives, policy approaches or sustainability appraisal appear to be merited. Where such changes are required, they have been incorporated in the Preferred Options Report circulated as Appendix 1 to this agenda item.
- A5 The settlement hierarchy attracted most interest, with arguments being made for a limited number of villages to be accorded a different status to that suggested by the background paper on settlement hierarchy (including Brampton, Kimbolton, Little Paxton, Somersham and Stilton). However the suggested hierarchy (which has been carried forward into the Preferred Options Report) is based upon a careful application of the criteria set out in the Structure Plan and emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. If the hierarchy is to prove robust and an effective means of steering development to the most sustainable locations, it is important that a consistent and objective approach is taken. As the background paper explains, the categorisation carries no implication that a particular level of growth will be directed to certain settlements, but it does suggest a logical set of priorities (starting with the Market Towns) that can be used when the Council comes to consider allocations.
- A6 The views of Overview & Scrutiny and DC Panel are not included in the schedule, but the key points arising from the Minutes are as follows:
- Both Panels expressed strong support for the suggested approach to securing an improved mix of market housing (policy area H4)
  - DC Panel suggested that the text supporting H5 (alteration or replacement of existing dwellings in the countryside) indicate that any replacement property should be on a site identical to the original. Such wording has not been added at this stage, as in some situations opportunities may exist to lessen the environmental impact of an isolated dwelling should redevelopment be proposed.

- DC Panel also suggested that further consideration be given to H9 and H10 (which concern retirement housing and nursing/care homes), in relation to where such development might be allowed. The text of these policy approaches has been clarified in the Preferred Options Report to make clear their scope and purpose, but not to allow retirement housing on a significant scale within smaller settlements (unless it were specifically for local elderly people in housing need, in which case provision could be made via the 'exceptions' policy H8). Other than limited 'infilling', general market housing in smaller settlements, even if limited to the over 55's, would not be appropriate in the context of national and strategic planning policies, and efforts to limit the need to travel and improve access to services.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

---

### Policy approach P1 Policy approach name: Sustainable Development

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Would like to see the criteria extended to include 'protection of biodiversity'.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. This is covered by the existing criteria.

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Would like to see the criteria extended to include 'minimising waste'.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Point accepted. Amend text to make reference to waste reduction and recycling.

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Would prefer to see the use of 'reducing the need to travel while encouraging accessibility' rather than 'limiting the need to travel', as limiting could be seen as negative, especially when trying to maintain and encourage accessibility.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The word 'limiting' implies minimising the need to travel so far as possible, while recognising that some travel is inevitable, especially in a semi-rural area such as Huntingdonshire.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The reason for the policy approach includes an old incomplete definition of sustainable development. While some government documents use this, the UK Sustainable Development Strategy definition is preferable: 'development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.' The UK Sustainable Development Strategy 'Quality of Life' (1999) identified 4 key aims: 1) social progress which recognises the needs of everyone 2) effective protection of the environment 3) prudent use of natural resources 4) maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The text refers to the most commonly-used definition, and in any case this does not form part of the policy approach.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Bullet point 2 'maintaining and enhancing...' would add word 'locally' before 'characteristic'</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. This elaboration is unnecessary.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Bullet point 2 'maintaining and enhancing...' would remove 'species' and replace with 'native biodiversity'.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The existing wording is simpler and gives sufficient indication of the intended policy approach.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Second bullet point 'maintaining and enhancing...' would add 'maximising green infrastructure network creation'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This goes beyond the general nature of this policy approach, and is addressed elsewhere in the Core Strategy.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add a new bullet point - 'effective protection of the environment'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This is implicit in the existing range of criteria.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add 'to ensure any development results in an overall net gain in nature biodiversity and enhanced access to the countryside that includes habitat management, restoration and creation'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This goes beyond what may reasonably be required in relation to any development proposal.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add 'Reduces the impact of development on climate change'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This is covered by the existing criteria.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add 'Phases the release of development proposals, to ensure sufficient infrastructure is in place first before commencement.'	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The need for adequate infrastructure is covered by other policy approaches, and phasing will be necessary only in a minority of cases (not as a general principle).
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add 'Protects and enhances landscape heritage and reflects the local character and distinctiveness of the area.'	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This is covered by the existing criteria.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add 'Facilitates minimal waste, maximum recycling and energy efficiency.'	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted. Amend text to make reference to waste reduction and recycling (energy use is addressed by the existing criteria).
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The reference to improving public health is most welcome, however more detail is required to ensure certain aspects are addressed, for example community involvement can operate at a variety of levels.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The policy approach is dealing with overall principles. Specific impacts on public health are best dealt with in the context of specific projects and proposals.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Inequalities is not mentioned, which is a critical omission as inequalities undermine the internal stability of communities and affects relationships with neighbouring communities.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This can be considered within the context of the 'social and economic well-being of the local population'.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The objectives are wide-ranging and are evidence of support for developing sustainable communities. A commitment to sustainability principles is evident in this Policy and throughout all the documents.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Peterborough City Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> First criterion 'making efficient use of land...' This does not make any distinction between greenfield and previously developed sites. Given that policies SS1 (RSS14) and P1/1 (Structure Plan) give preference to previously developed land and re-use of buildings, this should be reflected in the criterion, otherwise equal preference would be given to greenfield and previously developed sites.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. Efficient use of land is an appropriate aim whether 'greenfield' or 'brownfield' sites are involved.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Peterborough City Council</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>  Criteria 2-4 seek to minimise the impact of development upon the environment. While these are totally supported as laudable aims, it is difficult to see how they could be implemented. Eg would a planning application be refused if it were considered to have adverse effect on the environment? How would the effect be monitored and by whom? When would levels of greenhouse gases be monitored, during or after construction? For how long after completion? Full implication of the criteria should be considered.</p>	<p>No change required. Some of these criteria will be implemented through other policy approaches in the Core Strategy. They will also be considered through the use of a 'checklist' to be applied to major developments.</p>	
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Wildlife Trust</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>  Fully support policy approach. Only comments concern "Limiting consumption and having no adverse affects on water supplies and flood risk". Believe this should refer more explicitly to "water resources" for nature as well as people, rather than just "water supplies", as this implies water is only required for human consumption.</p>		<p>Point accepted.</p>

---

**Policy approach P2      Policy approach name: Settlement Hierarchy**



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Brampton Parish Council</p>		
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Brampton is classified as a potential growth area. Could this be reconsidered to limited growth? Proposed road developments around Brampton could surround the village with heavy traffic affecting noise pollution and air pollution and the general quality of life. More houses will make it worse.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. It is appropriate to identify Brampton as a Key Centre (Potential Growth) given that it satisfies all the relevant criteria in the Structure Plan and draft RSS, as well as its proximity to Huntingdon. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Brampton will necessarily have to accommodate significant growth, as the Settlement Hierarchy background paper makes clear.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils</p>		
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p> <p>Choices of priority for development include many towns and parishes where there are problems already, often involving youth. It should be a pre-requisite that these chosen areas are addressed now so that increased development does not exacerbate the problem. Design principles should also include a strong focus on facilities for all under-19s with early completion to prevent a new area being a problem before it is finished.</p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The need for appropriate community facilities and for designs that minimise the fear of crime are addressed in general terms elsewhere in the Core Strategy, and can be considered more fully at the project-specific stage. These issues are not so significant as to justify amending the approach to the settlement hierarchy, particularly bearing in mind national and strategic guidance.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p>		
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The approach of restricting development to market towns and a small number of key settlements is strongly supported and conforms with the Structure Plan.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Noted.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

In the Structure Plan Policy P1/1 Ramsey is a market town with lesser development. In this document it has been upgraded to market town. Would suggest that the Structure Plan approach should be followed as argued during the EIP.

**Council response**

Point accepted. Ramsey is classified as a market town in the Structure Plan, but it is accepted that it is also identified as being capable of taking only limited growth. This will be acknowledged and addressed in the spatial vision, and also by noting in P2 that Huntingdon and St Neots are expected to take most of the Market Towns growth (as the Structure Plan also indicates).

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Would prefer the use of 'Rural Centres' as described in Policy P1/3 of the Structure Plan rather than 'Key Centres'. This could be divided into sub-categories specifying the level of proposed development. Cambs County Council has made representations to EERA asking for the Structure Plan term to be used in RSS. Given that the Structure Plan policies will eventually be replaced by those of RSS, would suggest that HDC adapt categories which would reflect the RSS approach if adopted.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. As the background paper on Settlement Hierarchy explains, the term 'Key Centre' is appropriate as not all the settlements concerned are 'rural' in character.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Jonathan Gray

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Agree with the designation for Kimbolton as Key Centre (Limited Growth)

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Councillor Nick Finnie

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Little Paxton should be reclassified as a Key Centre (limited growth). The access to Little Paxton is inadequate and flooding has affected vehicle access on an average of 9 days a year over the last 5 years. The County Council have made it clear that there is little or no prospect of the river crossing being improved in the foreseeable future. The 1998 Local Plan Alteration identified Little Paxton as unsuitable for large scale housing development for reasons of access problems outlined above and the desire to retain Little Paxton as a separate settlement. Permission has already been given for development that will increase the size of Little Paxton by nearly 50% despite its designation as a group village.

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

#### **Council response**

No change required. As the background paper on Settlement Hierarchy makes clear, development will be permitted only if suitable sites are available and all other planning requirements (including the availability of adequate infrastructure) can be satisfied. Hence the capacity of Mill Lane will be a key consideration guiding any decisions about further development. Little Paxton satisfies most of the criteria that merit its designation as a Key Centre (Potential Growth), so it is appropriate to use this designation. However, the importance of adequate infrastructure and maintaining the separate identity of settlements will be emphasised in the overall spatial vision and the plan objectives.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Paula Longford

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Appendix 2 of the background paper comparing facilities of towns and larger villages shows Little Paxton to have only one food retail outlet, whereas other key centres (Potential Growth) have between 4 and 9. It also shows that L. Paxton has the lowest number of service and food and drink outlets. There is considerable doubt whether the criterion of having a Doctor's Surgery will now be met.

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

#### **Council response**

No change required. Little Paxton has sufficient facilities to satisfy the tests set out in paragraph 4.6 of the background paper on Settlement Hierarchy (and this will be augmented by the redevelopment of the Samuel Jones site).

