CHAPTER 5: VILLAGE FRAMEWORKS	
QUESTION NO.	**SUMMARY OF REPS**
QUESTION 6: Which of the potential amendments to village frameworks do you support or object to and why?	
VF1 Caldecote – Eastern edge of Caldecote Support:3 Object: 0 Comment: 0	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **Caldecote Parish Council** - Simple tidying up of village border. • Makes it clearer. • Current boundary very ragged / unusual in way follows individual buildings – require straightening. **OBJECTIONS:** • **COMMENTS:** •
VF2 Chittering Support: 1 Object: 3 Comment: 2	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **OBJECTIONS:** • Discontent with the framework for Chittering. • **Waterbeach Parish Council** – recommend framework removed and return to previous status. **COMMENTS:** • Propose small extension to allow a house to be built for ill relative in social housing in Waterbeach. • Boundary does not allow room for infill – suggest a bit more land is included to allow the odd plot to be developed. • Framework neither benefits nor protects village. Proposed by Parish Council to allow some housing. Include land adjacent to A10 and along School Lane / Chittering Drove. • Applaud proposal, but extend along School Lane to give uniformity on north and south sides.
VF3 Comberton – Comberton Village College Support: 44 Object: 16 Comment: 5	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Makes sense to allow school to develop within village framework / ensures college part of village. • Already in village - unlikely to have detrimental impact on character of village or rural landscape. • Makes sense to have CVC within our parish boundary. CVC already part of village. • Appropriate correction of anomalies. • Simply 'tidying up' but should not be license for CVC or any further development in Green Belt. • Ensures consistency of approach for college buildings. • Small, sensible developments. • Comberton has facilities and schools – large scale development inappropriate for small villages. • Good pedestrian access to schools, village centre and shops etc.

	OBJECTIONS: • Loss of Green Belt – should be maintained. • Green Belt does not need to be changed – protects character of village. Irrevocable loss of green space. • Communication between authorities, including Anglian Water needed – sewerage problems. • Object to expanding framework – must remain a village and maintain rural character. • Change will open door to changing category of village from Group to Minor Rural Centre and herald substantial development that can't sustain. • Lack of essential infrastructure, loss rural aspect, already additional housing, inadequate roads. **COMMENTS:** • Whether buildings in or out of Green Belt irrelevant as they are in situ and unlikely to be demolished. • **Comberton Parish Council** – makes sense to adjust framework between Toft and Comberton so areas remote from Toft are included in Comberton to allow local people affected to have greater say. Boundary Commission will need to allow. • Comberton / Toft boundary needs to be resolved before development permitted – finance going to Toft unacceptable. • Object as map does not represent the current structure of this village. • No objection so long as kept at that. • Moving CVC into framework sensible – if Bennell Farm site developed, include in Comberton not Toft parish.
VF4 Guilden Morden – High Street Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 0	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **OBJECTIONS:** • **Guilden Morden Parish Council** objects as no clear rationale has been provided. **COMMENTS:** •
VF5 Meldreth – Land at 97a North End Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 1	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **Meldreth Parish Council** approves inclusion of entire building which currently bisects boundary but not any of land associated with the property. **OBJECTIONS:** • **COMMENTS:** • No objection.
VF6 Sawston – London Road, Pampisford Support: 21 Object: 54 Comment: 6	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • If this can be done it would make planning issue much easier. • Makes sense as historically regarded as part of Sawston / most people regard it as Sawston. • Feels part of Sawston. All for generating jobs in Sawston.

	• Makes sense, then Pampisford is all on one side of road, not so confusing to visitors. • Support as long as no detrimental impact on local business – will they be relocated? Good location for houses though. • Given easy access to bypass / A505, should remain industrial estate, providing employment. • Ideal for building as most road infrastructure in place. • Physically linked to Sawston, meets Council's approach to identifying village frameworks, would not undermine ST/7, strengthens Council's objective of providing certainty to local communities and developers to development in villages. **OBJECTIONS:** • If effected, Rural Centre rather than Infill policies apply, but only apply to housing not employment (current use). Loss of employment to housing not supported. • Not supported by either parish council. Long history of separate development. Why single out this area? What is justification for Sawston Parish Council exercising power over Pampisford land? • Would create anomaly in planning and tensions between parishes. No merit to proposal – both parishes can comment on equal footing on planning applications. Loss separate identities. • No justification – nonsense if Pampisford had no influence on development in their village. Removes certainty about approaches to village development. • Seems change is to allow future housing development. • Area integral to Pampisford's nature and history. • Development would create an imbalance between residential / commercial, swamp Pampisford's community, adverse impact on village shops. • Incremental inclusion of additional land at western end of Brewery Road. • No explanation of why it is included, or advantages there are for inclusion that cannot be delivered under present arrangements. • Transfers authority to another council for whom I have not voted. • No benefits to changing – will not be considered for redevelopment. • If leads to more housing – infrastructure inadequate, road network poor, no capacity in schools, health centre and parking. • Sets dangerous precedent for further changes. • Pampisford has always been mix houses, farms, shops, light industry – changes ignore history –

