

Response to Examiners Clarification Notes

Evidence Doc : Examination Stage Note 1

Update : 7 March 2022

Version 7 (Consolidated responses)

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|-------|---|---|
| Intro | <p>This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification.</p> <p>For the avoidance of any doubt, matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.</p> | |
| 1 | <p>Initial Comments</p> <p>The Plan provides a clear and concise vision for the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>The relationship between the objectives of the Plan and its policies is very clear. This provides a robust structure for the Plan.</p> <p>The presentation of the Plan is excellent. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. The Plan makes good use of various maps.</p> <p>The Plan is underpinned by an excellent range of background documents. The six Evidence Papers are particularly helpful and directly inform key policies in the Plan.</p> | <p>The Parish Council wishes to thank the Examiner for the encouraging opening words.</p> <p>A Neighbourhood Plan is for the community more than a land use policy plan: it also aims to capture the essence of our village and other elements that matters to people locally: such as employment, environment, recreation, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>It also includes (as 'aspirations') suggestions made by villagers that are not strictly speaking related to planning matters. We believe this approach reflects the thrust of the Localism Act seeking to broaden the involvement of communities in planning issues.</p> <p>It is a difficult balancing act, especially given the statutory nature of the F.NP and the relative obligations.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Points for Clarification</p> <p>I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now in a position to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council.</p> <p>The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination report and in recommending any</p> | <p>Noted</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--|--|
| | <p>modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions. I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan:</p> | |
| 3 | <p>Policy FUL1 The Important Visual Gap and Important Countryside Frontages are distinctive components of the Plan.</p> | <p>The key aim of this policy is keeping a clear visual and landscape separation between Fulbourn, as a distinct village, and the ongoing Cambridge urban spread (Objective 1).</p> <p>This needs to be achieved even if (in strict development terms) there is near continuity of development because the Fulbourn Hospital, Capital Park and Ida Darwin sites are developed even if located in the Green Belt. Development in this area started well before the Cherry Hinton expansion of Cambridge and took the form of sparse buildings in parkland, which were hardly visible from a distance and from adjoining roads.</p> <p>In recent years frontage development (housing, Tesco), taller buildings with car parks (Capital Park) and intensification (Ida Darwin) have taken place, regardless of the Green Belt designation. These are progressively eroding the 'visual' separation, as well as increasing physical continuity. Agents for the landowners keep challenging the relevance of the Green Belt designation at this location (see point 6.1 below) arguing that more development at this location makes commercial and operational sense.</p> <p>The concept of the Visual Gap arose through discussions associated with the production of the Village Design Guide (VDG, an SDP adopted in 2020) and a similar area is identified within the VDG Fig 17 as an 'essential visual gap'.</p> <p>SCDC's officers supported the policy and suggested renaming the visual gap 'Important' rather than essential.</p> |
| 3.1 | <p>However, to what extent does the Parish Council consider that they add distinctive value to national and local planning policies which apply in the Green Belt?</p> | <p>It is evident from the recent development history that the Green Belt designation is insufficient to retain a 'visual gap'.</p> <p>As parts of the 'gap' are already developed and are considered brownfield sites, the Green Belt designation has proven to be weak: buildings have been added and development has become more compact, trees have been removed, etc.</p> <p>The Important Visual Gap is intended to add additional requirements to control 'visual' encroachment, as redevelopment in these areas cannot be prevented. It is important that new development</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|---|--|
| | | <p>safeguards or enhances the tree cover and parkland, dim lighting and barely perceivable buildings in between trees that gives the perception of separation when going from Cambridge to Fulbourn, even where development is present.</p> <p>The Important Countryside Frontages add value by specifically identifying areas around Fulbourn that are of particular importance to the setting of the village in between agricultural fields. This is intended also to discourage any suggestion of 'rounding off' the village – as intended by the criteria for definition of the Important Countryside Frontages, which protect wedges and gaps between built areas.</p> <p>Particularly important is the permanent retention of the green wedge included in the Site Specific Policies DPD (Jan 2010) at SP/9.3 for the Fulbourn Hospital and Ida Darwin Major Development Site in the Green Belt.</p> <p>It is intended to discourage any further release of green belt along Fulbourn Old Drift (linking Cherry Hinton to Ida Darwin); along Cambridge Rd (linking the extension of Peterhouse Technology Park further eastwards towards the village) and also along Teversham Rd. We note that none of these sites are being considered for allocation in the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan.</p> |