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Councillor Paula Longford

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Little Paxton should be downgraded to Key Centre (Limited Growth). The proposed designation does not meet the Potential Plan Objectives to 'conserve and enhance the special character and separate identities of Huntingdonshire's villages and market towns'. Little Paxton does not meet the criteria of good access by foot, cycle or public transport to St Neots because of the inadequacies of the river crossing. As there is little prospect of a remedial scheme being included in the Local Transport Plan, believe this remains a material consideration and major house building should be avoided in Little Paxton.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Peter Mitchell

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

### **Council response**

No change required. As the background paper on Settlement Hierarchy makes clear, development will be permitted only if suitable sites are available and all other planning requirements (including the availability of adequate infrastructure) can be satisfied. Hence the capacity of Mill Lane will be a key consideration guiding any decisions about further development. Little Paxton satisfies most of the criteria that merit its designation as a Key Centre (Potential Growth), so it is appropriate to use this designation. However, the importance of adequate infrastructure and maintaining the separate identity of settlements will be emphasised in the overall spatial vision and the plan objectives.

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

### **Council response**

Stilton will be disadvantaged if identified as a 'smaller settlement'. Would prefer to see the approach of Hunts Local Plan 1995 whereby as a Limited Rural Growth village, more growth could be allowed in Stilton, for example small groups of up to 8 dwellings.

No change required. Stilton does not satisfy the criteria for selection as a Key Centre, so allowing anything more than very limited development would conflict with strategic policies. The proposed approach allows infilling and larger groups, provided the latter comprise affordable homes to meet local needs. There is no evidence that allowing more growth would enable the retention/enhancement of village facilities.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

Organisation name: Councillor Steve Criswell  
Comments on the content of the policy approach

### Other approaches that might be considered

Policy P2A is sound in principle but needs some of the flexibility offered in option P2B. Some larger villages on the threshold of reaching a certain size and level of sustainability should not be abandoned solely on the grounds of their geographical position

### Council response

No change required. Greater flexibility is not merited, as this would be a less sustainable option (as demonstrated by the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report). The proposed hierarchy allows for modest development in Key Centres (Limited Growth), particularly where this supports local needs.

Organisation name: Councillor Steve Criswell  
Comments on the content of the policy approach

### Other approaches that might be considered

Somersham should be a Key Centre (potential growth) Pro-active forward looking council, desire for more facilities within the village as in danger of losing some if the village stagnates, potential for local employment opportunities (include small business premises in future plans)

### Council response

No change required. As the background paper on settlement hierarchy explains, Somersham is not in a location where strategic policies would support major development, and there is no evidence that additional housing would assist the retention of services(unless it were on a very large scale).

Organisation name: CPRE  
Comments on the content of the policy approach  
Agree with whole policy approach

### Other approaches that might be considered

### Council response

Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Fenstanton PC	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> It is Fenstanton PC's understanding that future development will be confined to windfall/ infill only and that no building will be approved outside the village limits. The Parish Council would be grateful if this could be confirmed, in writing, and also qualified where Village Limits currently exist with a detailed drawing. It is also the considered opinion of the Parish Council that the village infrastructure, ie High Street, Chequers St, the utilities and village amenities are currently at maximum capacity.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> No change required. As the background paper on Settlement Hierarchy makes clear, the proposed identification of Fenstanton as a Key Centre (Potential Growth) implies that schemes of 10 or more dwellings could be permitted in the village, but other considerations such as the availability of suitable sites and supporting infrastructure will also need to be considered.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Holme Parish Council	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Councillors wish Holme to remain a 'smaller settlement'	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> Noted

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

Organisation name: Holywell-cum-Needlingworth Parish Council

### Comments on the content of the policy approach

#### Other approaches that might be considered

The council feel that there should be another tier between key centres (limited growth) and smaller settlements. The smaller settlement size as proposed will cover a broad range of villages in size and nature. This makes the policy too generalised and inflexible, and may not meet the needs of particular communities. For smaller settlements it is a negative policy, and may lead to further gentrification of village, putting homes out of the price range of the locals, as well as leading to the possible loss of further services e.g. schools, thereby forcing more people into cars

#### Council response

No change required. There is no provision in strategic guidance for another tier of settlements, and nor would this assist the move to a more sustainable pattern of development (as the Initial Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates). There is no evidence that increased growth in smaller settlements will reduce house prices nor assist the retention of services, unless it were on a massive scale.

Organisation name: Holywell-cum-Needlingworth Parish Council

### Comments on the content of the policy approach

The comparison of facilities in villages does not appear to take into account sports and leisure facilities. Needlingworth for example has two playing fields with a good range of outdoor sports facilities. The survey refers to public hall and does not take into account that Needlingworth has another site with a separate sports pavilion.

#### Other approaches that might be considered

#### Council response

No change required. The comparison covers a wide range of facilities, but cannot be exhaustive. It includes the key facilities identified by the Structure Plan and draft RSS. Inclusion of leisure facilities would not effect the overall outcome.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

The Parish Council would welcome further discussions with Huntingdonshire District Council on where possible development could take place. Although the village does not have a range of shops or a GP, the village is close to St Ives. They are prepared to consider one larger development (100 houses) which could bring much needed affordable housing, sheltered housing, and other community benefits as well as sustain the primary school.

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

#### **Council response**

No change required. The Core Strategy is not concerned with specific allocations, but a scheme on this scale would not be appropriate given Needingworth's proposed position in the settlement hierarchy (the reasons for which are set out fully in the settlement hierarchy background paper).

**Organisation name:** Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

#### **Other approaches that might be considered**

Question the District Councils policy of restricting development to Market Towns and Key Centres (Potential Growth). There are many reasons why some development might be appropriate in villages, not least the question of sustainability of the village. It is appreciated that you cannot build your way to sustainability but there may equally be good reasons why some building should be permitted. The proposed policy precludes consideration of such an option.

#### **Council response**

No change required. The general approach to locating development proposed for the Core Strategy accords with national and strategic guidance, and is the most sustainable option (as the Initial Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates). However, it does not preclude all development in Key Centres (Limited Growth) and smaller settlements, particularly where it caters for local needs.



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Thought that a special case can be argued for villages such as Kimbolton, which is a local centre and attracts trade from a wide area. Much of that trade is not acknowledged by District and County Councils as it emanates from Beds or Northants, as Kimbolton is within 1 mile of Beds, and 3 miles of Northants. Similarly rural transport services do not favour villages close to county boundaries, since they are generally organised within each county. Kimbolton school - a major local employer - should also be taken into account.

**Council response**

No change required. The background paper on settlement hierarchy explains that Kimbolton merits designation as a Key Centre (and recognises the role of the school), but also makes clear that the village's location makes it unsuitable for significant growth. The Key Centre (Limited Growth) designation allows for modest development particularly where it would help to meet local needs.

**Organisation name:** Kimbolton and Stonely Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

While accepting the proposal to place Kimbolton in the Key Centre (Limited Growth) category, this being the most appropriate of the options offered, there is considerable argument for treating Kimbolton as a special case and establishing a category of settlement which reflects this.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No changes required. There is no provision in strategic guidance for another tier of settlements, and nor would this assist the move to a more sustainable pattern of development (as the Initial Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates).

**Organisation name:** Little Paxton Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Believe that the identification of Little Paxton as a Key Centre (Potential Growth) is flawed. Applying correct facts to the criteria used in the background document, eg range of shops and services, employment opportunities, good non-car access to town/city, would place Little Paxton in the category Key Centre (Limited Growth).

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Little Paxton should be reassigned to the category Key Centre (Limited Growth)

**Council response**

No change required. The background paper on settlement hierarchy explains clearly why Little Paxton justifies being identified as a Key Centre (Potential Growth), but also stresses that this does not imply a particular level of development; all other planning considerations will also need to be taken into account.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Peterborough City Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

As Yaxley lies in close proximity to Hampton, Peterborough City Council is concerned that development at Hampton could be delayed by greenfield housing development nearby. Development at Yaxley should be balanced so that jobs and housing are provided within the village to reduce the possibility of outcommuting, especially to Peterborough.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. Yaxley's identification as a Key Centre (Potential Growth) does not mean that significant further development is likely to take place, as this depends upon the availability of suitable sites. The need for additional employment land will be considered in the context of the Planning Proposals DPD.

**Organisation name:** Peterborough City Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Have no objection to St Neots, Huntingdon or St Ives being identified as Market Towns in line with Structure Plan policies, but concerned that Ramsey is included in the list. Although Ramsey will play a part in the settlement hierarchy, Structure Plan policies make it clear that it will be to a lesser extent than the others. The distinction should be made clear in the second bullet point in line with Structure Plan Policy P10/3.

**Council response**

Point accepted. The policy approach and spatial vision will indicate that development in Ramsey will be on a lesser scale, particularly in relation to Huntingdon and St. Neots

**Organisation name:** Somersham Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Acknowledge that larger scale development should be concentrated in areas served by major roads and offering greatest opportunities for employment, however changing Somersham to a Key Centre (Potential Growth) would allow for some carefully considered and planned development helping to retain services. Somersham lost any advantage of being a small settlement long ago.

**Council response**

No change required. As the background paper on settlement hierarchy explains, Somersham is not in a location where strategic policies would support major development, and there is no evidence that additional housing would assist the retention of services(unless it were on a very large scale).

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Somersham Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

To relax the restriction to 9 dwellings associated with Key Centre (Limited Growth). There may be sites suitable for 15 dwellings for example that are preferable to 2 sites of 9 each, and much needed affordable housing would also be easier to secure on slightly larger developments.

**Council response**

No change required. If, exceptionally, a particular site merits development for more than 9 dwellings in a Key Centre (Limited Growth), then this could be justified on the basis of other material considerations.

**Organisation name:** Somersham Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

There is evidence that local people would like to work locally and that more business start up premises would be welcome. As extension to the existing industrial site is identified in the current Local Plan and has yet to come forward. Would like to see to see this encouraged.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The policy approaches allow for business development in Key Centres (Limited Growth). Progress in implementing existing allocations will be reviewed in the context of the Planning Proposals DPD.

**Organisation name:** St Ives Town Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Welcome the use of sustainability criteria as defined in the core strategy but consider that the sophisticated characterisation of villages into key centres (potential growth), key centres (limited growth) and smaller settlements could in some measure be applied also to market towns, in order to more clearly define development aspirations for each of the said towns in Huntingdonshire.

