

Appendix A: Summary of key issues and SPD changes

Section 1. Introduction		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
10	8	2
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support reference to “appropriate mitigation of environmental and health impacts [to provide] a satisfactory living environment”. Landowner supports the SPD’s aspirations, and guiding principles. Vision for this area to 'reflect and enhance the special character of the surrounding area' - should be reflected throughout the SPD. 	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD’s incomplete strategic plan - No reference to the adjacent land south of Coldham’s Lane (LSCL) Area of Major Change (AMC) to support both Local Plans. 	
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the SPD. 	

Section 2. Planning Policy Context		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
15	3	12
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan’s flexibility in relation to the function of the spine road, as to whether it provides a through-route to vehicular traffic or not. Welcome the need to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites/on-site habitats - treat wildlife site on eastern boundary with sensitivity with creation of additional grassland habitat in that location. 	
(Object)	<p>Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to clarify that any habitat or open space enhancements in this location should not unintentionally have an impact on perennial flax and crested cow-wheat. An ongoing management contribution to achieve this would be required. <p>Mineral and Waste Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference to the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste adopted development plan for the area. <p>Open Spaces and Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principle of secondary school playing fields in the green belt is acceptable to the Education Place Planning team, however, a balance is needed between appropriate boundary treatments and maintaining the character of the green area. Object to green belt land being used for school playing fields unless those fields are opened to the public. Green belt must prevent coalescence with Teversham and retain green corridor linking Cambridge with the rural countryside. No indication regarding landscaping on the north-eastern and eastern edges of the playing fields. Playing fields in this location could be allocated as a nature area for educational purposes. <p>Services and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ensure the greenbelt tests will be met without prejudicing 	

	<p>the secondary school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPD should make clearer that the LNCH site should be developed with consideration for future development on the safeguarded land, in terms of appropriate mitigation, transportation, views, open spaces, local centres, etc. • Schools are oversubscribed in this area.
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cumulative impacts of the development will be assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and Transport Assessment which are required as part of any future outline planning application. • A landscape and ecological management plan will be required as part of any future outline planning application for the site. • The inclusion of sports fields in the Green Belt is not incompatible with this designation, provided that the function of the Green Belt unaffected (i.e. maintains proper separation between Teversham and Cherry Hinton and protects the setting of Cambridge). • The site's landscaping/buffering strategy will be addressed as part of the Development Management process. Figure 50 provides an indicative landscape framework plan. • Include additional paragraph which refers to the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan • Add sentence to paragraph 2.19: 'The school playing fields may be accessible to the general public, subject to a Community Use Agreement'.

Section 3. The Site and Surrounding Area		
Vision		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
72	9	63
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Archaeological - Preliminary archaeological investigations. • Natural England - Proposal to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites and on-site habitats and to create additional grassland habitats. • Environment Agency - Support for proposed approach to soil contamination. • Historic England – Support the need for the development to reflect and enhance the special character of the surrounding area. 	
(Object)	<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic routes and bus frequency are wholly inadequate to cope with the additional traffic generated; and dangerous for cyclists. • Need to improve public transport with particular importance of cycling infrastructure for both existing and new homes. <p>Services and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already insufficient doctors available; site is too far from these and other medical facilities, with no easily walkable routes proposed. • Absence of local employment opportunities. • Facilities are inadequate for the number of dwellings proposed. • The airport is a valued employer and is part of the village so 	