| 3.2 | <p>The boundaries of the Important Visual Gap do not appear to follow natural or man-made boundaries. Two questions arise as follows:</p> | <p>When the 'Visual Gap' approach was first identified as part of the Village Design Guide (SPD) it was not considered necessary to exactly define the boundaries as the gap was intended as a loose green area separating Cambridge and Fulbourn.</p> |
| 3.3 | <p>Was this approach intentional and if so for what purpose?</p> | <p>It was considered important at the time to extend the gap to include both developed and agricultural areas to reinforce the principle of separation through green and countryside settings. It is difficult, however, to precisely state where the gap stops: it should be where open land is no longer under pressure for development.</p> <p>As shown it includes both sides of Cambridge Road and of Teversham Road (where development is already urbanising the road corridor through intensification of agricultural development), reaching the NP designated boundaries to the north and the limit of the Important Countryside Frontages east and west. This would reinforce the intention of views A1, A4, A3.</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--|--|
| 3.4 | How would the District Council be able to implement the policy with clarity throughout the Plan period without any clear definition of the boundaries of the Gap? | It is recognised that clear boundaries to the Visual Gap are easier to enable implementation of policies that reference it. Suggestions for adjustments to the boundaries that retain the overall intention and are easier to defend in planning terms would be welcome. |
| 3.5 | I saw the significance of the Locally Important Views during my visit. Did the Parish Council consider preparing a policy which was more positively-worded and required that any development proposals were designed to take account of the identified views? | <p>The Locally Important Views were intended to support the retention of Fulbourn as a village within a rural setting. It is in the nature of villages to have informal layouts with breaks and pockets of countryside in between developed areas, so that the countryside is never far away. We believe that this character would be compromised if the village was to be 'rounded off' and detached from the countryside. This is also the intention of Local Plan Policy NH/13, which recognises this value.</p> <p>We recognise that positive wording would be more appropriate, and would welcome suggestions that do not create ambiguity as to the intention of the policy (i.e. the retention of fields as gaps in close proximity to the village area).</p> |
| 4 | <p>Policy FUL3 The connected Green Infrastructure Network is an interesting and distinctive concept</p> | <p>The interconnectedness of the village and countryside is very important for its character. Even more now that there is a greater recognition within the community of the importance of biodiversity and therefore enriching the ecology partially lost to intensive agriculture in recent decades. The identification, protection and integration of the green spaces within the village with the external wildlife corridors is therefore considered an essential factor in the current and future environmental development of Fulbourn. Many of the component parts already exist and there is some 'green connectivity' around parts of the area. It is however a fragile concept project that requires commitment and safeguarding into the future.</p> <p>What we would like to achieve through the neighbourhood plan is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That future development does not prejudice or compromise the potential to establish connected corridors (i.e. is designed with a layout that does not interrupt the network). • That future development contributes to a richer biodiversity along these corridors, on site as part of their development but also where appropriate through offsite contributions (for example to reach a biodiversity net gain target). • To establish the principle of the corridors as a shared project for the village and community. <p>SCDC officers encouraged us (after Reg. 14) to include a map to indicate the locations of corridors to be preserved as well as locations where biodiversity contributions could be made by developers. The 'fuzzy' map was then introduced for this purpose: to provide an indicative location without establishing well-defined / fixed boundaries. The Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire Wildlife</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|---|--|
| | | <p>Trusts (on whose evidence the map is based) thought it was a fair representation of their recommendations for this area.</p> <p>We agree that the policy combines requirements for development bolted on a commitment and aspiration for the village. We would welcome any support in making the policy clearer and stronger in guiding development.</p> |