**Council response**

Point accepted. The policy approach and overall spatial vision will indicate that Huntingdon and St Neots are expected to accommodate more development than the other market towns.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Stukeley Meadows DC

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

The settlement hierarchy paper identifies Huntingdon as a sustainable location for housing and employment growth. However Huntingdon has already expanded greatly, and this has not respected or enhanced its character as a small country market town. This character should be considered as an integral part of sustainability. Similarly, growth so far has had a degrading impact on the countryside around the town which forms its setting. Traffic congestion of traffic entering and leaving the town at peak hours results in high levels of pollution and emissions, contrary to sustainability objectives.

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

#### **Council response**

No change required. All these issues will be taken into account in any decisions about specific development proposals. Other parts of the Core Strategy highlight the importance of these considerations.

**Organisation name:** Stukeley Meadows DC

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

The gap between the Stukeleys and Huntingdon has been continuously eroded over recent years. The Stukeleys PC strongly objects to any suggestion that there should be further development on the edge of Huntingdon and fails to see where else on the periphery such development could take place and be acceptable. If further development of Huntingdon is required, it should be limited to the redevelopment of previously developed land of which there is a significant amount in the town.

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

#### **Council response**

No change required. Strategic guidance points clearly to Huntingdon as a potential location for further development, but this does not mean that sites on the edge of the town that could harm its setting or erode the gap with the Stukeleys will be acceptable. The Core Strategy will make clear that urban sites have priority and that avoiding coalescence and landscape harm are key concerns.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Stukeley Meadows PC

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

The Council would also support any proposal to locate growth in smaller settlements, particularly Ramsey, in order to make them more sustainable.

**Council response**

No change required. Ramsey is identified as a Market Town where some growth may occur, but the Core Strategy will make clear that this should be on a lesser scale than at Huntingdon and St Neots (in line with strategic guidance).

**Organisation name:** Warboys Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Parish Council support the proposed Settlement Hierarchy and the identification of Warboys as a Key Centre (Limited Growth).

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

**Organisation name:** Yaxley Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Concerned that Yaxley has been identified as a 'Key Centre' for further potential growth, and would appreciate these concerns being taken into account with other observations.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. As the background paper on settlement hierarchy explains, the designation as Key Centre (Potential Growth) does not imply that major development will necessarily take place, as all other planning considerations (such as availability of sufficient community facilities and physical infrastructure) will also need to be taken into account.

---

**Policy approach P3**

**Policy approach name:** Development in the Countryside

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Councillor Jonathan Gray

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

While agreeing with the suggestion to abandon environmental limits of smaller settlements, the policies regarding the 'built-up framework' will need to tightly control the potential for 'creeping' development. Over longer distances or views, one 'marginal' decision could possibly have significant consequences elsewhere in the village.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The supporting text will be phrased to ensure that an appropriate degree of control is put in place.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Steve Criswell

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Needs to acknowledge that in certain villages, carefully considered and sympathetic development on the edge of a settlement with off road parking is preferable to the often favoured development in the centre of villages where resident parking is limited and visitor parking is non-existent.

**Council response**

No change required. Allowing development on the edge of smaller villages as a general principle (and other than rural 'exception' schemes) would conflict with national and strategic guidance, fail to make best use of land and be a relatively unsustainable approach.

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Agree with the decision not to define boundaries for the reasons given. Support the use of criteria based policies. Suggest that the use of planning tools such as Parish Plans and Village Design Statements would be helpful in determining where and what sort of development would be appropriate in individual settlements.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p> <p>In order to define the existing built-up framework there should be maps (inset) produced clearly showing limits to development in smaller settlements, and these should be named.</p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. As the text supporting the policy approach explains, this alternative was examined but has been assessed as offering a less effective approach to controlling development at the edge of small villages.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Would add a final point - 'in the above areas only permit development that does not conflict with other policy areas.'</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. Such a phrase is unnecessary - the introduction to the Core Strategy will make clear that all policies need to be read together.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>After the first - ending 'national defence' would add 'and meets sustainability criteria, is minimal in scale and not in the open countryside'.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. These concerns are covered by the existing range of policy approaches.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Holywell-cum-Needlingworth Parish Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The council agree with the proposal to not draw settlement boundaries around all villages. The use of policies to restrict development to within the 'built up framework' is a stronger approach.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Noted.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

---

### Policy approach P4 Policy approach name: Mixed development

Organisation name: CPRE

Comments on the content of the policy approach

In second bullet after 'community facilities' would add 'local services and necessary infrastructure, including open spaces'.

Other approaches that might be considered

Council response

No change required. This point is more concerned with providing an appropriate range of facilities, which is covered by P7.

---

### Policy approach P5 Policy approach name: Amenity

Organisation name: Councillor Jonathan Gray

Comments on the content of the policy approach

Specific mention of light pollution would be welcome. Modern street lighting can vastly improve this problem. Domestic security lighting is often wholly unnecessary on the scale employed, and industrial security lighting often given little consideration

Other approaches that might be considered

Council response

Point accepted.

Organisation name: CPRE

Comments on the content of the policy approach

Would add another bullet 'Light pollution'.

Other approaches that might be considered

Council response

Point accepted.

---

### Policy approach P6 Policy approach name: Flood Risk



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Welcome the requirement that development should be informed by a flood risk assessment.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Approach and direction for this policy supported, however would like to see the sequential approach as outlined in PP G25 demonstrated, eg the reasons for discounted sites is required.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The proposed approach complies fully with guidance on appropriate plan policies in PPG 25. There is no need for further replication of the advice in that document.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Support the policy, but needs strengthening. Would add extra bullet - 'No development to be permitted within known flood retention areas' (supported by EA maps)	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This point would be covered through the application of the existing criteria.
<hr/>		
<b>Policy approach P7</b>	<b>Policy approach name:</b> Infrastructure requirements	
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Add waste recycling facilities, youth provision, sports facilities, social services and health care to the list of potential contributions.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted (although sports facilities are already covered).

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The reference to 'footpaths, cycleways, highways and public transport' should be amended to read 'public rights of way and other linear access, cycleways, highways and public transport'.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Point accepted in part. It is acknowledged that the policy approach should make reference to 'transport infrastructure' generally, and this makes the cumbersome phrase 'other linear access' unnecessary.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>It should be made clear that developments will need to contribute an appropriate share of the cost of the major offsite transport and countryside access provision that will form part of the infrastructure needed to support residential and other growth.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required; this is implicit in the policy approach (and will be explained more fully in a strategic planning contributions document).</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire Horizons</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>For the sake of clarity, Leisure, Cultural and Arts activities should be added to the list of matters which may require contributions.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Point accepted.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>In third bullet point would add another point: - to provide a net gain in native biodiversity and green infrastructure</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. As a general principle this goes beyond what may reasonably be sought.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would amend other community facilities to add extra area in the brackets after places of worship, ... appropriate youth facilities (skate parks, shelters)	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted in part (include reference to youth facilities).
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The policy approach refers to contributions made by developers to meet the running costs of services and facilities, when such costs cannot be met from the public purse in the short term. This is a very welcome principle underpinning the policy. It is particularly important in terms of primary health care where the new funding formula does not make allowance for growth, and health providers must identify other sources of funding.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Sport England</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>One issue which is not covered in the policy options we have been consulted upon that should be addressed in the core strategy/policies is providing sport/recreation facilities through new development, as advised in PPG17. To assist local authorities to successfully secure such provision, Sport England has published a good practice guide which provides guidance on how new facilities, or contributions towards providing new facilities, can be secured from developments through the planning process, which includes appropriate planning policies and supplementary planning guidance.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The potential need for contributions covering recreation facilities is noted in P7.</p>
---	---	---

---

### Policy approach G1      Policy approach name: Open space and recreational Land

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Recommend that areas of open space located within and outside built-up areas are identified and mapped in order that informed decisions can be made.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. It would be difficult to map these in a comprehensive manner across the district and there is a risk that areas would be missed, and therefore put under pressure for development. The use of a criteria based policy avoids this risk.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>In last bullet would add to the end...and is located within walking distance of the original site</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. This is covered adequately by the requirement for any replacement facility to provide a net benefit to the community in terms of accessibility.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p>	<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p>In the first bullet would add another point: - provide a corridor for wildlife which are of native biodiversity value to the community.</p>		<p>Point accepted. Include reference to spaces that form part of green corridors.</p>	
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Sport England</p>	<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Recommend an audit of open space in accordance with PPG17 is carried out to justify the approach taken to protection of open space/recreation. The assessment should include sports facilities such as sports halls, synthetic turf pitches and swimming pools. Policy approach should reflect that the criteria applied to assessing proposals that affect open space in broad terms is not always appropriate for considering proposals that specifically affect playing fields. In PPG17 specific criteria are advised for developments affecting playing fields (para15). Policy approach in the Core Strategy should be sufficiently flexible in this regard, eg. current policy approach would not appear to permit in/outdoor sports facilities or ancillary facilities on open space.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The Council is currently undertaking an assessment of open space in accordance with PPG17, and this will be reflected in the standards for open space to be contained in the Planning Contributions DPD. The general criteria to be applied to playing fields are adequately covered by this policy approach, and would not preclude the development of suitable ancillary facilities.</p>

---

**Policy approach G2      Policy approach name: Landscape Character**

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Councillor Jonathan Gray

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Would prefer for the designation of Area of Best Landscape to remain, used in addition to a criteria-based approach. This will draw attention to the fact that whilst all landscapes are valuable, some are of particular merit and would add weight and rigour to the application and type of conditions placed upon relevant development.

**Council response**

No change required. Government policy is that these designations should only be retained when criteria-based policies would not provide sufficient protection. The criteria-based approach requires all proposals to be carefully assessed for potential landscape impact and therefore protects the character of all landscapes within the district.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Jonathan Gray

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Specific mention of light pollution would be welcome. Modern street lighting can vastly improve this problem. Domestic security lighting is often wholly unnecessary on the scale employed, and industrial security lighting often given little consideration.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The issue of light pollution is addressed elsewhere in the Core Strategy (P1, B2).