	<p>concerned for the future of Marshalls and likelihood of closure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two primary schools are not highlighted on the map – Cherry Hinton Primary and Colville Primary. <p>Green Infrastructure (incl. Ecology)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of an important buffer between urban development and countryside will turn Teversham into a suburb. • Need to recognise the hedges and open fields do support a wide range of birds including breeding skylarks - a protected species - in the Airport boundary. • Significant loss of farmland biodiversity/wildlife. • SPD omits Green Belt and historic landscape characterisation of area. <p>Open Spaces and Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the wording 'close proximity'. New development will only be close to Church End green, a small piece of roadside land that has little to offer children, or dog walkers. • The open spaces proposed for the development site are local in nature. These will not meet resident's needs for accessing larger open spaces or achieve significant biodiversity gains. • No large area of open space proposed in SPD. Need for a new country park noted however, this is not addressed in the SPD. <p>Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of noise, ground conditions and air quality pollution implications are needed. • Noise pollution and the danger of flying routes above residential areas will lead to the closure of Marshalls. • Development is too near to the runway resulting in the pollution from aircraft causing health problems.
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment considerations are beyond the scope of this SPD. • The new development will be expected to provide local shops reducing the need for people to travel by car. • The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. This can be secured through the S106 process. • The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is an expectation that any potential ecological losses are mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process. • Figure 18 amended to include: The Teversham Conservation Area, Abbey Meadows Primary School and St Philip's CofE Primary School. • Add reference to other Listed buildings omitted • Use current NPPF terminology - amend reference to scheduled monument and not scheduled ancient monument. • Reference to Teversham Conservation Area to north east of site to be included in paragraph 3.28. Figure 18 to be amended to reference conservation area boundary. • Amend paragraph 3.26: 'There are no statutory or local landscape designations that cover the site. The site is not within the Green Belt (Figure 18).

Section 4. Vision and Key Principles		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
15	8	7
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development to reflect and enhance the special character of the surrounding area. • References to: a strong green framework and the development being inspired by the unique characteristics of the existing settlement and surrounding area, with cherry trees and countryside setting and celebrating views; historic landscape features and the idea to incorporate the existing countryside walk into a linear park. • The vision of LNCH shows it will be a high quality development, meeting the housing targets set for the City and District. 	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doubts about: site vibrancy; design based upon existing piecemeal design improving the design of the rest of Cherry Hinton; and open spaces are rarely provided in their original form. • Clarification regarding what is meant by a strong green framework. • Existing community in SCDC not considered as being part of Cherry Hinton and this development will result in minimal social interaction and sense of belonging. • Development will destroy existing habitats, plants and creatures. Artificial nest sites and decorative planting cannot replace the existing habitat. 	
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The detailed design of the development will be considered as part of any future outline and reserved matters planning applications. • The intention of the SPD is to create a community that is properly integrated with Cherry Hinton and Teversham. The matter of access to city services by residents in South Cambridgeshire is beyond the remit of the document. • The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. Substantial ecological losses should be avoided as part of the detailed design of the scheme. It is an expectation that any loss of habitat is mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process. • No changes to the SPD. 	