| 4.1 | <p>However, Parts 1 and 3 of the policy read as a community project rather than a land-use policy</p> | <p>Part 1 of the policy: the last sentence before the list should probably be reworded to state that development should contribute, where appropriate, to the items listed a to e. This would be in response to requirements for biodiversity net gain (referenced in supporting text paragraph 7.7).</p> <p>Part 3 of the policy: our intention was to ensure that any biodiversity contribution made through development should be associated by a maintenance plan secured through legal agreement / S106, etc. We recognise that this part of the policy does not make that sufficiently clear.</p> <p>In recognition of the community's commitment to the Green Infrastructure network, we suggest to add a section to the Community Aspirations (chapter 14). Our suggestions are below.</p> <p><i>11 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Network</i> <i>The community values the features of Fulbourn that result from its rural setting and is committed to the enhancement of the natural environment both around and within the village.</i> <i>A high biodiversity network of green infrastructure that links the village to its surroundings is an ambition that will increase the quality of our natural greenspace and provide improved access to the countryside. There is an aspiration that future developments will also contribute to this ambition (Policy FUL/03).</i></p> <p><i>14.50 : The natural environment within and surrounding Fulbourn would be enhanced by the protection and enhancement of the green corridors that enable the flourishing of flora and fauna across the area. This would potentially connect the Gog Magog Hills, Roman Road, Fleam Dyke, the Fulbourn Nature Reserve and other important biodiversity sites with the green spaces within the village.</i></p> <p><i>14.51 : The extended Green Infrastructure Network will increase the area of accessible natural greenspace and provide improved access to the countryside as they frequently correspond with existing bridleways, footpaths and permissive paths.</i></p> <p><i>14.52 : The protection of these wildlife corridors will contribute to the important views that surround Fulbourn.</i></p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--|--|
| | | <p>14.53 : <i>The Green Infrastructure Network is intended to become a long term feature of the landscape and it is expected that the Parish Council will support the Green Infrastructure concept within its wider activities.</i></p> |
| 4.2 | <p>Part 2 of the policy is effectively a safeguarding policy which will work best where it is clear that the Network has been or will be implemented.</p> | <p>Understood – it will be important that any development retains the continuity of the network and contributes to its establishment as appropriate. We believe the map, as suggested by SCDC after Reg. 14 consultation, clarifies where this is to be taken into account.</p> <p>In parallel, the Parish Council and community volunteers will work towards wider implementation.</p> |
| 4.3 | <p>Does the Parish Council have any comments on these matters? Does the Parish Council have any assurance that the Network will be implemented in the Plan Period and/or that a management plan is in place to achieve this outcome?</p> | <p>National land management policy is generally moving in the direction of conservation management and land-owners are being encouraged by the 'Environmental Land Management Scheme' to have increased environmental considerations.</p> <p>Community volunteers and the 'Environment Working Group' established for the F.NP will be working with local land-owners and farmers to utilise this approach to improve the landscape in and around Fulbourn. Part of this will be the retention and development of wildlife corridors – and these would form the constituent parts of the 'extended green network'. Over time the network will become a reality for the village, even if there isn't a formalised plan.</p> <p>Through the NP we would like to secure safeguarding, contribution and commitment to maintenance and appropriate management for wildlife areas secured through development.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Policy FUL4 The second part of the policy requires that 'consideration' should be given to a series of matters.</p> | |
| 5.1 | <p>Is this intended to require that developments incorporate such features?</p> | <p>Yes : This section is intended to require promoters of development / applicants that they have proactively considered all these features as part of their proposals. Reference to scale and proportionality have been introduced as a result of feedback from SCDC officers, as future applications may only include smaller scale infill development or extensions.</p> |
| 5.2 | <p>The fourth part of the policy reads as a statement rather than as a policy. Is it intended proposals put such measures in place?</p> | <p>This mirrors the same aspiration as Policy FUL/03 (see comment 4.1 above): where landscape is incorporated in new development and appropriate arrangements for maintenance are also secured through planning conditions. Larger schemes now often include service charges for maintenance of shared landscape features. The same should happen for smaller infill sites, where landscape is neither private nor adopted by the Council.</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--|--|
| 6 | <p>Policy FUL5 The work on Local Green Spaces (LGS) is commendably underpinned by Evidence Paper 3.</p> | |
