

Appendix 8: Report of comments received from Greater Cambridge Shared Planning at Regulation 14 stage.

Consultation took place 9 October to 19 November 2023. This document details comments received from the Greater Cambridges Shared Planning Services (GCSP) alongside the Parish Council response to these comments.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
General	4. We note that the plan makes no reference to consultation with businesses either specifically or as part of wider consultation for the plan. This is a requirement of the process, so should be demonstrated in the Consultation Statement that it has been carried out for the Submission stage. It is especially important in Pampisford given the high proportion of employment land relative to the size of the village. It may be helpful to identify any issues encountered locally and if businesses have plans to expand or perceive that there are negative issues affecting them. These could include lack of transport, affordable housing, reliable broadband or recruitment issues, which may be relevant in shaping the NP Policies.	A range of local businesses were notified of the draft Neighbourhood Plan at Regulation 14 stage. This includes Dixons International Group (Brewery Road employment area) and Unity Campus (London Road employment area). The Consultation Statement accompanying the submission NP provides further detail.
PAM 1	9. Would consider removing part a) of policy because it repeats Local Plan policy H/9 which is unnecessary as this will already be considered when decisions are made about new development.	It is assumed this comment relates to the first paragraph of the policy. There is no part a). Policy H/9 in the Local Plan states the mix of market homes on sites of 9 or fewer houses should take account of local circumstances. It is therefore appropriate to retain clause 1 in this policy.
	10. Policy justification is logical and policy is well-written.	Noted.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	11. The Policy context and rationale could refer to and include some of the text from page 19 (2.5. Infill, upgrades and extensions) of the 'Pampisford Code Final' document.	Matters relating to design are covered in PAM 3 and PAM 4.
	<p>12. 'Where a wheelchair user...M4(3) standard' – We are not sure that this policy would stand up at examination because currently our Local Plan policy asks for sites providing over 20 units needing to deliver M4(2) provision – see Policy H/9: Housing Mix:</p> <p><i>'5% of homes in a development should be built to the accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) standard rounding down to the nearest whole property. This provision shall be split evenly between the affordable and market homes in a development rounding to the nearest whole number.'</i></p>	<p>Noted. We consider the policy requirement to be appropriate given population age profile now and in the future. It is also appropriate given the recommendation 47 in the Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk Housing Needs Specific Groups Study (2021), referred to in paragraph 6.1.14 of the NP. The priority to raise accessibility standards for new homes is recognised nationally and the Government announced its commitment to raising standards in July 2022¹. It is understood the government intends to mandate the achievement of M4 (2) provision via Building Regulations. Until this comes into place, the requirement as part of Policy PAM 1 can apply.</p>

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/raising-accessibility-standards-for-new-homes/outcome/raising-accessibility-standards-for-new-homes-summary-of-consultation-responses-and-government-response>

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	<p>13. This policy could be strengthened to use the Neighbourhood Plan as an opportunity to obtain more affordable housing for local people. We have included, but slightly tweaked, an example policy from West Wickham's Neighbourhood Plan, demonstrating how this could be achieved for Pampisford:</p> <p><i>'Larger residential development schemes coming forward under the exceptional circumstances set out in Policy S/11 of South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan (more than 2 and up to 8 dwellings on brownfield sites) will be supported where the identified positive overall benefit to the village includes the delivery of affordable homes which meet the needs of local people whose needs are not met by the market and smaller homes which will help to address the low stock of two and three bedroom homes in the Parish.'</i></p>	<p>Policy has been updated to incorporate this suggestion.</p>
PAM 2	<p>14. This policy appears quite similar to H/11: Rural Exception Site Affordable Housing from South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan, so it could be removed unless you can demonstrate a distinct difference that would apply to Pampisford.</p>	<p>This is not accepted. Through PAM 2, the community is expressing in principle support for rural exception sites where it can help to address Pampisford specific needs and where development contributes positively existing character of the village. This is an important part of the plan given the affordability issues (see paragraph 6.2.2. of the NP) and NPPF policy that restricts the ability to require affordable housing on sites with less than 10 units.</p>
	<p>15. Paragraph 6.2.5 needs to be tightened. It currently says that 'rural exception sites lie outside of the village framework and that they require evidence of local</p>	<p>It is not clear what this is a reference to. Paragraph 6.2.7</p>