Section 5. Framework Principles and Masterplan		
5.1 – Connectivity and Movement		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
151	57	94
	<i>Movement</i>	
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for traffic calmed environment, including reference to street design, intersecting cross routes and setting the spine road speed limit to 20mph, if not for the entire development. • Strong support for a safe and segregated cycle route away from vehicles and pedestrians. • Support for safe secure crossings for pedestrians at Airport Way. • National Rail supports the use of a Transport Assessment to aid further design and appropriately upgrade requirements and mitigate against issues of overcapacity. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the provision of an essential spine road but should consider the impact on Church End if Bus gate option is adopted. • There is ample space to make improvements to cycling infrastructure along Coldham's lane. • Support Figure 44 including a connection to the TINS route, however, it needs to acknowledge the requirement to integrate such proposals effectively with the Protected Industrial Area and the intention to regenerate the Area of Major Change. • Support the importance of an improved public transport service; however Coldham's Lane cannot be classed as having a bus route due to infrequent service. • It is welcomed that the development should "also encourage healthy lifestyles and the use of sustainable travel modes, such as cycling".
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail is in more advanced stages in considering the re-opening of Fulbourn station. Therefore, it is unlikely that a new station at Cherry Hinton would also open due to its proximity. • Highly unlikely that more buses and upgraded cycle paths will achieve the required modal shift. • No reference to cycle and pedestrian routes to the new bridge over the river to the Cambridge North Railway Station and the Northern fringe employment site. • Lack of credible evidence to demonstrate why spine road is appropriate in development – How will it prevent through traffic? • The expansion of Addenbrooke's and ARM will significantly increase traffic congestion along with the new secondary school. • A Spine Road is clearly essential however, there are concerns regarding the location of future development within the area. • The site should take account of the area's wider development, especially in terms of transport infrastructure to avoid adversely impacting upon potential future alignments for road, public transport and active travel links where this is possible and sensible to do so. • Site should reduce need to travel by car both 'within the development' and beyond the development and aim for zero net impact on road traffic. • Additional road layouts should be considered to improve the permeability of the site for people walking and cycling ensuring better integration. • Bus route proposed won't accommodate all additional traffic generated by the proposal and will impact other roads. • Other roads through the development should be primarily for walking and cycling, as in the Eddington development in North West Cambridge. Vehicle movements should be confined as far as possible to the outer edges of the development, to ensure that the public outdoor space is attractive and safe for people of all ages to move around, and for children to play. • Objections to the suggestion that bus gate are a possibility on spine road, due to the creation of traffic. • No reference to cycle and pedestrian routes to the new bridge over the river to the Cambridge North railway station and site. • There should be improvements to the cycle route along Coldham's Lane which are dangerous routes for cyclists.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements should be made to the bus services with concerns that the provision of a high frequency service will be unlikely. Importance to acknowledge that there is a need to harmonise the proposals with the emerging strategy for the surrounding area.
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that the bus services between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport. Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.16: 'The requirements of the final spine road design will be determined by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority and local planning authorities, as part of the pre-application planning process. Extend geographical area in Figure 43 to show pedestrian and cycle linkages to Cambridge North station and northern fringe employment site. Figure 39 will be amended to colour Options A and B differently for clarity and legibility of vehicle access improved.
	Car Parking
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of electric charging points welcomed but more specific detail needed. SPD should reflect the need for electric vehicle (EV) charging points in different settings e.g. Residential, Commercial, Carparks etc. and the different types of EV charging points (standard and rapid). SPD should have an aspiration that all dwellings are provided with EV charging points.
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underground car parking should be considered. Any new development must make parking a priority. Concerns regarding access point of March Lane and Church End as there is a blind corner with parking issues on both sides of the road. Consider centralised/edge parking to deter people from using cars.
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electric vehicle charging points and the provision of related infrastructure is an evolving matter with the changing technologies for electric and zero emission vehicles. This level of detail is outside the scope of the SPD, but will be considered as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process. Cycle and car parking provision will be assessed and addressed as outline and reserved matters planning application process.
	Site's Environmental Sustainability
(Support)	<p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency (EA) supports SPD's water quality/wastewater aspects and fully endorses comprehensive consultation with Anglian Water to meet their requirements. Support installing any water saving devices, any surface water storage systems or management systems that can be incorporated into the design of buildings and infrastructure. Advice on the correct use of infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) provided to ensure that they will not pose a risk to the water environment. <p>Energy</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic use of energy as well as energy production i.e. combustion sources within domestic dwellings. • Consider other forms of energy supply and conservation, including solar panels and wind turbines. <p>Air</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality should be considered at the design stage. <p>Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of both strategic household waste recycling centres and individual household waste and recycling receptacles.
(Object)	<p>Archaeology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the potential archaeological sensitivity of the site archaeology should be given more consideration in the SPD. <p>Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need recognition of the Waste Planning Authority in identifying potential sites for facilitating waste management operations and wider consideration should also be given to local capacity for managing the waste streams associated with development and occupancy thereafter. • Consideration for a waste hierarchy and the promotion of waste prevention measures, so opportunities for waste minimisation, reuse and recycling are realised at the earliest stage.
Draft response and Consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 3.30 effectively deals with archaeology. Further investigation will be conditioned through the outline planning application process. • Additional paragraph added (5.61): "To avoid foul flooding of existing properties, and to avoid pollution of the local water environment, all planning applications should include a Pre-Application Assessment Report from Anglian Water confirming that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate foul drainage from the site or phase of development" • The supply of water to the development site is the responsibility of the developer. Whilst this is beyond the remit of the SPD, it is an expectation that provision is made for appropriate water supply to the site. This should be established prior to the submission of any future planning application. Water efficiency measures in new development can be addressed secured as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process. • An Air Quality Assessment will need to be submitted as part of the outline planning application.
	Open Spaces/Landscape/Green Belt
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites and on-site habitats and in particular to treat the wildlife site on the eastern boundary with sensitivity and to create additional grassland habitat in that location. • Inclusion of green infrastructure, in particular an uninterrupted linear park/wildlife corridor potentially linking with wildlife sites to the south of Coldham's Lane with the Green Corridor to the north. • Natural England believes development should contribute towards delivery of landscape scale biodiversity net gain, in particular enhancement of chalk grassland and woodland and farmland bird habitat.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological impacts, including on farmland species, should be appropriately mitigated and enhancements incorporated to demonstrate delivery of net biodiversity gain, to meet NPPF requirements and the needs of people and wildlife. • Natural England supports the proposal to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites and on-site habitats and to create additional grassland habitats.
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of farmland wildlife needs to be mitigated off-site. More explicit detail needed in the sections that deal with ecology in the main document. • The houses adjacent to the linear park have the potential to cast shade on the linear park. Consideration of shade/building height/aspect is therefore required. • Concern that the provision of green space is insufficient, although the SPD references the policies within each Local Plan. • Playing fields often urban in character will erode Green Belt and merge development with Teversham. • Playing fields towards eastern boundary should be reserved for landscaping/buffering; part of a nature area for the school. • No large area of open space proposed in SPD. • The development should provide sufficient informal open space to meet the additional and growing recreational demands of new (and existing) residents and to deliver biodiversity net gain. Natural England advises that additional off-site green infrastructure provision is likely to be required to meet these needs. • Concern that the spine road provides an entrance route to future development on safeguarded land and creates a road that would cut across the linear park, devaluing wildlife connectivity. • Play areas and spaces for young people need to be easily accessible for the existing Cherry Hinton residents south of the site. • Open spaces proposed for development are too local and won't meet resident's needs for larger open spaces. • Important hedgerows must be preserved in development to protect the valuable habitat of the skylarks and wildlife.
Draft response and Consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The central square area is connected to the wider green area. It is the intention that pocket parks and the linear park will be linked, creating a comprehensive green network. • The proposal presents an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is an expectation that any potential ecological losses are mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process. • Update Figure 38 to reflect the nature of the greenspaces.
	Education
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Education officers generally support the education provision and the locations of the schools. • The primary school will include provision for early years. County Officers encourage the provision for a commercially operated nursery. • Teversham CofE Primary School support proposal unless there are school places available in local schools or that the school is built before the housing is occupied in the development.