| 6.1 | <p>However, to what extent has the wider process assessed the added value of LGS designation for proposed LGS B, C and D over and above the protection provided by their location in the Green Belt (see Planning Policy Guidance ID: 37:010:20140306)</p> | <p>We believe that the LGS designation will help retain the balance between open space and development, which is critical at this location (see also comments to FUL/01 in items 3 above).</p> <p>The green spaces at B,C,D are important to Fulbourn and are have historical and emotional significance. Evidence Paper 3 describes in detail the contribution and attachment this area has to the village.</p> <p>The Fulbourn Hospital site is also associated with Special Policy Area H/3 of the Local Plan, which allows further development to compensate for the release of the Ida Darwin site to medical operation. This puts the proposed LGS under threat of development even if within the Green Belt. Two recent applications (excluded from the LGS boundaries), one on the hospital site and one on the business park, are already eroding the green spaces that are so important to the village.</p> <p>The recent review of the Conservation Appraisal (2021) by SCDC which reduces the boundary of the Conservation Area, de facto recognising that development out of character has taken place.</p> <p>The Representation responses received from Cambridge & Peterborough NHS Trust make it clear that they want to see changes to the Green Belt to support future additional development on the site. The letter from their agents, Savills states on page 3 of their letter;</p> <p><i>'It is the view of the Trust that legitimate questions should be asked about the appropriateness of including the Fulbourn Hospital site within the Green Belt given the significant amount of built form in the northern part of the site and the consequent character of the site in question'</i></p> <p>The LGS designations for these three sites will reinforce their status as valuable assets (not just 'empty land' to be used without thought). They would be recognised as sizeable elements of parkland to be preserved within the Green Belt and CA, still allowing development at the margins. More questions would need to be answered as to the necessity of development and it is more likely that compensation would be secured.</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--|--|
| 7 | <p>Policies FUL6/7/8/11 These policies are an excellent local response to the NPPF 2021 on design matters.</p> | <p>Thank you. This comment is very appreciated.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Policy FUL9 Should the policy also refer to the site area of development so that it has regard to the approach taken in the NPPF?</p> | <p>Agreed. We would welcome suggestions for modifications by the Examiner.</p> |
| 8.1 | <p>The fourth part of the policy reads as an explanation of the implementation of the policy rather than as a policy in its own right. I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned to the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?</p> | <p>The intention of part 4 is to encourage support, contribution or expansion of the <u>existing</u> community facilities, where possible, rather than provision of new ones or funding of provision elsewhere.</p> <p>Fulbourn has centrally located sport facilities, playground, community rooms, health centre, etc. These are the focal points of community activity and therefore village identity and cohesion. They are within a short walking distance from all parts of the village.</p> <p>Developers often propose a new community hall or children facility as a way to make their development more acceptable. In Fulbourn we would prefer to enhance and expand what we have for the benefit of the community as a whole, rather than creating small 'rival' facilities elsewhere or estate-style provisions where existing villagers are 'outsiders'.</p> <p>We would welcome suitable policy wording that make this consideration a requirement of larger developments.</p> |
| 9 | <p>Policy FUL10 Does this policy add any distinctive value to the approach already included in the adopted Local Plan?</p> | <p>We recognise that part of the policy overlaps with the Local Plan. We consider, however, that points 'd' and 'e' of part 1 are specific to Fulbourn.</p> <p>There has been a lot of pressure for exception sites in the recent past, and the representations of developers and landowners to the F.NP indicates that this will not become any less in the future. It is very important that rural exception sites, should they come forward, have real benefit for the community (in terms of access and affordability to housing) and respect the landscape setting, Important Countryside Frontages, Important Visual Gap, views, green infrastructure, etc.</p> |
| 10 | <p>Policy FUL12 Does this policy add any distinctive value to the approach already included in the adopted Local Plan?</p> | <p>We believe that this policy does add some value as it emphasises the real local concern about additional heavy traffic on the village streets.</p> <p>Even a small increase in traffic, which would not normally cause concern in an urban area, can be very daunting in the narrow lanes of Fulbourn. Experience has shown that standard assessment and</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|---|--|
| | | <p>mitigation measures are inadequate to recognise the impact of even a handful of HGVs turning into the village lanes.</p> <p>The policy aims to discourage new employment uses that rely on heavy vehicles moving through the village and place more scrutiny on how new businesses plan their site's car parks and access and impact on the village.</p> |