	own heritage, thriving community - separate. • Against covering up more dwindling green spaces, possibility of water displacement causing flooding or lack of water during droughts. • Fragmentation of Pampisford. • **Pampisford Parish Council** – strongly objects to change that mean parish representations to planning issues would made by Sawston Parish Council. Lead to change to parish boundary. Separate communities. • Potentially removes more industrial sites reducing local employment, increasing traffic, making more commuter estate. **COMMENTS:** • Road and transport infrastructure does not support further development in this area.
VF7 Toft – Land at 46 High Street Support: 2 Object: 0 Comment: 0	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Will tidy up area and remove an anomaly. • Support Comberton / Toft as village college in Toft – new development also in the grey area between the two villages. **OBJECTIONS:** • **COMMENTS:** •
VF8 Toft – Land at Old Farm Business Centre Support:2 Object: 0 Comment: 0	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Adjacent to existing boundary and some buildings straddle boundary. Area needs tidying up and change ensures consistency in line with VF3. • Support Comberton / Toft as village college in Toft – new development also in the grey area between the two villages. **OBJECTIONS:** • **COMMENTS:** •
Please provide comments Support: 8 Object: 7 Comment: 66	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Support principle however it should not promote loss of Green Belt land. • Support these options otherwise such villages with few amenities will die. • Broadly support, provided roads are able to support traffic volume. • I see no reason not to support Parish Council proposals. • Support all if majority of local population in respective and neighbouring parishes agree. • **Papworth St Agnes Parish Council** – unaffected by proposals and support existing framework. • Support so each settlement can grow proportionately to its current size allowing it to evolve naturally. **OBJECTIONS:**

	• Village frameworks should stay as they are. Will lose character and individuality. • Villages need to look within existing boundaries. Once moved, leaves open for future widening. • If land is Green Belt, grazing or recreational, I would object to any changes. • Object to Bennell Farm, West Street, Comberton. • No – these must remain Group Villages, especially Comberton, to allow limited infill. • No change – Grantchester Parish Plan – no more houses in Grantchester, safeguard character. • Against wholesale development of fringe land – quality of housing often poor, detracts from character of village. • None, why are all these houses needed, sounds like greed to me. Nothing is affordable but great for buy to let / move out of London. **COMMENTS:** • No preference so long as developments are not large scale, good farming land not lost. Large scale developments should go where infrastructure and local services can cope. • Cottenham should be looking to develop more agriculture around village not houses. • Localism - wishes of the locals should be respected / up to the villages involved to give their opinions. Parish Councils do not always reflect parishioners' views. • Bennells Farm, if developed, is sufficient. • **Dry Drayton Parish Council** – no views on amendments in Table 5.2. • No problem with proposed changes, provided they do not encroach / impact other villages. • If local Parish Council supports, it should be supported. • Would not support enlarging these villages except Comberton. • Controlled village developments maybe with proposed sites - and others? • **Ickleton Parish Council** – as plan period so long, needs to be mechanism to bring forward proposals later if local support for changes. • **Oakington and Westwick Parish Council** – business of each Parish Council. • Areas within villages should be considered – renovation of larger houses into flats should be encouraged. • Boundaries may have to change to accommodate social housing – Parish Councils have hard decisions to make. • I would be suspicious such requests reflect secondary personal interests. • Use sites within villages first before greenfield land