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	housing need'. However, district data cannot be used as a justification for exception sites, you would need to use the information from the Housing Needs Survey	states that rural exception schemes will only be supported if evidence is in place that demonstrates a parish-specific need for the housing ..."
	16. In relation to paragraph 6.2.9, the council have a First Homes interim position statement . At present SCDC are not looking to force the adoption of First Homes in the district. The Parish Council can state preference if a developer wishes to bring it forward First Homes they wish for the site to have a local connection criteria applied as you have suggested in PAM 2.	Noted.
PAM 3	17. Explanation about how NP group have carried out design work is clear and logical.	Noted
	18. In justification, you could also include national landscape character area context, how the Neighbourhood Plan Area links to the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment 2021 character areas, and then add detail from the design code.	Agreed. Paragraph 6.3.4 in the Reg 14 plan has been moved to appear directly underneath the 'Policy context and rationale' heading. The wording has been slightly amended and additional text provided to explain more fully the landscape character area 8a (Pampisford Lowland Chalklands) as described in Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment 2021.
	19. Policy reads well and we support the policy.	Noted
PAM 4	20. It might be prudent to add a line in the policy about what a coherent and attractive streetscape would be and what measures the policy would seek to implement. E.g., in the northern part of the road do you want to hide the	Policy PAM has been amended to increase clarity.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	industrial units between hedgerows? What is the difference between what you want to achieve at the north gateway as opposed to the south? In the south do you want a gateway feature?	
	21. Perhaps more photos would help illustrate the problems with the street scene. Other aspects of the street scenes to consider could be footway surface quality, widths of streets and footways, how well maintained they are, green verges, signage, barriers, less safe or less visible sections, and poor street lighting. Is it the case that the Brewery Road/London Road village gateway is satisfactory in terms of these other aspects as a point of contrast with the problems identified? In the draft policy below, I've highlighted where this could be added in.	Noted.
	22. The policy doesn't refer to the type or scale of development where contributions are sought. The policy might not be suitable for minor applications (extensions), or for small numbers of new housing dwellings.	Noted. The last clause states where 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development'.
	23. Cambridgeshire County Council have said that "Given the context policy PAM 4 is unlikely to impinge on the operation of the adopted public highway (any works within the same would need the Highway Authority's consent), so from the perspective of the Highway Authority PAM 4 is acceptable".	Noted
	24. We do however have concerns about the deliverability of this policy and seek information about who owns the pathway and hedges next to the road. Is it the businesses or Cambridgeshire County Council? Depending on the owner, the policy emphasis could change to ensure that the policy is strong enough to capture contributions efficiently. For example, if the County Council owns the hedges and pathway, then it would make sense to emphasise using contributions to improve the 'public realm' of that area. However, if the hedges and pathways are owned by the businesses, with little publicly owned land, then the policy needs to change to place the onus upon the businesses to improve the land next to the road as part of any future proposals. The NP group is encouraged to speak	The policy has been amended so that it would work in both scenarios. A scenario where the developer owns the land where the improvements are to take place and a scenario where the area is not owned by the developer.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	<p>to Jon Finney (jon.finney@cambridgeshire.gov.uk) at the County Council to find out about the extent of the adopted highway to see if the County Council owns all road and the land next to it.</p>	
	<p>25. Following on from this, we have put together an edited draft policy you could use with new additions in red to address this issue:</p> <p><i>The area shown on Map 5 is defined as the London Road street scene improvement area. In the event of development proposals coming forward along London Road, including redevelopment of existing buildings, opportunities will be sought to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improve landscaping that better defines London Road village gateway north (e.g. xxxx) ;</i> • <i>Improve landscaping that better defines the London Road village gateway south, proposed as Local Green Space;</i> • <i>Implement design and/or landscaping schemes that help to create a more coherent and attractive streetscape along the built-up frontage of London Road (e.g., better defined boundary treatment of properties, amenity spaces or other areas of public realm when development comes forward); and</i> • <i>Improvements will be delivered directly and thereafter maintained by landowners. Buildings that are accessed from but do not front onto London Road might be required to pay contributions towards these initiatives where necessary to achieve a sense of place as part of new development, where directly, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</i> 	
PAM 5	<p>26. Reference is made in para 6.5.2 to the Local Green Space Assessment being “available to view alongside the Plan”. This does not appear to be available on the website and we are unable to determine fully as to whether the proposed LGS</p>	<p>The open spaces assessment has been prepared, has been shared with applicable stakeholders and will be made available at submission stage.</p>
	<p>27. Do any of the protected green spaces have any nature conservation value, protection or designations or, if not, is that something which could be an objective in the NP?</p>	<p>As set out in Paragraph 6.5.3, the Spinney (LGS 1) was initially set up as a nature reserve. As shown on Map 7 it includes – deciduous</p>