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

The policy should require development to contribute, as appropriate, to the regeneration, restoration, enhancement, maintenance or active conservation of the landscape likely to be affected.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. This is adequately covered by the existing criteria, and by Policy Areas P1 and G6.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Countryside Agency</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Welcome the decision not to retain the existing "Area of Best Landscape" designation, agreeing with the reasoning set out, and strongly support the proposed criteria-based approach underpinning by landscape character assessment. It should be made clear what is meant by "respect and respond appropriately" in the first bullet point.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The meaning of 'respect and respond appropriately' is demonstrated through the criteria in the second bullet point.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>In the last bullet point 'Require appropriate mitigation...' - there needs to be a rigorous definition of this to ensure that the mitigation is in sympathy with the existing green infrastructure and enhances native biodiversity, and creates a proper boundary and enhancement to other landscape character.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The most appropriate form of mitigation is best determined in the content of specific development proposals, but also taking into account other guidance including the Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>In bullet 2 would add to second point after 'characteristic of the area...protecting and enhancing existing native biodiversity and wildlife habitats'.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. Protecting and enhancing existing native biodiversity and wildlife habitats is covered by the existing text.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** English Nature  
**Comments on the content of the policy approach** Other approaches that might be considered  
Agree with approach  
**Council response**  
Noted.

---

### **Policy approach G3**    **Policy approach name:** Trees, hedgerows & other environmental features

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency  
**Comments on the content of the policy approach** Other approaches that might be considered  
For larger allocated sites, we suggest that the District Council would find it extremely helpful to prepare a Concept Statement. This is a simple clear expression of the kind of place that new development should create. It is a brief explanation of how development on that site should contribute to the local authorities vision. Concept Statements explain how the policies and objectives of the Local Plan should apply to each specific site, in order to deliver the best possible economic, social and environmental benefits. We have published Concept Statements and Local Development Documents - Practical guidance for local planning (CA149)  
**Council response**  
No change required. This is addressed by the provision for design statements (Policy Area B1) and by the Huntingdonshire Design Guide.

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency  
**Comments on the content of the policy approach** Other approaches that might be considered  
Developers should be encouraged to use techniques such as Quality of Life Assessment in appraising potential development sites to identify key features of value.  
**Council response**  
No change required. Guidance on site appraisals is contained in the Huntingdonshire Design Guide.



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>          In third bullet point would add after 'hedgerows....ponds, trees, meadows and orchards.'</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b>          No change required. The examples given are indicative, not exhaustive, and should also be considered alongside the protection offered by Policy Area G3.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> English Nature</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>          Agree with approach</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b>          Noted.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Wildlife Trust</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>          Support policy approach, but would like the policy to refer explicitly to the diversity value of the features described, and refer specifically to drainage ditches and road verges within "other features", as there are significant areas of each within Hunts which contribute towards networks and corridors important for biodiversity.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b>          Point accepted in part. Include reference to ditches and verges in supporting text, but referring to the wider 'diversity value' of features is unnecessary given the existing emphasis within the policy approach.</p>

---

**Policy approach G4**      **Policy approach name:** Protected habitats and species

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

Comments on the content of the policy approach

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Policies in the Greenspace section under-estimate the value of biodiversity in the wider environment as emphasis is given to designated sites and protected species. Would recommend an explicit biodiversity policy and links to be made with other policies within this section.

**Council response**

No change required. The wider value of biodiversity is addressed in Policy Area P1; adding an additional policy would involve unnecessary repetition.

Organisation name: CPRE

Comments on the content of the policy approach

Second bullet point would add after 'or important species, ... or sites of importance for local native biodiversity... should not proceed.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. This policy relates specifically to protected habitats and species. Wider biodiversity is addressed in Policy Area P1.

Organisation name: CPRE

Comments on the content of the policy approach

At second bullet point would delete... 'unless the need for... interests' sentence end. There should never be justification for the loss of such sites. The presumption should always be against any development.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. It is necessary to have this caveat as there may be cases where the loss of such sites is necessary, for example in the achievement of wider Sustainable Development objectives. The policy approach reflects national and strategic guidance.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> In third bullet point 'off the site'...add 'of local native biodiversity value'. Wherever possible harm should be avoided and wildlife corridors and green infrastructure remain on the site to ensure existing native biodiversity can be preserved also on site. This should be backed by a detailed EIA.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The existing policy adequately addresses these points. EIA is justified only in the case of some developments, not as a general principle.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add to first bullet point after 'sites of ...local, national....etc	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. Local sites are dealt with in the second bullet point.
<b>Organisation name:</b> English Nature		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> It is important to emphasise the need for cross-compliance with other policies in the plan, for example, to ensure that protected species are not harmed by implementation of policies to re-use or alter buildings in the countryside (which may contain bats which are European Protected Species and Barn Owls).	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The plan should be used as a whole so all policies should be considered together, where relevant. The introduction to the submission document will make this clear.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> English Nature		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The Council may wish to note paragraph 6 of draft PPS9 which indicates that a policy relating to the protection of internationally designated sites is no longer considered to be necessary as the sites are protected by legal procedures and international obligations.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. Sites of international importance are included for completeness, and to indicate the relative levels of protection that apply to different types of site.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Wildlife Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b> Fully support policy approach, however an additional policy related to protection and enhancement of wider biodiversity features would also be appropriate, though this could potentially form part of G3.	<b>Council response</b> No change required. Wider biodiversity is addressed by policy approach P1.

---

## Policy approach G5 Policy approach name: Historic Parks and Gardens

<b>Organisation name:</b> National Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Support the objective of protecting historic parks and gardens. Seek to work with Local Authorities to widen such policies to emphasise the setting of historic parks and gardens controlled by NT, for example defining buffer zones for NT's major parkland, either for inclusion in LDDs or as tools in the planning consultation process. Although there are no major NT parklands in HDC area, the Authority should consider the value of giving greater protection to the setting of historic parks and gardens.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The importance of respecting the setting of historic parks and gardens is addressed by the existing policy approach.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

---

### Policy approach G6      Policy approach name: Areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Welcome the proposed policy approach, however there is a difference in terminology between the proposed policy approach (Areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement) and Policy P7/3 of the adopted Structure Plan (Countyside Enhancement Areas).

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The proposed terminology reflects more accurately the strategic intent of the policy approach.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Jonathan Gray

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Would like to commend the western areas of the District as being areas where woodland development could also be considered. Some large tracts exist to the west of Grafham Water up to the Beds/Northants border. Opportunities to attract visitors across shire boundaries would exist.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The areas of woodland to be west of Grafham Water are included in one of the Areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement. It does not stretch as far as the Beds/Northants border at the moment, but includes the areas with greatest potential for consolidating the existing woodland cover.

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Welcome the emphasis on improving the recreational value of the countryside. Wherever possible, the defined Areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement should be made accessible from nearby urban areas by safe, non-car modes, preferably along defined green corridors.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> In second bullet point, would add 'native' before 'planting'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This additional text is unnecessary.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> In second bullet point would add 'native' before 'biodiversity'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This additional text is unnecessary.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Would add another bullet - 'A list of native biodiversity will be produced and an action plan to maximise native biodiversity implemented, and also to examine historical native biodiversity records to ensure endangered native biodiversity can be given maximum protection and extinct biodiversity reintroduced where possible.'	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The policy approach deals with general principles rather than detailed implementation arrangements.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Holme Parish Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Concern that plans to flood large areas of land in relation to the Great Fen Project will result in surrounding villages being plagued by mosquitos in a way similar to that which occurred 20 years ago.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The Great Fen Project does not involve flooding large areas of land. Wetland creation takes place on land as well as water, and although there are some areas of open water, these are limited and would not have a significant impact on the number of mosquitos in the area.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Wildlife Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Fully support this policy approach.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.

---

### Policy approach B1      Policy approach name: Design Quality

<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Second bullet, second from last point add 'native' before 'biodiversity'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The existing wording is simpler and gives sufficient indication of the intended policy approach.

---

### Policy approach B2      Policy approach name: Street scene

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Councillor Jonathan Gray		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Specific mention of light pollution would be welcome. Modern street lighting can vastly improve this problem. Domestic security lighting is often wholly unnecessary on the scale employed, and industrial security lighting often given little consideration.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted in part. References to light pollution will be incorporated into Policy Approach P5.
<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> In second bullet fifth point on lighting, add whilst minimising light spill, and ensuring light is directed downwards and remove the word 'widespread'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted in part. Reference to light pollution will be incorporated into Policy Approach P5. The word 'widespread' needs to be retained to make clear the concern of the policy approach.

---

### Policy approach B3      Policy approach name: Accessibility and security

<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Suggest that the location and design of development proposals should also take into account that 'public rights of way and cycleways should be open and free from bends which limit visibility; and that countryside access provision should be accessible to people with disabilities where possible'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This can be addressed through the supporting text to T3 in due course.

---

### Policy approach B4      Policy approach name: Energy use



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

Comments on the content of the policy approach

**Other approaches that might be considered**

The approach should be for major development to maximise energy efficiency and provide onsite renewables, not one or the other. This is the approach proposed by both South Cambs and Cambridge City, which aids contribution to county and regional renewable energy targets. The phrase 'wherever possible' is considered weak and undermines the policy aims. It offers too great an opportunity for avoiding maximising levels of energy efficiency or providing energy from renewable sources. The 'other' approach would sit better with other Local Development Frameworks and RSS14.

**Council response**

No change required. In principle the policy approach requires both energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy technologies; achieving greater energy efficiency than the Building Regs require is offered as an alternative to the use of renewables only because this may achieve the ultimate objective (reduced reliance on non-renewable energy sources) by alternative means. The words 'wherever possible' provide a hook for requiring developers to show why they cannot achieve these targets. The 'alternative' approach would apply to fewer developments, and so be less effective in achieving regional targets.

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

Comments on the content of the policy approach

It would appear that the definition of major development varies between districts (Huntingdonshire is different to South Cambridgeshire which is different to the City). It would be beneficial if all districts would combine to seek a common approach, otherwise there will be inconsistency across the County with implementation thresholds.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The definitions employed are tailored to local circumstances, and consistent with the objective of maximising energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b>
We should be aiming for zero emission properties - other districts have set this target. This policy is therefore very welcome. Targets in bullet point two could be much higher or should have a clause that states that targets may be increased in further development documents.		No change required. The targets are appropriate to the nature of development in Huntingdonshire. As this is a new requirement it would not be appropriate to set a higher target until the implication of this in practice can be assessed. In future policies it may be feasible for this target to be increased.

---

### Policy approach B5 Policy approach name: Listed Buildings

<b>Organisation name:</b> National Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b>
Would like to see policy approach strengthened by stipulating that a thorough recording of a building will be required should consent be given for demolition or major alteration.		No action required. This is covered by paragraph 3.22 of PPG15. If necessary it will be addressed in supporting text.