| 11 | <p>Policy FUL14 Does the first part of this policy add any local value to the approach already included in the adopted Local Plan?</p> | <p>The aim of Part 1 was to underline the 'accessible location'. This is important to consider as there is a tendency to develop community facilities as part of new development, which in the case of Fulbourn is peripheral and not as easy to access as existing facilities which are central and near bus stops. This is complementary to part 3 of this policy – which also relates to FUL/09.</p> <p>We recognise that avoiding repetition would add clarity.</p> |
| 11.1 | <p>Is the proposed extension of the Recreation Ground practicable given the approach taken by the landowner?</p> | <p>Fulbourn is lacking recreation space. Extending the Recreation Ground is seen as important and remains an objective. Hill Residential have verbally indicated a willingness to consider allowing part of their land to meet this objective. Their adversarial representation (below) indicates that they would put pressure for further development.</p> |
| 11.2 | <p>The third part of the policy reads as an explanation of the implementation of the policy rather than as a policy in its own right. I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned to the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?</p> | <p>See comment at 8.1.</p> <p>We believe it is important that current facilities, which are well loved and well located for everyone in the village, are supported and expanded in preference to alternative ones.</p> |
| 12 | <p>Policy FUL15 The third part of the policy reads as an explanation of the implementation of the policy rather than as a policy in its own right. I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned to the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?</p> | <p>The third part was intended to place a requirement on developers proposing a new healthcare centre (or providing land for it) to engage with the current GP practice. This requirement is additional to standard practice of negotiating through S106 or CIL and providing financial or in kind contribution.</p> <p>Working with the GPs will provide better understanding of the needs of the village.</p> <p>We fear that as supporting text, this engagement will not happen.</p> |
| 13 | <p>Policy FUL16 I acknowledge that the policy comments about 'where appropriate'</p> | <p>It is not unusual for larger developments to provide contributions to bus services. Government plans to 'decarbonise transport' are quite ambitious for the modal share to be achieved by public transport, walking and cycling (50% of all trips).</p> |

| Ref' | Examiner's Note 14Feb2022 | F.NP Responses & Notes (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|---|---|
| | However, will it be practicable or reasonable for development to deliver Part 1e of the policy? | While this is not something the F.NP can impose as a target without proper evidence, we would prefer that 'off site' transport improvements would be directed to encouraging use of public transport rather than facilitating car use. Alternative wording will be welcome. |

The table below contains comments on the representations made by landowners and developers highlighted by the Examiner in his note.

| Ref' | Other Representations | F.NP Comments (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--|---|
| 14 | <p>Representations Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan? In particular, does it wish to comment on the representations made by:</p> | <p>Overarching note: SCDC is in agreement that the two developments with outline planning permission can meet the projected housing need and no further major development for housing is required during this plan period. The new Greater Cambridge Local Plan is not considering any further release of Green Belt at Fulbourn. The community does not think that additional housing allocations will be beneficial as the increase of population due to the two sites with permission is already substantial and require efforts for integration in the existing community. For these reasons, we believe that pressure for development is not driven by need or sustainable development: it is purely a factor related to the commercial pull of Cambridge. In addition, we would like to remark that the 'Call for Sites' for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan took place not long before the Reg. 16 of the F.NP, and some of the representations below demanding release of Green Belt (something the NP cannot address) appear to have been influenced by that process, rather than a genuine consideration of the NP.</p> |
| 14.1 | Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust; | <p>See also point 6.1 of this document. Background : Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust are the freehold landowners of land at Fulbourn Hospital. This is the site currently occupied by a number of healthcare services and located to the west of Capital Park (referred to as the "former Fulbourn Hospital site") within the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment: The Fulbourn Hospital site is a key feature of Fulbourn and is on the main route that connects the village to Cambridge. These routes are used by walkers, cyclists, motorists and buses. Historically it has provided significant employment for Fulbourn residents and been the venue for</p> |