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
		woodland, a priority habitat. The Claypit (LGS 3) is also valued for its value to local wildlife. Community Action 7 (see Chapter 7) states the PC will work alongside stakeholders to deliver environmental measures at these two sites. A reference to Community Action Point 7 will be inserted in this part of the plan.
	28. The Policy itself is effectively worded.	Noted.
PAM 6	29. Could some of the Design Code information in support text be summarised as it is quite detailed for the reader. Is it necessary to even reproduce this information if it's already in Design Code? Could just keep 6.64, but summarise this information, i.e. the Design Code had key implications for height, massing, etc. Perhaps this could be linked to briefly summarise the features of built form, streetscape and boundary treatment, etc. for each of the 5 character areas to establish what is the existing character at the beginning of the chapter.	In light of these comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix two and Three are retained but updated to take on board comments made at Regulation 14 stage - The supporting text to Policy PAM 6 to list the applicable Design Codes but not repeat them - A summary is provided at in the context to PAM 6 that summarises the character of the 5 character areas
	30. Policy reads well and it is good that is linked to the Design Code in a clear way. Perhaps some of the language could be tightened, i.e 'any material that is not in	Accepted. See changes document

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	keeping with local character should be avoided should not be used?.' Could add in 'the site layout and boundary treatments should be designed to avoid a streetscape being dominated by vehicles along the front of properties.' Could also add in 'Bricks should be predominantly in rich hues of orange and yellow to coordinate with existing materials in the village'.	
	31. Perhaps more definition is needed in relation to 'tree canopy', i.e. is this trees on the site, next to the site, or specific trees?	It is a reference to the parish tree canopy generally. The bullet point has been amended to read "to any nearby tree canopy". See changes document.
PAM 7	32. Policy reads well and it is good that it follows on from evidence in a logical manner. The policy could also be refined to reflect South Cambs Local Plan policy SC/8, e.g., allotments would be replaced by an area of equivalent or better quantity and quality and in a suitable location.	Noted.
	33. The scope of the policy could be widened so that it protects community facilities generally rather than just allotments, but this would be the Parish Council's decision.	Noted. But Policy SC/3 in South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan will apply alongside the NP and there is no need to repeat it.
	34. Point 6.7.2 and point 6.7.3 of the policy justification are well written, however they don't refer to allotments, so perhaps could be removed (or kept if it was part of a wider policy seeking to protect community land and facilities)?	The text is important context but it has been moved to appear above the policy heading.
PAM 8	35. Policy justification reads well and policy is well-written.	Noted
	36. We believe the site has been sold since the fire that destroyed the pub in 2021. The site was subsequently registered as an Asset of Community Value on the basis of 'recent past' community value, having been nominated by the Parish Council. South Cambridgeshire's Asset of Community Value Register shows that a notification to dispose of the asset was received on the 17 th March this year, which triggered the moratorium process, and the site has now entered the	Noted. The policy has been amended to reflect the priority to see this village centre site developed.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	protected period which extends to Sept 2024. There is communication between the Parish Council and our Planning Compliance team in relation to the site. The Neighbourhood Plan should reflect any recent changes.	
	37. The loss of employment associated with the pub is regrettable, however, the community value is of primary concern.	Noted
PAM 9	38. Policy justification reads well and is clear.	Noted
	39. Some of the supporting text could be surmised specifically the part about what is contained in the Net Zero Carbon Toolkit. Perhaps just Table 3 and a few lines could be retained?	The text is retained as it provides useful guidance
	40. We are supportive of the level of ambition in the policy which supports implementation of current adopted policy while also encouraging the adoption of more ambitious approaches.	Noted
	41. In the first sentence of the policy, it would be helpful to add clarification that this element relates to the adopted Local Plan. The wording could be slightly amended to read "All development proposals will be expected to embed the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation in line with <u>policies CC/1 and CC/3 of the adopted Local Plan.</u> "	Not accepted. The policy needs to apply when the new Local Plan is adopted.
	42. In relation to the policy context and rationale, from a clarity and implementation perspective, it would be helpful to reorder this section so that it first references adopted policy (so CC/1 of the Local Plan, but also CC/3 as this sets the requirements for energy use and carbon emissions in new development). Reference could also be made to the guidance in the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD as this supports the policy element related to the energy hierarchy and also provides more guidance on many of the sustainability elements that are included in the Design Code. This can then be followed by the wording about the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan and the Levitt Bernstein toolkit, which all relate to the element of the	Accepted. The supporting text now starts with South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan context and SPD.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	policy that encourages more innovative and ambitious approaches. Reordering would help this section flow a little better and provide the clarification that the adopted policies are the starting point, but with support for greater ambition.	
PAM 10	43Policy reads well.	Noted
	44. In a similar comment to our previous feedback, we feel that this policy replicates Local Plan policy. Cycle and electric parking are already covered by TI/2 'Planning for Sustainable Travel' from South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan. Electric car parking is covered by policy TI/3 'Parking Provision' and policy TI/10 'Broadband' already covers broadband. It is also likely to be covered in the new Local Plan.	The policy is retained but note the amendments to this policy.
	45. We question how the requirement to incorporate a dedicated home office area could be monitored and enforced?	This is about ensuring the layout of dwellings in the initial instances is suitable for home working. It is not about monitoring how people use their homes once they are built.
	46. The requirement for cycle storage is supported but there will need to be an agreed approach on where within site it will be provided. Clarification within the supporting text of the policy would help guide applicants.	Design Guidance Code 3.2.1. 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 are relevant here (see Appendix Two to NP) or page 21 of the Design Guidance document. The supporting text to the policy has been amended to reference this.
	47. You could also consider requiring the provision of the highest speed broadband to facilitate home working in the policy and adding reference to the fact that charging points should meet the technical requirements set out in Part S of the Building Regulations, which would ensure that proper EV charge points get installed.	We believe the provision of broadband technology is mandated through building regulations. We have amended the first bullet point to reference