---

### Policy approach B6 Policy approach name: Conservation Areas

<b>Organisation name:</b> National Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b>
More emphasis should be given to protecting the landscape setting of Conservation Areas particularly where the designated areas are surrounded by rural countryside. Protection of the setting will also reinforce the need to protect views into and out of the designated areas.		No action required. It is considered that protection of setting is covered by wording 'within or affecting'.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

---

**Policy approach B7**      **Policy approach name:** Sites of archaeological interest

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Change wording of third bullet point to 'Make satisfactory arrangements for the physical preservation...'. Would change last sentence to 'There is a presumption that nationally important remains will be preserved in situ, but this may also be justified where landscapes, monuments or artefacts of local or regional significance are revealed'.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**  
Point accepted.

---

**Policy approach H1**      **Policy approach name:** Location of housing development

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Choices of priority for development include many towns and parishes where there are problems already, often involving youth. It should be a pre-requisite that these chosen areas are addressed now so that increased development does not exacerbate the problem. Design principles should also include a strong focus on facilities for all under-19s with early completion to prevent a new area being a problem before it is finished.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**  
No change required. Development proposals are required to provide facilities on an appropriate scale to the scheme. It is unreasonable to expect them to rectify existing deficiencies. By focussing new development in towns and Key Centres, residents have the greatest opportunities of being able to access recreational and community facilities.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Councillor Jonathan Gray</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Whereas the definition of minor schemes is clear, what is not clear is whether two or more minor housing schemes can be contiguous, assuming that it is possible for more than one minor scheme to be undertaken within a Key Centre (Limited Growth). If so, there is the potential to develop housing on a scale broader than sustainability policy may suggest, although I accept that there may not be many windfall sites within environmental limits that would sustain the above scenario.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. Proposals for minor schemes would be assessed in their wider context, including whether the site forms a discrete parcel of land or is part of a larger site which might be inappropriate for development.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> CPRE</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Would add a bullet - 'Within towns preference should be for brownfield redevelopment subject to biodiversity study'.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. This point is covered adequately by national and strategic guidance.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Kimbolton &amp; Stonely Parish Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Concern that the scale of housing development only has two types in addition to infilling, upto 9 and 10+. The fact that the 10+ category is open ended gives rise to concerns in many people that developments of several hundred houses could follow, if that route is chosen. Even after many attempts to alleviate concerns, the suspicion remains that, once placed in this bracket, the way is clear for massive development.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The scale of development permitted in policy is only one of many considerations assessed to determine the suitability of a scheme.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Warboys Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Parish Council support the policy approach in H1 and the designation of minor housing development schemes to up to nine dwellings.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

---

### Policy approach H2      Policy approach name: Affordable housing

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Given that 'affordable housing' is a term being used in all planning documents, could a common definition be used, as there is one definition in Structure Plan and another in the RSS. Suggest that the Structure Plan definition is used as disagree with the RSS approach.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The proposed definition is in line with recommendations in proposed changes to PPG3 that affordable housing be defined in terms of the relationship between income levels, rents and prices, not tenure as it is in the Structure Plan.

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

No mention is made of what percentage of housing supply should be affordable, or the thresholds that apply. RSS Policy CSR2 and Structure Plan Policy P9/1 say 40% or more in the Cambridge Sub Region. Suggest a percentage should be included in the policy approach.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The percentage targets for affordable housing will be set out in the Planning Contributions DPD.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

There is no mention of Key Worker housing and whether this is to be looked at as part of the affordable housing considerations. The plan should reflect any local assessments within Huntingdonshire on the need for Key Worker housing.

### **Other approaches that might be considered**

#### **Council response**

No change required. The proposed definition is in line with recommendations in proposed changes to PP/G3 that affordable housing be defined in terms of the relationship between income levels, rents and prices, not in terms of potential occupier.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Jonathan Gray

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

#### **Other approaches that might be considered**

In a village environment, one 'target group' are those who have lived in the village, perhaps as children, for a number of years, and need assistance to enter the housing market in their 'home' area. Were policies to deal with Huntingdonshire as a whole, rather than, say, Ward-specific, the potential benefits of diversity would be lost to more affluent communities that lack young adults and families.

#### **Council response**

No change required. The details of eligibility for affordable housing schemes are usually set out in the relevant planning agreements.

**Organisation name:** Councillor Jonathan Gray

### **Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Welcome the broader definition of what is classified as affordable housing. Representing a Ward where house prices are relatively high compared to the average within the District, the policy approach for 'intermediate' housing is particularly welcome.

#### **Other approaches that might be considered**

#### **Council response**

Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Councillor Paula Longford

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

There seems to be no reference to the actual number of affordable units to be secured within a development. Believe the amount should be specified, whether 29% as at present, or a larger proportion.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. The percentage target for affordable housing will be set out in the Planning Contributions DPD.

**Organisation name:** Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Argue for some relaxation in the rigid planning requirements proposed, that would allow for some development of affordable housing.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. Policy area H8 allows for affordable housing on rural exceptions sites.

---

### Policy approach H3 Policy approach name: Housing density

**Organisation name:** Great Gransden Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Lower building density than that initially proposed should be supported in the rural environment.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No change required. PPG3 requires a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare unless exceptional circumstances are demonstrated.

---

### Policy approach H4 Policy approach name: Mix of property sizes

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> In RSS Policy H2, the mix of housing should be determined by up to date local housing needs studies. Should this policy be more flexible to allow for changing local housing needs?	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The LDF will be regularly updated.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Councillor Paula Longford	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The policy does not seem to address the aspirations of older people requiring single-storey accommodation such as bungalows. Not all older people require 'sheltered' housing.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The policy addresses the overall size of units, not their physical form. It does not preclude bungalow development.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Great Gransden Parish Council	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b> Gransden is to get infilling only, but not enough emphasis on affordable local housing. Need to push for smaller housing units on such infill plots.
	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The Planning Contributions DPD will set out the scale of development where affordable housing will be sought in various locations.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Warboys Parish Council	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Parish Council support the proposal that any scheme with a minimum of three housing units should incorporate one small dwelling in the interests of promoting affordable housing.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> Noted.



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** Warboys Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**      **Other approaches that might be considered**      **Council response**

Parish Council support the proposal by the District Council to incorporate the recently approved Supplementary Planning Guidance on Housing Mix.      Noted.

---

**Policy approach H5**      **Policy approach name:** Alteration or replacement of existing dwellings in the countryside

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**      **Other approaches that might be considered**      **Council response**

No comments      Noted

**Organisation name:** Great Gransden Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**      **Other approaches that might be considered**      **Council response**

Support the ideas regarding the impact of alterations to dwellings.      Noted.

---

**Policy approach H7**      **Policy approach name:** Housing for agricultural and related workers

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Councillor Jonathan Gray</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The definition of 'immediate vicinity' is critical to the effective operation of this policy. Whilst some current research has been done as to what exactly this means, security issues, in addition to the day-to-day operation of the farm, should be considered as integral to what is 'necessary to operate the business'. A house up to 10km away is little use to a venture that may be vulnerable to theft or arson, and unable to viably insure itself due to claims history and/or lack of human presence.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. These issues are taken into account when assessing proposals for such dwellings.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Countryside Agency</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>No comments</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Noted</p>

---

## Policy approach H9      Policy approach name: Retirement and sheltered housing

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Councillor Paula Longford</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The policy does not seem to address the aspirations of older people requiring single-storey accommodation such as bungalows. Not all older people require 'sheltered' housing.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The policy approach deals with the location of retirement/sheltered housing, not its physical form. The Core Strategy does not preclude the development of single-storey accommodation for older people in appropriate locations.</p>
---	---	---

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The policy could be extremely beneficial to older people, helping them to secure appropriate housing that meets their physical, mental, social and economic needs.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The proposed approach would ensure that a range of health and social care services could be provided.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The meaning of 'comprise solely of housing for the elderly if a major scheme (10 units or more) is located within a key centre' requires clarification.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The policy approach refers specifically to the provision of retirement and sheltered housing within Key Centres (Limited Growth).
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> There should be suitable housing available for older people in all major schemes.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The Core Strategy cannot specify that a proportion of housing should cater for specific age groups, although the Planning Contributions DPD will contain affordable housing requirements (some of which may cater for the elderly).

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Need to ensure that any housing that is built can be adapted as a person gets older using assistive technologies etc.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The standards for such issues are set out and updated in Building Regulations legislation.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Kimbolton and Stonely Parish Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Many three- and four-bedroomed village houses are occupied by elderly persons who would happily relinquish their large houses in favour of smaller ones if they could stay in Kimbolton. Sheltered accommodation should also be provided locally.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No change required. The policy approach as drafted would allow for provision of sheltered accommodation in Key Centres (Limited Growth) such as Kimbolton.

---

### Policy approach H10 Policy approach name: Nursing and care homes

<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Current health and social care policy is to decrease residential care and replace with sheltered housing supported by social care. This could be discussed further with Primary Care Trust.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.

---

### Policy approach H11 Policy approach name: Accommodation for gypsies & travelling showpeople

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The criteria included should reflect the sentiment of the new draft circular in ensuring that they are fair and reasonable.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The policy approach reflects the guidance in the draft Circular.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Given the new draft circular on gypsies, these two categories may have to be in separate policies, particularly with the new definition of gypsies.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. While the draft Circular applies only to gypsies and travellers, there is no reason why the policy approach should not cover travelling showpeople as well (as they have similar needs).</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p> <p>It would be beneficial if each District in Cambridgeshire were to use the same or very similar criteria for traveller and gypsy sites when producing core policies, to reduce potential conflicts between boundaries.</p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The policy in each district needs to reflect local circumstances and considerations. The proposed approach reflects national guidance on this issue.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Councillor Jonathan Gray</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>It is difficult to countenance any landowner adjoining a proposed site (or residents nearby) not arguing that they do not suffer an adverse effect of amenity or operations, given the reputation that certain sections of the travelling community have acquired.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>No change required. The policy approach refers to a 'significant adverse effect', which will need to be judged on the impact which may actually occur.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

---

**Policy approach E2**      **Policy approach name:**    **Location of industrial & warehouse development**

**Organisation name:**    Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Airfield should be included in an employment policy. It is identified in Structure Plan P2/3 as having an opportunity for strategic employment development either for existing distribution and transport related proposals or other appropriate uses. The RSS also has Alconbury under Policy CSR1 as an employment generator.