	is proposed for development. Natural order to any further expansion of a village – common sense. • Why implement frameworks if they are liable to change at any time. • **Shepreth Parish Council** – no objection to proposals, but object to Cambridgeshire County Council's attempt to include their land, particularly as no consultation was undertaken. • Great Chishill's boundaries should remain as are – no expansion – housing (affordable or otherwise) or commercial. Quietude should be retained. • Too tight restrictions on development boundaries leads to high land costs and unaffordable homes. • These villages can accommodate more housing, but more services must be provided. Whaddon has no shop, school, doctor. More traffic. Park and Ride needed near Barton. • Comberton has successful CVC and Cambourne building new VC – so spare capacity? • Phrase "flexibility" means changing the rules to suit the purpose and ignoring reason restrictions put in place to start with. **Proposed Amendments to Village Frameworks:** • Caldecote – mobile home park – include in framework. • Cottenham – Ivatt Street - land for 1 or 2 houses. • Croxton – Abbotsley Road and A428 – new framework • Fowlmere – triangle site – incorporate social housing. • Girton – south of Huntingdon Road – part of Girton – anomaly that excluded. • Guilden Morden - Dubbs Knoll Road – affordable housing. • Linton – village green / Paynes Meadow (suggested by Linton Parish Council) • Longstanton – High Street – anomaly - house in large grounds. • Orwell – Hillside – new framework (suggested by Orwell Parish Council). • Orwell – Fisher's Lane - allow business to expand. • Sawston – Whitefield Way – anomaly - garden / Green Belt boundary. • Steeple Morden – Trap Road – include garden. • Waterbeach – Land at Poorsfield Road - SHLAA Sites 142, 043 and 270 – land for housing.
QUESTION 7: Which of the Parish Council proposed amendments to village frameworks do you support or object to and why?	

PC3 Comberton – Land north of West Street Support: 36 Object: 29 Comment: 4	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • PC3 makes sense. Sensible use of eyesore. • Support - land currently unused and un-useful! Not attractive; no wildlife; should be available to PC for small scale development. • Unlikely to have detrimental effect on character of village, rural landscape, cause noticeable effect on traffic volumes, additional loading on sewage / drainage system. • Comberton parish is most logical place for these sites to be considered. • A smaller building site is more acceptable. • PC3 needs filling with 3-4 low cost high density key worker homes, currently wasteland / unsightly • Simply 'tidying up' but should not be license for CVC or any further development in Green Belt. • Natural extension to framework and suitable for single dwelling without affecting village character. • Within Toft parish – may be available as exception site if not included in framework. If H10 comes forward, no reason why change not take place. • Relates to built form not countryside, separated by mature and defensible boundary. Logical conclusion to development on north side of West Street. Not involve change to Green Belt. • Supported by Toft and Comberton Parish Councils • Single house only. • Good pedestrian access to school, village centre and shops etc. **OBJECTIONS:** • Unsuitable for development because of traffic. • Loss of Green Belt – must be maintained. • Green Belt does not need to be changed – protect character of village. Incremental development creates irrevocable loss of green space. • Object to changes to framework regardless of whether parish council support. Framework should fulfil intention of preventing urbanising the countryside / restricting unsuitable development. • Unsure how this affects village. • Communication between authorities, including Anglian Water needed – sewerage problems. • Should not be developed – outside framework – subject to large numbers objections over years, upheld at appeal. • Opposite access to CVC with 20+ buses, coincides with end of cycle way - dangerous. • Object as map does not represent the current structure of the village. • Lack of essential infrastructure, loss rural aspect, already have additional housing, inadequate road. **COMMENTS:** • Large number of additional housing units required

	- fail to understand why concerned with options VF3 and PC3. PC3 seems to relate to provision of one dwelling - hardly going to impact on housing needs. • **Comberton Parish Council** – makes sense to adjust framework between Toft and Comberton so areas remote from Toft are included in Comberton to allow local people affected to have greater say. Boundary Commission will need to allow.
PC4 Little Gransden – Land bounding 6 Primrose Hill Support: 3 Object: 3 Comment: 6	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • In favour of new housing here. • Land opposite subject of outline planning application, therefore PC4 becomes a natural and logical site for future village infill. • Not in conservation area, not visible from listed building • Two separate points of vehicular access. **OBJECTIONS:** • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. **COMMENTS:** • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village. • Some areas could be enhanced by small-scale, careful, sympathetic planning. • More drive access would be required, speed issues along Primrose Hill. • Would detract from present privacy. • Too extensive. • No discussion or consultation with residents. • To improve our village and make more infill sites • No objection to single infill properties, strongly oppose any major house building projects.
PC5 Little Gransden – South of Mill Road Support: 2 Object: 9 Comment: 7	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Support all. • Support as infill only. Giving local families the opportunities to stay in village grown up in. **OBJECTIONS:** • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Lack of detailed explanation or justification. • Ancient historic character would be compromised. • Biodiversity or wildlife would be compromised.