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
		technical requirements set out in Part S of the building Regulations.
PAM 11	48. Given the impending requirements for development proposals to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain, it would be perhaps better if the policy sought to minimise the loss of any trees or hedgerows and then require the benefits of the proposal to outweigh any loss and to provide suitable on-site mitigation.	Accepted. See changes document.
	49. If the Parish Council intend to keep the policy, we recommend adding in the following: 'Where a development proposal is likely to affect trees, woodland or hedgerows, it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will be expected to be accompanied by a professional arboricultural survey report undertaken to the appropriate standards (to BS5837) identifying the arboricultural landscape and biodiversity value of the trees.' 	Accepted. See changes document.
	50. Also recommend clarifying policy when it says: 'Where the developer cannot replace such features within the site a financial contribution will be sought'. How is this calculated?- suggest that a standard method is used if this remains in the policy, e.g. CAVAT (Itoa.org.uk)	Accepted. See changes document.
	51. Should the policy also say that when replacing trees and hedgerows, they should be native species of a local provenance? The policy currently says this for new planting but not for replacement.	Accepted. See comments document
	52. You could also add in that 'Non-native trees which are resilient to climate change and have nature conservation value will also be considered.'	Accepted. See comments document
PAM 12	53. In relation to 6.12.5, arable weeds tend to exist within the arable crop and field margin. However, the increase in use of pesticide has reduce these populations dramatically. Arable weeds encourage a range of invertebrate life, which in-turn encourages passerine and galliform bird species. Protection of such arable weed species would require a change in management from	It is felt this is beyond the scope of the planning policies in the NP. However, the community would support the and champion the return of the interrupted brome and other rare plants. Community