(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools should be planned away from the airport to avoid the adverse effects of pollution. • Object that a shortage of school places has been used to justify the inclusion of a primary school and secondary school in this development. Currently, Cherry Hinton has 4 primary schools and 2 secondary schools. • Better to expand existing schools rather than provide new schools. • Concern that if the school is built and finished before new residents move in the places will go to other pupil from elsewhere. • The effect of a 2FE rather than single form entry primary risks making at least one of the existing schools unsustainable. • School should be as small as possible to prevent traffic jams. • No need for a large secondary school in this area. • New schools should be delayed as long as possible.
Draft response and Consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. Any school development will need to have good sustainable transport links to reduce the need for vehicular movement to and from the site. It is an expectation that bus services and cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport. • The specification for the educational facilities and the timing of the delivery of the schools will be part of the Section 106 agreement. • Graphics of Figure 52 will be amended to better identify the secondary school building zone.
	<i>Housing</i>
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing - a key worker option could also be beneficial. • Good to have high density housing around the centre to support local shops and encourage walking.
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPD should give full consideration throughout to the needs of disabled or older people (incl. those with dementia) and other marginalised groups. Single storey buildings for elderly. • SPD should recommend the proportions of dwellings that are built to the Government's 'Approved Document M' standards to ensure that people are able to access and use buildings and their facilities. • SPD needs to tackle crime through innovative design. • SPD must stress the importance of achieving 40% affordable housing. • The development should provide more lower density, traditional family housing.
Draft response and Consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 5.89 refers to the 40% affordable housing threshold. This quantum will also be tenure blind, to ensure it is fully integrated into the whole development. • The site's housing mix will be agreed as part of any future outline planning application. • Section 5.99 (Character & Form) reference a number of key Local Plan policies which seek to ensure the site is designed to a high standard which, including the creation of safe, urban environments. • Figure 5.13 will be amended to refer to Barnwell Road not Drive.