**Council response**

No action required. The Core Strategy is not a site specific document. The importance of Alconbury is emphasised in the Spatial Vision.

---

**Policy approach E4**      **Policy approach name:**    **Location of tourist facilities**

**Organisation name:**    Countryside Agency

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

We agree that most tourist-related development should be directed to the Market Towns and key centres, and agree that the lower, preferred size threshold is the appropriate one for the reasons advanced. We agree that the policy approach to touring caravan and camp sites is a realistic one, and welcome the requirement that visual impact should be minimised.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> East of England Tourist Board</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Wonder whether the threshold set of 0.5 hectares is at the right level to discriminate between major and minor. Would suggest 1 ha might be more appropriate in these circumstances.</p>		<p>No change required. The suggested threshold is appropriate given the predominately rural nature of the district and the type of development likely to be affected.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> East of England Tourist Board</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> It might be worth considering / referring to EEDA's new Regional Tourism Strategy under the section 'Alternative approaches'.</p>		<p>No change required. This document has been taken into account in drafting the policy approaches, but does not justify a specific reference.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> East of England Tourist Board</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Query whether the needs of the Business Tourism market has been considered in the drafting of this policy.</p>		<p>No change required. All forms of tourism are covered by the suggested policy approach.</p>
<hr/>		
<p><b>Policy approach</b> E5</p>	<p><b>Policy approach name:</b> Re-use &amp; redevelopment of rural buildings</p>	
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Countryside Agency</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> No Comments</p>		<p>Noted.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

---

### Policy approach E6    Countryside Agency    Policy approach name: Farm Diversification

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Strongly support the argument set out under "Alternative approaches" to the effect that some scope should be allowed for farm diversification-related development on previously undeveloped land, so as not to limit unduly the ability of farm businesses to diversify.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

**Organisation name:** Countryside Agency

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Endorse the presumption that existing buildings should be re-used where possible and support the size limit placed on new farm diversification related development

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

---

### Policy approach E8    Policy approach name: Location of Retail and Leisure Development



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

Organisation name: Sport England

Comments on the content of the policy approach

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Policy approach would accord with government advice. However would be concerned if all sports facilities are included within 'leisure development'. Many sports facilities will be located on school/college sites which are rarely located in town centres or will be located in out of centre locations because they will be provided in conjunction with outdoor sports facilities. Due to benefits of dual use sports facilities and concentrating in/outdoor sports facilities together it is not always appropriate to guide such facilities towards town centres or to apply sequential approach. Would request policy approach is sufficiently flexible to permit sports facilities in locations other than town centre.

**Council response**

Point accepted. Amend wording to indicate that both the scale and nature of major retail and leisure developments should be consistent with the function and character of the town centre.

---

### Policy approach E9 Policy approach name: Retention and enhancement of village facilities

Organisation name: Councillor Jonathan Gray

Comments on the content of the policy approach

I do not agree with the 'last shop in the village' approach. I believe it should be turned around and made 'the first shop in the village'. Anyone investing in or owning commercial premises is more than aware of potential failure. Allowing business premises to become residential properties is particularly unwelcome as the owner may make a 'windfall' profit at the expense of the community.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Point accepted in part. It would not be reasonable to insist on the retention of all facilities in villages where more than one outlet of a particular type exists. However, it is accepted that the overall viability of a Key Centre is a legitimate concern of the planning process, and the policy approach will be amended to reflect this.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

Organisation name: Councillor Jonathan Gray

Comments on the content of the policy approach

**Other approaches that might be considered**

I would like to see a more imaginative policy that attempts to engineer a solution to maintaining what we already have, and advancing services that make a welcome change to the usual faceless town-centres and retail parks.

**Council response**

Point accepted in part. There are limits to the extent to which planning policies can 'engineer' the maintenance of existing facilities, much of which depends upon other factors such as personal mobility and competition from other centres. However, the policy will be changed so that the overall vitality and viability of a Key Centre can be taken into account.

Organisation name: Countryside Agency

Comments on the content of the policy approach

Strongly support the proposed approach. The first bullet point should be strengthened to the effect that applicants should be required to demonstrate that all reasonable attempts have been made to find a new owner for the business or facility and that no reasonable offer has been refused. A marketing test should be included in the plan which seeks to prevent loss of the facility to the community. The test should be included within the relevant policy and could be along the following lines: 'Applications for conversion are supported by evidence that the property has been advertised locally at least four times at roughly equal periods in the last twelve months and no reasonable offer has been refused'

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

No action required. Full details of the evidence required will be included in the supporting text of the submission document.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

**Organisation name:** CPRE

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Would remove..of the last remaining..and replace with loss of..village facilities such as..All facilities should be saved if possible - not just protecting the last! The loss of a pub could cause a loss of character of an area for example even if there were two pubs in the village. By keeping to the original text it allows developers to change use of facilities as long as they are not the final one! This could lead to the loss of an important local resource, or historical use.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Point accepted in part. It would not be reasonable to insist upon the retention of all facilities in villages where more than one outlet of a particular type exists. However, it is accepted that the overall viability of a Key Centre is a legitimate concern of the planning process, and the policy approach will be amended to reflect this.

**Organisation name:** Great Gransden Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

Full support for the ideas on the retention or re-establishment of village facilities, such as village shops and post offices.

**Other approaches that might be considered**

**Council response**

Noted.

**Organisation name:** Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

The policy relating to the protection of the last remaining shop in a village is fundamentally wrong. In Kimbolton we are fortunate to have a range of shops and businesses, but many of these villages are complaining about loss of trade and the loss of any one of them would have considerable impact on the survival of the remainder. Waiting until we are reduced to the final shop before taking preventative action would be disastrous and we urge you to adopt the alternative approach outlined.

**Council response**

Point accepted in part. It would not be reasonable to insist on the retention of all facilities in villages where more than one outlet of a particular type exists. However, it is accepted that the overall viability of a Key Centre is a legitimate concern of the planning process, and the policy approach will be amended to reflect this.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

---

**Policy approach T1**      **Policy approach name: Highway access and capacity**

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Structure Plan Policy P9/8 indicates that local plans should include major infrastructure requirements and any implications for phasing.

**Council response**

No change required. Infrastructure requirements will be set out in the Planning Contributions DPD.

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

The proposed approach to transport policy is narrow and not totally consistent with the aim of transport policies in the Structure Plan. There needs to be a policy 'peg' for travel and demand management measures including provision of public transport, car clubs, soft measures, travel plans etc.

**Council response**

Point accepted in part. The overall importance of sustainable transport is highlighted by policy area P1, but text will be added to T1 indicating the requirement for transport assessments and travel plans in appropriate circumstances.

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on the content of the policy approach**

**Other approaches that might be considered**

Need a policy (maybe T1) to include A14 upgrade, Cambridgeshire Guided Busway and market town park-and-ride as set out in Structure Plan Policy 9/9.

**Council response**

No change required. These schemes will be set out in the Spatial Vision, so an additional policy is not necessary.

---

**Policy approach T3**      **Policy approach name: Public paths and cycle ways**

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> British Horse Society</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>The policy approach needs to be amended to include equestrians and the lack of coherent bridleway network. In particular, the 3rd last sentence should read 'new circular routes and connections between local and long distance bridleways, footpaths and cycle ways.' Please remember the 3 key routes which form National Bridleway Network 1) Community Circuits 2) Regional Routes 3) National Routes</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Point accepted. Amend text to refer more clearly to Rights of Way (which include bridleways) and include specific references to bridleways at appropriate points.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>Recommend wording is changed from 'between local and long distance footpaths/cycleways' to 'between local and long distance footpaths, bridleways and cycleways'.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Point accepted. Amend text to refer more clearly to Rights of Way (which include bridleways) and include specific references to bridleways at appropriate points.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p> <p>It should be noted that where policies cover Public Rights of Way, these include footpaths, bridleways and byways and not just footpaths.</p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p> <p>Point accepted. Amend text to refer more clearly to Rights of Way and their constituent elements.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Suggest adding a further sub-bullet to read 'improved opportunities for healthy exercise'.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This is implicit in the existing text.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Countryside Agency	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Strongly support the ambition to exploit opportunities to extend and improve the rights of way network. Such opportunities will often arise through development proposals and we would wish to see the maximum use made of planning obligations to this end. We believe that improving links between town and country must be a priority.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Sustrans	
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Need to refer to the fact that development proposals should be designed to encourage cycling and walking. It is often not enough to provide facilities, they need to be good, convenient and offer advantages to cyclists/ pedestrians.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>
	<b>Council response</b> No change required. This is implicit in the existing range of criteria, and in Policy Area P1.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Sustrans		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> "new circular routes and connections between local and long-distance footpaths/ cycle ways" wording should be changed to 'cycle routes' because this includes on-road and off-road facilities	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted. Amend text to read 'cycle routes'.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Sustrans		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b> Developers should be asked to contribute to marketing costs to encourage cycling and walking.	<b>Council response</b> No change required. Contributions towards transport infrastructure are covered generally by Policy Area P7, and will be addressed more fully in the Planning Contributions DPD.

---

### Policy approach T4 Policy approach name: Telecommunications

<b>Organisation name:</b> Mobile Operators Association		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Agree with the policy approach, sources and reasons. Suggested wording for a policy on siting and appearance provided.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Mobile Operators Association		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The issue of interference is dealt with under a separate regulatory regime and hence it should not be for the planning process to replicate this within the LDF. In the interest of brevity, would suggest that this aspect of telecommunications development be omitted from any Local Development Document.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted.

---

### Policy approach T5 Policy approach name: Renewable Energy

<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Policy approach supported. Strong policy wording will be required.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.

<b>Organisation name:</b> Councillor Jonathan Gray		
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> Given that this is a subsidy-driven industry and one that is given undue prominence within what has to be a long-term approach to creating a sustainable energy policy for this country, I welcome the statement regarding compensation and mitigation. In my view these despoil the landscape, and consequently utilising financial compensation to enhance habitats should form part of any proposed scheme.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted.