| Ref' | Other Representations | F.NP Comments (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|------------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>regular local sporting events. Evidence Paper 3 of the F.NP describes in detail the contribution and attachment this area has to the village.</p> <p>The F.NP proposed two Local Green Spaces (LGS) within the CP.NHS.T area (See also point 6.1 of this document). The boundaries of these proposed LGSs take into account, and exclude, any areas currently being developed.</p> <p>The representation received from Cambridge & Peterborough NHS Trust make it clear that they want to see further release of the Green Belt and develop the site without constraints. The letter from their agents, Savills states on page 3;</p> <p><i>'It is the view of the Trust that legitimate questions should be asked about the appropriateness of including the Fulbourn Hospital site within the Green Belt given the significant amount of built form in the northern part of the site and the consequent character of the site in question'</i></p> <p>Considering the ongoing developments on the site and the importance of this land to maintain the separation of Fulbourn as an independent village, we believe it is important not only to retain the Green Belt designation (which also the new Greater CambridgePlan proposes), but also to highlight the sensitive nature of the site as parkland with occasional buildings (see also points in section 3 above).</p> |
| 14.2 | Castlefield International Limited; | <p>Background : Castlefield International owns a parcel of land to the east of Teversham Rd and between the chalk stream behind Cow Lane and the railway line. This site has outline consent for residential development and the planning approval process is ongoing.</p> <p>Comment: The Castlefield proposed development on the site off Teversham Road has been through many planning application iterations and it is understood that at the time of this note it has still not received full approval. There are several reasons, but a significant concern is the low lying nature of the land and its tendency for flooding; indeed it lies across the chalk stream from Poor Well which is a spring with a long history. It remains flowing even during drought periods. Across Teversham Rd the residential area around Thomas Rd is frequently flooded as ground water and rainfall overwhelms water courses that are effectively at the same ground level.</p> <p>There is a vigorous local village campaign to limit or stop the development on this site.</p> <p>It is not however intended to try to retrospectively apply neighbourhood plan conditions to developments where full planning consent has been awarded. Policies relating specifically to this site and included at Reg. 14 stage have been removed and the site is only specifically mentioned in the supporting text.</p> |

| Ref' | Other Representations | F.NP Comments (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>It should be noted, however, that the views were identified within the Village Design Guide (VDG) that pre-dates the reserved matters determination on the Teversham Road site. The planning application as of 2022 has still not been finalised. The policies of the F.NP assist the delivery of 'good development' within the specific context of Fulbourn and should be interpreted as such by the developers.</p> |
| 14.3 | Ely Diocesan Board of Finance (EDBF) | <p>Background : EDBF owns land south of Fulbourn Old Drift (adjacent to Capital Park) and land south of Cambridge Road (north of Shelford Road and adjacent to Fulbourn). These agricultural fields fall inside the Important Visual Gap and are edged by Important Countryside Frontages (see points under section 3 above).</p> <p>Comments : The land areas that are owned by EDBF are key parts of the landscape and rural settings that define that part of Fulbourn and a key objective of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan is to protect these areas, their openness and rural character. This is essential to retain the separation between Fulbourn and Cambridge.</p> <p>In our responses above (points 3) we explained why we believe it is important to retain this area free from development. No additional housing is demonstrably needed and the land remains in the Green Belt.</p> |
| 14.4 | Hill Residential; | <p>Background : Hill Residential owns the land east of Balsham Road in Fulbourn. A part of this site is identified for a proposed extension to the recreation ground in Policy FUL/14 of F.NP.</p> <p>Comments : We do not consider that there is a need to provide a strategy to meet local housing needs (see point 14 above).</p> <p>Hill Residential would like to have a housing land allocation in the Green Belt as a trade-off for the land the Fulbourn community require to extend the community recreation ground. The land identified by Policy FUL/14 is agricultural and at present has no 'hope value' for residential.</p> <p>While the Parish Council recognise potentially the need to allow some development as a rural exception if not in position to buy the land outright, we also consider that allocating land for housing in the Green Belt is not currently justified and will only increase the expectations of speculative development.</p> <p>Their request to delete all policies related to landscape setting and village character and calls for additional housing in the Green Belt suggest a completely different interpretation of 'sustainable development', one we cannot support.</p> |

| Ref' | Other Representations | F.NP Comments (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|------------------------------------|---|