	<i>Community & other non-residential uses</i>
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support community facilities that will integrate new and existing communities. • Sport England support the principle of provision for community indoor sports facilities being secured. • Need to ensure sufficient space for recreational and social areas and for multi-purpose buildings that the community can use for leisure activities. • St Andrew's is happy to serve as a 'link organisation' to knit together the community. • New Community Centre should be available for both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire residents. • Access to the facilities at the secondary school would benefit the local community. • Play facilities will be critical to the success of the development.
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPD should include reference to The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sports Facilities Strategies (2016) to help inform requirements. • Sport England would recommend that the SPD is amended to state that indoor sports provision should be based on existing robust evidence and the use of Sport England planning tools such as the Sports Facilities Calculator. • The use of the proposed units should be made available to local independent business operators and not large national chains. • Lack of detail regarding doctors' surgeries and dentist provision, which is at crisis point in Cherry Hinton. • NHS England - capacity deficit in the catchment practices and a developer contribution is required to mitigate additional primary healthcare services arising directly as a result of the development proposal. • Optimal use and timing needed regarding Section 106 funds for new and existing communities in the local area. • Need for high quality cafes, restaurants and/or local shops. What should definitely be avoided are charity shops and betting shops.
Draft response and Consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sports Facilities Strategies (2016) in paragraph 5.117. • The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities. This can be secured through the S106 process. Discussions are currently taking place regarding the provision of community facilities. • Access to school sports facilities are secured with a Community Use Agreement.
	<i>Design/Character/Form/ Layout</i>
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire Crime Prevention Design Team considered that the draft SPD addresses paragraphs 58 and 69 of the NPPF. No further comments, observations or recommendations. • SPD should comply with recent Government Housing White Paper– "The onus should be on good design, realistic local and neighbourhood plans, and should focus on areas that can accommodate it". • Street lighting should not be omitted above the horizontal, so that

	<p>the direction of light doesn't cause glare or light pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that there are regular benches along the green corridors to enable older people to use them for walking, with opportunities for rest.
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry Hinton and Teversham have already accepted new development and residents will both lose their identity and just become urban sprawl. • SPD should refer to 'Streets for All East of England'. • Design and materials palette need to be contextual and based on local vernacular. • The various proposed developments in and around Cherry Hinton will lead to its coalescence with Cambridge and Romsey losing its 'separate village identity'. • Village identity needs to carry through into new development. • 4-5 storey buildings will be wholly out of keeping with the rest of Cherry Hinton and Teversham. • No housing of one-storey e.g. bungalows and not fitting to the character of form of the surrounding community of Teversham Drift. • Brief could refer to the need for high quality design and good practice in relation to the public realm. • There is no aspiration within the SPD to tackle crime through innovative design.
Draft response and Consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site's Green Belt/landscaping/buffering strategy will be addressed as part of the outline planning application process. The Green Belt designation will continue to provide clear separation between Cherry Hinton and Teversham. • The detailed housing mix will need to be the subject of detailed discussion with Council officers to identify the appropriate range of housing. The developer has indicated that an element of older people's housing could be provided within the development, which would be supported. Paragraph 5.88 has been amended accordingly. • Section 5.99 (Character & Form) reference a number of key Local Plan policies which seek to ensure the site is designed to a high standard which, including the creation of safe, urban environments.

Appendix 1 – Glossary of Key Terms		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
1	0	1
	<i>Glossary</i>	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion of additions to glossary of 'Heritage Assets', 'Conservation Area', 'Scheduled Monument', 'Listed Buildings' and 'Locally Listed Buildings'. 	
Draft response and Consequential changes to SPD	<p>Add following terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Assets • Conservation Area • Scheduled Monument • Listed Buildings • Locally Listed Buildings 	