	• Car parking issue. • No discussion about improving infrastructure. • Should not include “bulge” to the East – compromise the watercourse. • Serious drainage issues. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. • Highly sensitive entrance to the village would be spoilt. • Hazardous road access. • Further development inappropriate. • Increase in surface run off issues. • Not part of conurbation. • What control would villagers have over what is built there? **COMMENTS:** • Drainage and run off. • Wildlife area. • Boundary should not go east of brook. • Ensure brook is not compromised – could lead to flooding. • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village. • Too extensive. • No discussion or consultation with residents. • Perhaps an ‘island’ insertion for a dwelling to replace the dilapidated barn could be considered rather than extending the area up from the village. • To improve our village and make more infill sites • No objection to single infill properties but I strongly oppose any major house building projects.
PC6 Little Gransden – Church Street Support: 1 Object: 6 Comment: 5	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Support all. **OBJECTIONS:** • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Within Conservation Area. • Part of the proposed infill site would require access off the bridleway. • Church Street should be identified as an ICF. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village

	framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. • Inappropriate to put new housing amongst listed buildings on a quiet dead-end road. • Already issues for turning vehicles, including lorries. • Development would destroy the rural ambience and setting. • Road is more of a lane and often congested with parked cars. **COMMENTS:** • Undeveloped plot of land included in PC6 but excluded in PC6A is an ideal plot for a suitable house to be built on. • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village. • Sensitive part of the village with a combination of significant listed properties and extremely poor access. • Infill will damage the settings of some of the most beautiful houses in the village. • An increase traffic along the single track road will damage the verges and local ecology. • Too extensive. • No discussion or consultation with residents. • No objection to single infill properties but I strongly oppose any major house building projects.
PC7 Little Gransden – West of Primrose Walk Support: 3 Object: 4 Comment: 4	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • In favour of new housing here. • Support all. • Support as infill only. Giving local families the opportunities to stay in village grown up in. **OBJECTIONS:** • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. • Area is of outstanding beauty enjoyed by ramblers, children etc. • Loss of footpath, surrounding wooded area and hedgerows would be disastrous for wildlife. • Road is barely width of a single car – could not cope with construction lorries. **COMMENTS:** • Essential that great thought is given to the existing

	feel of the village.
PC8 Little Gransden – Land opposite Primrose Walk Support: 4 Object: 3 Comment: 5	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • In favour of new housing here. • Support all. • Being the only road frontage in Primrose Hill not built-up this makes obvious sense. • Support as infill only. Giving local families the opportunities to stay in the village they have grown up in. **OBJECTIONS:** • Framework should fulfil the intention of preventing urbanising the countryside and restricting sustainable development. • Will almost double developed area. • Significant character change. • Overload road and drainage systems. • Inflate land prices. • Pockets for infill development within village framework. • Lack of biodiversity consideration. • Lack of infrastructure. **COMMENTS:** • Essential that great thought is given to the existing feel of the village. • Too extensive. • No discussion or consultation with residents. • To improve our village and make more infill sites. • No objection to single infill properties but I strongly oppose any major house building projects.
Other Little Gransden Comments	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • In favour of new housing here. • Support all. • Being the only road frontage in Primrose Hill not built-up this makes obvious sense. **OBJECTIONS:** • Neither necessary nor desirable - double size village. • Maintain 'Infill-only' policy. • Not opposed to one or two additional houses. • Would open up village to over-development and damage its integrity, especially loose ribbon development. • Parish Council submitted proposals without prior consultation. • Need for biodiversity appraisal to protect and enhance wildlife habitats. • Ancient centre of village is Conservation Area. Since 1986, 30 houses built without detriment to integrity - demonstrates infill-only policy successful. • Village does not require development to sustain long term - several areas within few miles. • Lack of infrastructure, prone to flooding and