---

### Policy approach None Policy approach name: General comments



## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<b>Organisation name:</b> Alwalton Parish Council			
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> No comments	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> Noted	
<b>Organisation name:</b> Bury Parish Council			
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b> No comments	<b>Council response</b> Noted.	
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridge Water Company			
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b>	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b> No comments	<b>Council response</b> Noted.	
<b>Organisation name:</b> EEDA			
<b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b> The authority should consider the extent to which the core strategy options and the plan objectives reflect and complement the strategic objectives of the Regional Economic Strategy. It should also reflect the content of PPS1.	<b>Other approaches that might be considered</b>	<b>Council response</b> No action required. These documents have been taken into account in drafting the policy approaches.	

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Great Gransden Parish Council</p>	<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
	<p>There seems to be nothing new or radical.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Great Gransden Parish Council</p>	<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
	<p>The format of the documents is such that it is hard to understand what are the planning and other policies with so many choices and options. Surely a clearer document could have been produced.</p>		<p>No action required. The consultation material has been drafted so as to indicate clearly the policy options available and how they have been identified. The Preferred Options consultation will, however, be accompanied by summary material.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Highways Agency</p>	<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
	<p>No comments</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust</p>	<p><b>Comments on the content of the policy approach</b></p>	<p><b>Other approaches that might be considered</b></p>	<p><b>Council response</b></p>
	<p>Ideally there would be a policy component relating specifically and clearly to sustaining health. However overall the policies and their identified impacts support developments that would directly and indirectly enhance health and well-being. The reference to improving public health is welcomed.</p>		<p>No action required. Health concerns are integrated within appropriate policy approaches, and are also a key feature of the sustainability appraisal framework. This ensures that health concerns both shape the policies and will be taken into account during implementation.</p>

## Responses received on Policy Scoping Sheets

Organisation name: Peterborough City Council

Comments on the content of the policy approach

### Other approaches that might be considered

There would appear to be no transport policies in the Core Strategy. Paragraph 2.20 of PPS12 (Local Development Framework) suggests that the Core Strategy should draw on any strategies of the Local Authority and other organisations which have implications for development and use of land. The Local Transport Plan is given as one such example. Guidance should be provided in the core policies for the sustainable use and provision of transport infrastructure.

### Council response

No change required. Promoting sustainable transport is a key element of policy approach P1, and is also addressed by P7, T1, T2 and T3. It will, in addition, feature strongly in the spatial vision.



## Responses received on Plan Objectives

---

### Objective no: 1

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

Biodiversity should be included.

**Council response**

No action required. This is addressed by the existing objective.

**Organisation name:** CPRE

**Comments on individual objectives**

Modify end of sentence 'habitats, species and biodiversity'.

**Council response**

No action required. This is addressed by the existing objective.

**Organisation name:** English Nature

**Comments on individual objectives**

English Nature welcomes and supports the Plan Objectives. Very pleased to see the first objective is to maintain and enhance Huntingdonshire's characteristic landscapes, habitats and species.

**Council response**

Noted.

### Objective no: 2

**Organisation name:** CPRE

**Comments on individual objectives**

Modify end of sentence 'and landscape character'.

**Council response**

No action required. This is covered by objective 1.

## Responses received on Plan Objectives

**Organisation name:** Glatton Parish Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

We consider it very important to conserve and enhance the special character and identities of small villages. Special note being given to the ancient characteristics such as Linear or Cluster etc. It is most important that we do not become an area of total uniformity. The current idea of 'knock one down and put in as many as you can' causes great concern.

**Council response**

Noted.

---

**Objective no:** 3

**Organisation name:** English Nature

**Comments on individual objectives**

Would urge the Council to add the words 'and biodiversity' to the end of Objective 3.

**Council response**

No action required. This is covered by objective 1.

**Organisation name:** Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust

**Comments on individual objectives**

There is an emphasis that any building is in keeping with the distinct character of Huntingdonshire and meets the requirements of the local population. There has been considerable research into the effects of the built environment on health, eg mental health. It would be useful if the objectives would consider the impact on health, as well as simply meeting needs, or consistent with the character of Huntingdonshire.

**Council response**

No action required. These concerns are addressed by other objectives in the list.

---

**Objective no:** 4

**Organisation name:** Cambridgeshire County Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

Amend 'limit the consumption of' to 'minimise the consumption of'.

**Council response**

Point accepted.

## Responses received on Plan Objectives

**Organisation name:** CPRE

**Comments on individual objectives**

Modify end of sentence 'and maximise energy efficiency and recycling'.

**Council response**

No action required. This is covered by the existing objective.

**Organisation name:** Wildlife Trust

**Comments on individual objectives**

Support the intention behind the objective, but suggest it should be rephrased to give an indication of what limits to consumption of natural resources developments should aim for, such as "limit consumption of natural resources to levels supportable by natural processes". Or objective could be to "minimise the consumption of natural resources".

**Council response**

Point accepted.

---

**Objective no:** 6

**Organisation name:** English Nature

**Comments on individual objectives**

The objectives seeking to reduce the need to travel are an important contribution to addressing the effects of climate change.

**Council response**

Noted.

**Organisation name:** Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust

**Comments on individual objectives**

A recurrent theme that is expressed in this objective is the need to decrease the need to travel by strategically locating houses, and maintaining and enhancing the availability of key services and facilities in villages. This might run the risk of raising expectations.

**Council response**

No change required. It is important to identify desirable objectives so that policies can be geared to achieving them, so far as possible. However, the spatial vision will indicate that enhanced access to services is most likely to be achievable in the 'key centres' as opposed to the smaller settlements.

---

**Objective no:** 9

## Responses received on Plan Objectives

**Organisation name:** Brampton Parish Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

There are many people with homes in North of England but no work. Why entice them south and then have to build houses for them. Why not send work north where there are plenty of workers and port facilities to export.

**Council response**

No action required. This is a question of regional policy, rather than something that the Council's Core Strategy can address.

---

**Objective no:** 10

**Organisation name:** Brampton Parish Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

It is paramount that towns and in particular villages should have sustainable local employment in an effort to stop them becoming just dormitory collections of dwellings

**Council response**

Noted.

---

**Objective no:** 11

**Organisation name:** Glatton Parish Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

Maintaining key services and facilities in villages is of great importance and involves not just facilities but support services as well.

**Council response**

Noted.

---

**Objective no:** 13



## Responses received on Plan Objectives

**Organisation name:** British Horse Society

**Comments on individual objectives**

Discriminates against equestrians. Please amend to read 'To increase opportunities for pursuing a healthy lifestyle by maintaining and enhancing recreation and sporting activities and encouraging walking, cycling and horse riding.' The National Bridle Route Network will provide routes for all - riders, cyclists, walkers, offering a value for money approach. Plan objectives fail to recognise the equestrian community, the severance on public bridleways and lack of equestrian facilities.

**Council response**

No action required. Recreation opportunities (of all sorts) are addressed by the objective, and walking and cycling are mentioned in the context of encouraging healthy forms of transport. Equestrian routes are covered by policy area T3.

**Organisation name:** English Nature

**Comments on individual objectives**

Particularly support objective 13, as we recognise the importance of recreation opportunities, including those that enhance the enjoyment of wildlife and geology adding to a healthy lifestyle.

**Council response**

Noted.

---

**Objective no:** 14

**Organisation name:** Wildlife Trust

**Comments on individual objectives**

Infrastructure must include the provision of green infrastructure as well as built infrastructure.

**Council response**

Noted.

---

**Objective no:** 999

**Organisation name:** Alwalton Parish Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

No comments

**Council response**

Noted.

## Responses received on Plan Objectives

**Organisation name:** Bury Parish Council

**Comments on individual objectives**

No comments

**Council response**

Noted.

**Organisation name:** Cambridge Water Company

**Comments on individual objectives**

No comments

**Council response**

Noted.

## Responses received on Plan Objectives - General Comments

---

<b>Organisation name:</b> Alwalton Parish Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> No comments	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Brampton Parish Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> Individual plan objectives seem reasonable but necessary infrastructure e.g. roads, jobs, schools and other local facilities need to be considered	<b>Council response</b> No action required. This is covered by objective 14.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Brampton Parish Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> Any more large scale developments in Brampton are not appropriate and the village has reached its capacity with the road layout as it stands	<b>Council response</b> No action required. The objectives do not refer to specific places, but do make clear that the availability of infrastructure will be a key concern. However, subject to this and to the availability of sites that are acceptable in all other planning terms, some growth could reasonably be considered at Brampton for reasons explained in the background paper on the settlement hierarchy.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Bury Parish Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> No comments	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridge Water Company	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> No Comments	<b>Council response</b> Noted.

## Responses received on Plan Objectives - General Comments

<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> One off opportunity to introduce measures to look at water sustainability. For example "each property must have facilities when built to use what I believe is called Grey Water". Infrastructure would also be required for this.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. Limiting the consumption of natural resources, including water, is covered by objective 4 and policy area P1. However, the Core Strategy cannot go beyond what may reasonably be required in the context of existing legislation and national and strategic guidance.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> An objective referring to the need for the consideration of Crime and Disorder Issues in all planning matters should be considered. A clear statement to this effect is necessary.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. This is covered by objective 5.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> Suggest the list of potential plan objectives needs to be extended to include: 'To reduce the need to travel and ensure that development only takes place where it can be accessed by public transport, cycle or on foot.'	<b>Council response</b> No action required. Limiting the need to travel and promoting walking and cycling are covered by the existing objectives. It would be unreasonable to require every development to be accessible by non-car modes in a rural area such as Huntingdonshire.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> Suggest the list of potential plan objectives be extended to include: 'To reduce or minimise the contribution new development makes to climate change and adapts to the impacts of climate change.'	<b>Council response</b> Point accepted in part. Include reference to greenhouse gas emissions in objective 4. Adaptability to climate change is a concern that underpins a number of the objectives already, together with the criteria in policy area P1.

## Responses received on Plan Objectives - General Comments

<b>Organisation name:</b> Countryside Agency	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> Would like to see a compatibility analysis undertaken and, while integration of the objectives must be the aim, the Core Strategy expressly demonstrates how the almost inevitable conflicts between objectives are addressed in the choices made by and provided in the plan.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. This is addressed in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> No comments	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Highways Agency	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> No comments	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> The council support the plan objectives.	<b>Council response</b> Noted.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> The objectives do not include a reduction in inequalities which could be economic, social and health. It is a cross cutting objective that demands a targeted approach that seeks to promote inclusiveness and address inequalities.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. Promoting opportunities for all is an over-arching issue which is best referred to in the spatial vision (and which already underpins many of the existing objectives).