| 14.5 | Janus Henderson Property UK PIAF | <p>Background : Janus Henderson owns the land referred to as ‘Victoria House Parkland’ that lies between the old Victorian hospital building and Cambridge Road. It extends to circa 2.2 hectares and fully includes the Local Green Space ‘b’ identified in Policy FUL/05. To the west of LGS ‘b’, Janus Henderson ownership include small buildings within a mature landscape and the site which received planning permission in November 2018 for the demolition of the Fulbourn Social Club and construction of a new 72-bed care home. Their land is not identified for development and is located within the Green Belt and within a Conservation Area. It is also essential to the setting of Victoria House, a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, and the most significant building in the area.</p> <p>Janus Henderson argues that the site is well located in terms of connectivity and has mature trees that provide a visual barrier sufficient to allow development.</p> <p>Comments : The Fulbourn Hospital site is a key feature of Fulbourn and the ‘Victoria House Parkland’ is important to the appreciation of the heritage of the site and the setting of Victoria House itself, as recognised by its designation as a Conservation Area. Its designation by the F.NP as a LGS is related to the value of this site to the community (Evidence Paper 3). The Local Green Space has been used as a sports field and the venue for local league football matches. A bowling green, now a picnic area, was located directly in front of the Victorian building and the Fulbourn Social Club, whose site is now being redeveloped into the care-home, supported these sports facilities and was also the meeting venue for social clubs unrelated to the hospital activity. In recognition of the role this area played in the social life of Fulbourn village the planning consent for the redevelopment of the sports & social club site required a replacement facility to be built on the far north-western corner of Capital Park, adjacent to Fulbourn Old Drift.</p> <p>Further and significant employment will be provided nearby through the former Green Belt site allocation E/2 in the Local Plan (Peterhouse Technology Park). This site has been retained within the Green Belt by the current Local Plan and the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan. We see no evidence to go against their assessments.</p> <p>In addition, development of this area will harm the meaning of the Conservation Area and the setting of Victoria House (heritage local plan policies), compromise the separation of Fulbourn and Cambridge and the Important Visual Gap and affect important views (A1, A4, B3).</p> |
| 14.6 | KG Moss Will Trust and Moss Family | <p>Background: KG Moss Will Trust owns land off Home End and the Moss Family own land at Court Meadows House off Balsham Road in Fulbourn. The K G Moss Will Trust & Moss Family have been involved in many aspects of the development of Fulbourn village over the years and it is noted that land</p> |

| Ref' | Other Representations | F.NP Comments (on behalf of Parish Council) |
|------|--|---|
| | | <p>used by both parts of the current Fulbourn Health Centre and the Recreation Ground was purchased from them.</p> <p>The land at Home End lies adjacent to the Fulbourn Centre and is directly connected to the current Fulbourn recreation area. It is noted that in the representation from K G Moss Will Trust & Moss Family they recognise the potential needs of the village, as they state;</p> <p><i>'If allocated for residential development the land owned by KG Moss Will Trust off Home End could make planning contributions towards additional health facilities in the village, and the land owned by the Moss Family at Court Meadow House off Balsham Road could provide land for a multi-purpose health centre as part of a mixed use development'</i></p> <p>Comments: The land at Home End, adjacent to the Fulbourn Centre and just outside the village Development Framework is identified in the current Local Plan as an Important Countryside Frontage (Policy NH/13). The Village Design Guide (VDG) identifies the land as 'sensitive' and the location of a key visual gap bringing views of open landscape right inside the village. This assessment is supported by the F.NP, which identified View C8 at the same location, giving policy status to the assessment of the VDG.</p> <p>The land at Court Meadows House, off Balsham Road is dissected by Hindlodgers, an ancient right of way and bridleway that is identified as a key component of any proposed 'Integrated Green Network' as it connects directly to the Fulbourn Nature Reserve and, via various hedgerows, up towards the Roman Road. This land is not directly adjacent to the Recreation Ground and it was not identified as an obvious recreation ground extension but it is noted in their representation they say:</p> <p><i>'The land owned by KG Moss Will Trust off Home End could make planning contributions towards sport and recreation facilities in the village. The land owned by the Moss Family at Court Meadow House off Balsham Road could provide planning contributions and additional land to support the delivery of the extension to the recreation ground.'</i></p> <p>Apart from these considerations, the same apply as our overall comment at point 14 and our comment to Hill Residential point 14.4 above.</p> |
| 14.7 | <p>The District Council suggests several detailed modifications and refinements to various policies. Does the Parish Council have any comments on these suggestions?</p> | <p>Detail commentary has been produced as a separate document.</p> |