	inadequate drainage. • No minutes of PC meeting, but concern that views will be played down or ignored. • Too extensive. **COMMENTS:** • Four of the five proposals are closely linked to the members of the Parish Council. • Why were parishioners not offered the chance at an open forum to discuss or gauge public feelings? • Matter seems to have been conducted behind closed doors. • Other places in the village could have been included in the proposal don't appear to have been considered. • For the last 30 years or so planning permission for a bungalow in The Drift has been turned down – the reason I was turned down should also apply to the new proposals. • Disappointed not to have been consulted. • All infill areas developed so must be accepted that either Little Gransden remains static or the village framework be amended. • Important to maintain small green spaces in the village rather than building on them – important in maintaining habitats, views and environments which are essential to the character of the village.
PC9 Toft – Offices and barns near Golf Club Support: 2 Object: 1 Comment: 0	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Including this area within framework allows it to be tidied up – next to houses on edge of framework, gateway to village. Ensures consistency of approach with VF3 and VF8. • Support inclusion of buildings next to golf club – commercial use, not Green Belt, partly within Conservation Area which indicates close relationship to village- part of unbroken frontage. **OBJECTIONS:** • **CPRE** – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. **COMMENTS:** •
PC10 Whaddon – Land west of 97 Meldreth Road Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 4	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **OBJECTIONS:** • **CPRE** – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. **COMMENTS:** • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall appearance of nice village.

	• **Orwell Parish Council** – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. • May take pressure off surrounding villages a little. • **English Heritage** - May appear logical 'rounding off' but historic map in Whaddon Village Design Statement shows part of last vestiges of 'Great Green'. Development of site would mask historic form of village and potentially impact on setting of two Grade II listed former farmhouses.
PC11 Whaddon – Land east of 123 Meldreth Road Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment:3	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **OBJECTIONS:** • **CPRE** – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. **COMMENTS:** • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall appearance of nice village. • **Orwell Parish Council** – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. May take pressure off surrounding villages a little.
PC12 Whaddon – Land at 129 Meldreth Road Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 3	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **OBJECTIONS:** • **CPRE** – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. **COMMENTS:** • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall appearance of nice village. • **Orwell Parish Council** – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. • May take pressure off surrounding villages a little.
PC13 Whaddon – Land south of Meldreth Road Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 3	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • **OBJECTIONS:** • **CPRE** – object regardless of whether there is Parish Council support. Framework should prevent urbanising countryside and restricting unsustainable development. **COMMENTS:** • Flexible approach to infilling etc. could improve overall appearance of nice village. • **Orwell Parish Council** – major concerns with development if sewerage feeds into Foxton Sewerage Works, as out-dated facility frequently

	exceeds capacity - impact on Orwell and Wimpole. • May take pressure off surrounding villages a little.
Please provide comments Support: 5 Object: 6 Comment: 10	**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** • Support all of them as much better idea to allow for small villages to stay viable and sustainable than have massive new towns. • **Orwell Parish Council** – support all if majority of local population in respective parishes and neighbouring parishes agree. • **Teversham Parish Council** – parish councils and local communities should be supported in achieving schemes that have local support. **OBJECTIONS:** • Not support extensions of current outlying villages into undeveloped land around village perimeters – loss character and individuality. • Concern about continuing loss farmland and Green Belt. • Object to PC4-8 – permission turned down for bungalow on Drift now plans for development at other end of street – same reasoning would apply. • Object to parish councils making changes to boundaries of their villages – infrastructure cannot cope with more houses – roads, transport links. • Acknowledge some infill needed but Little Gransden proposals too extensive. **COMMENTS:** • None if Green Belt lost. • **Cottenham Parish Council** - Option 1 require amendment of V/F, as affordable housing needs to be guaranteed for first refusal to those in need in village - affordable home sites need to be identified in advance of V/F amendment to remain adjacent but outside. Options 2 and 3 require V/F amendment that predetermines specific uses for land, including: industrial, recreational, green open-space, housing, roads. • **Litlington Parish Council** - whilst retaining village framework, consider small amounts of development outside, where strict requirements met, and support of Parish Council. • **Natural England** - concerns with Parish Council proposals - seek to include areas comprising sporadic agricultural outbuildings, farm tracks. Risk will encourage further development and potentially cause harm to natural environment and landscape character. • Little Gransden – 4 of 5 proposals closely linked to members of parish council. Parishioners not offered chance to discuss – other changes could have been included. Either accept village remains static or make changes. Green spaces important to habitats, views and environments essential to character of village which may justify protection as

	Local Green Space.