## Responses received on Plan Objectives - General Comments

<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> Innovative technology (such as broadband facilities) which improves access to services, could also be promoted in the objectives.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. This point is rather more specific than the existing objectives (although it can be pursued within the context of a number of them).
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> Include objective indicating need for appropriate infrastructure to support any development.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. This is covered by objective 14.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> It would be useful to have an objective referring to the effects of regional or national strategies, most importantly the M11 growth corridor.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. The wider strategic context is best referred to in the spatial vision.
<b>Organisation name:</b> Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust	
<b>Comments on potential objectives</b> The objectives do not explicitly express a commitment to developing strong, active and participatory communities. This is associated with having a mix of types of housing, and the overall design of development, not just affordable housing.	<b>Council response</b> No action required. The question of active communities is best addressed in the context of the Community Strategy, but the objectives do refer to meeting local housing needs generally (objective 7).

## Responses received on Plan Objectives - General Comments

**Organisation name:** Sawtry Parish Council

### **Comments on potential objectives**

The objectives need to take into account the requirements of residents in Sawtry. A survey recently completed by 53% of residents found that 16.7% were in favour of village growth, 51.4% totally opposed to village growth, 29.7% had no strong views and 2.2% didn't answer the question. If the village had to have development 74% were in favour of small scale development, 5.8% large scale development, 14.1% a new settlement and 6% didn't answer the question.

### **Council response**

No action required. The objectives are phrased in general terms rather than referring to specific places.





## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

---

Page no 7

### Paragraph no: Table 1

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

The list of sustainability topics and objectives are supported, as they recognise those in the Structure Plan and the Draft Regional Strategy.

#### Council response

Noted.

### Paragraph no: Table 1

Organisation name: Sawtry Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Objective 4.3 is of particular concern to Sawtry due to historical flooding problems

#### Council response

Noted.

---

Page no 20

### Paragraph no: Issue 1

Organisation name: Holme Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Despite significant development in Holme failure to address the need to replace an antiquated network of storm drains and sewage system currently causes problems. Upgrading pumps and retaining tanks have proved inadequate to cope with flash flooding. How will these existing problems be addressed?

#### Council response

No action required. The Scoping Report makes clear that drainage and flood risk need to be considered when formulating policies.

## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

### Paragraph no: Issue 1

Organisation name: Sawtry Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Items 1 and 4 of Key sustainability issues are of particular concern to Sawtry Parish Council

#### Council response

Noted.

---

### Page no 21

### Paragraph no: 12.6

Organisation name: Hemingford Grey Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

This paragraph refers to availability of outdoor recreational facilities, however the provision of adequate indoor recreational facilities and swimming pools etc is essential to the infrastructure, to ensure healthy communities in sustainable new development. Although Huntingdonshire is currently well served with these, they would need expanding in line with development.

#### Council response

No action required. The Scoping Report makes clear that the availability of services and facilities generally needs to be considered when formulating policies.

---

### Page no 23

### Paragraph no: 13.5

Organisation name: Sawtry Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

The Community College is oversubscribed as is the Junior School

#### Council response

Noted.

---

### Page no 25

## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

### Paragraph no: 14.3

Organisation name: Holme Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Little evidence of solution in response to 14.3 reduction in agricultural employment. Job losses will be exacerbated by the Great Fen project and hunting ban.

#### Council response

No action required. There is no evidence that the issues referred to will necessarily lead to a net reduction of jobs in Huntingdonshire.

### Paragraph no: Issues 5/6

Organisation name: Holme Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

There are few remaining opportunities for infill development in Holme. Over the last 20 years mainly 4/5+ bedroom dwellings (large detached) have been built. It would now seem impossible to achieve a good housing mix with adequate supply of affordable homes for youngsters in the village to get on the housing ladder.

#### Council response

No action required. The assessment refers to these issues generally, and sets out potential responses.

---

### Page no 26

### Paragraph no: 14.7

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

The first sentence is misleading as it implies that more workers live in rural areas than in the towns. To remedy, delete the words 'greatest flows' and replace with 'highest proportion'.

#### Council response

Point accepted.

---

### Page no 31

## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

### Paragraph no: Appendix 1

Organisation name: Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

In relevant plans/programmes, only one health specific plan was referred to, 'Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation (DOH 1999). This has now been superseded by the Public Health White Paper 'Choosing Lives' . The 'Cambs Health Improvement and Modernisation Plan 2002-05' is no longer valid as it was developed by the now non-existent Cambs Health Authority. In Huntingdonshire the strategic direction for health is set by the annual Director of Health Public Health Report, the Local Delivery Plan and the forthcoming Health Improvement Plan.

#### Council response

Noted. The range of health-related plans and strategies will be checked and updated.

---

### Page no 32

### Paragraph no: Appendix 1

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

The section on County plans and programmes should also include the Structure Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2003 (published June 2004) and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Housing Supply Report 2004 (published October 2004).

#### Council response

No action required. These are monitoring reports, not plans or programmes.

---

### Page no 58

## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

### Paragraph no: Appendix 4

Organisation name: Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Decision making criteria: Tobacco smoke - second hand smoke is not included in the list of pollutants.

#### Council response

No action required. This issue is unlikely to be affected by planning policies and proposals.

### Paragraph no: Appendix 4

Organisation name: Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Maintain and enhance human health - the decision making criteria is dependent on death rates and the encouragement of healthy lifestyle. It needs to include morbidity and differentiate between physical and mental health and well being.

#### Council response

No action required. The decision making criteria focus on key questions rather than all possible considerations, in order to keep the process manageable.

---

### Page no 59

### Paragraph no: Appendix 4

Organisation name: Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities - should ask the question will it build social capital.

#### Council response

No action required. The decision making criteria focus on key questions rather than broad concepts such as social capital.

---

### Page no 999

## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Huntingdonshire Primary Care Trust

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

The fundamental issue with the development of local plans, is that health impact assessments are not mandatory. A social model of health clearly links to all the topic areas in the SEA appraisal framework. However health issues are implicit rather than explicit and therefore the appraisal runs the risk of ensuring that future plan development makes no clear link to its impact on health.

#### Council response

No action required. The potential impact on human health forms a key part of the appraisal framework, and this issue is best considered in an integrated manner alongside other relevant concerns.

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Bury Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

No comments

#### Council response

Noted.

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Cambridge Water Company

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

No comments

#### Council response

Noted.

## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

The Government's consultation paper on Sustainability Appraisals refers to 'the broad options, which are proposed to be considered in more detail (during Stage B)'. The characterisation and key sustainability issues for the District are discussed at some length, but there is no real attempt in this document to synthesise the broad options for development that are to be considered.

#### Council response

No action required. The options are set out in the 'Initial Consultation on Options' document'.

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Initial Sustainability Appraisal has been produced at the same time as the Draft Scoping Report. There is a danger that telescoping two stages into one may appear to prejudice the integrity of the appraisal.

#### Council response

No action required. The Scoping Report was produced before the Initial Sustainability Appraisal.

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Highways Agency

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

No comments

#### Council response

Noted.

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: English Heritage

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Good coverage of issues relating to historic and built environment.

#### Council response

Noted.

## Responses received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: English Nature

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

Generally accept the findings of the Scoping Report. The criteria cover the basic tests for sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. They appear to have been applied with a reasonable degree of consistency and practicality.

#### Council response

Noted.

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Alwalton Parish Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

No comments

#### Council response

Noted.

### Paragraph no: General comments

Organisation name: Northamptonshire County Council

#### Comments on the content of the draft scoping report

No comments

#### Council response

Noted.



## Responses received on Initial Sustainability Appraisal

---

Page no 999

Policy no:

Organisation name: Wildlife Trust

Comments on the findings of the initial appraisal report

Council response

It has failed to adequately pick up the fact that the lack of a policy on water resources and water efficiency in new developments could undermine efforts to promote sustainable water resource use.

No action required. Water resources and efficiency are covered by policy area P1.



## Responses received on Initial Sustainability Appraisal

---

Page no 11

Policy no: G3

Organisation name: English Nature

### Comments on the findings of the initial appraisal report

The proposed changes are generally supported, for example those at G3 would improve implementation of the policy designed to protect trees, hedgerows and other features. We would draw the Council's attention to the requirements of Regulation 37 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994. This policy should comply with the requirement.

### Council response

Noted. The proposed change to G3 is addressed in the Council's responses to the findings of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal.



## Responses received on Initial Sustainability Appraisal

---

Page no 999

**Paragraph no: General comments**

Organisation name: Wildlife Trust

**Comments on the findings of the initial appraisal report**

It has failed to adequately pick up the fact that the lack of a policy on water resources and water efficiency in new developments could undermine efforts to promote sustainable water resource use.

**Council response**

No action required. Water resources and efficiency are covered by policy area P1.



## Responses received on Initial Sustainability Appraisal - Detailed Assessment Sheets

---

Page no 37

Policy no: B4 A

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

Comments on the findings of the initial appraisal report

Council response

It is arguable that measures that contribute to reducing climate change do bring long term benefits in terms of avoiding damage to designated sites and protected species, maintaining/ enhancing the viability of habitats and species, avoiding damage to protected sites/ historic buildings and promoting appropriate investment in infrastructure.

Point accepted. This will be addressed in the draft Final Sustainability Appraisal.

---

Page no 120

Policy no: T3

Organisation name: Cambridgeshire County Council

Comments on the findings of the initial appraisal report

Council response

The Sustainability Appraisal provides a positive review of Policy T3, however it fails to note that public paths and cycleways are also consistent with policies on healthy exercise, sustainable tourism and developing the rural economy.

No action required. These issues are covered by the assessment.

---

Page no 124

## Responses received on Initial Sustainability Appraisal - Detailed Assessment Sheets

<b>Policy no:</b> T5		
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council		
<b>Comments on the findings of the initial appraisal report</b>	<b>Council response</b>	
Renewable energies, being smaller scale, more diverse, and decentralised, can provide jobs/income for a region.	No action required. This point is addressed by the assessment.	
<b>Policy no:</b> T5		
<b>Organisation name:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council		
<b>Comments on the findings of the initial appraisal report</b>	<b>Council response</b>	
Wind farms are also removable with little lasting impact on land in terms of hard infrastructure, hard standing or contamination; hence they help minimise irreversible loss of land.	Point accepted. This will be addressed in the draft Final Sustainability Appraisal.	