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	landowners and protection of arable land from development. Is that what the Plan is encouraging?	Action Point 7 has been updated to include this point.
	54. In relation to 6.12.10, the Environment Act has not mandated a minimum Biodiversity Net Gain on all development. There are to be exceptions which will be provided through guidance and secondary legislation to be released in November 2023, with the first phase of mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain on all Major applications starting in January 2024, with Minor developments being eligible from April 2024. Exceptions are likely to include all householder applications, all permitted development applications and those applications that do not reach the de-minimum threshold impacting less than 25 m ² of qualifying area habitat or 5m of hedge or watercourse habitat. Biodiversity net gain is already a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (please see paragraphs 174,179, and 180) and has been since 2018. This replaces the previous concept of “no net loss” that was a feature of the previous National Planning Policy Framework. The Environment Act 2021 provides more robust legislation and mandates a minimum 10% gain.	Ok. Paragraph 6.12.10 has been amended to refer to ‘most’ instead of ‘all’.
	55. In relation to 6.12.16 – we now have Metric 4.0, and once guidance is released by DEFRA in November 2023 a new iteration of the Metric will be released. This should be updated as and when the new metric is released. Perhaps this could be updated or removed?	Now refers to Metric 4.0 or its successor
	56. In relation to 6.12.17 – There is specific guidance on the use of the Small Sites Metric and there are other qualifying factors that should be considered such as the presence of protected species and if offsite biodiversity credits will need to be purchased to provide the required % gain. Householder applications are likely to be exempt from providing a mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. Perhaps this could be removed because it is quite similar to national guidance?	Noted. Paragraph has been amended to refer to Small Sites Metric and the fact that some scheme will be exempt from the BNG requirement.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	<p>57. In relation to language used in point ii that it is not correct. The loss of protected habitats should be a principal reason for refusal of the application. Priority habitats (or habitats of principal concern as described in Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) are generally regarded as a principal concern to planning decisions and are accounted for within the biodiversity metric as habitat of High or Very High distinctiveness. This means they score very highly within the Metric and require like for like replacement either on or offsite. Other habitats such as ancient woodland are regarded as irreplaceable and are not accounted for with the metric as there is no reasonable way to recreate them. The policy wording must be clear on the terms they are using to describe different layers of protection between statutory and non-statutory designations.</p>	<p>Accepted. Text has been amended to avoid this error.</p> <p>Note: There is no ancient woodland in Pampisford but there are veteran trees.</p>
	<p>58. We have published an interim guidance document on the implementation of biodiversity net gain which follows a strict hierarchy to aid decision making on where biodiversity credits should be aimed at (please see GCSP Interim Offsite BNG Protocol (greatercambridgeplanning.org)). The second paragraph and points i and ii of the second paragraph should align with these principles. This document has been approved by the relevant South Cambridgeshire District Council committees and therefore is relevant.</p>	<p>Noted. The clause has been amended to ensure offsite provisions has regard to this guidance.</p>
	<p>59. Maps 7 and 8 could also serve and a guide to where local small scale Biodiversity net gain could take place. Developers will sometimes look to Parish Councils for information about any local Landowners who would be interested in selling credits. If the Parish Council had a database of such landowners, or a strategic plan of where they want Biodiversity Net Gain credits to be spent within the parish boundaries, this could provide a local biodiversity resource for small scale development rather than all credits being bought from larger habitat banks often many miles away.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	<p>60. 6.18.2 – public rights of way tend to diminish biodiversity rather than enhance them. Mostly due to dog walkers disturbing ground nesting birds and other wildlife or trampling habitats and coursing habitat degradation through unmanaged pathways. If the Parish Council wish for PAM 18 to support PAM 12 they must understand that some restrictions may be necessary, for example restricting access during roosting or breeding seasons, raised walkways to prevent erosion, restrictions on dog walking during sensitive periods, and dog proof fencing if necessary.</p>	<p>This is noted and it applies to rural routes throughout the country. There are so few public rights of way in Pampisford that opening up access is nevertheless a priority. We agree that rural routes should be used with consideration which could be encouraged through signage.</p>
PAM 13	<p>61. Cambridgeshire County Council have written in relation to this policy that: “It will be impractical to have a transport assessment that will be meaningful for all development, as this could include everything from an extension to a house to larger sites. The proposal needs to set a sensible limit on the size of development. The Transport Assessments Teams website gives a good break down of the level at which accessing transport becomes empirically viable: https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/planning-and-development/developing-new-communities</p> <p>The Highway Authority does not accept the use of the adopted public highway part of the parking allocation for any development. Not only do we have powers (independent of the planning process) to install waiting restrictions, but parking on the highway is available to all, so there is no guarantee that such parking will mitigate any impact of a development. Developments should always be able to provide a suitable level of parking for both cars and cycles within the curtilage of their site. The Highway Authority can only seek works that directly mitigate the impact of a development, so the use of ‘quiet tyre technology’ would fall outside our remit and would also require careful consideration in relationship to its life span and durability.’</p>	<p>First clause has been slightly amended to address CCC interpretation of the policy.</p> <p>With regards to the comments from highways in relation to on-street parking. There are many examples of land use where the development always or often leads to on-street parking. The impact of this on road safety and residential amenity is an important consideration. There is no suggestion in Policy PAM 13 that on-street parking can</p>

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
		mitigate the impacts of a particular development scheme.
	62. Does all development include householder development too?	Yes. But Clause 1 is only relevant where there is an impact on road safety.
	63. Policy doesn't mention cycling/cycle routes or encouraging walking and promoting public transport.	Policy PAM 10 has been amended to incorporate this
PAM 14	<p>64. The NP lists at 6.14.10 "The following Local Plan policies are applicable to proposals which may lead to pollution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SC/9: Lighting proposals • Policy SC/10: Noise pollution • Policy SC/12: Air quality • Policy CC/7: Water Quality" <p>6.14.10 should also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SC/14 : Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air • Policy SC/HQ1: Design Principles • Policy CC/1 : Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change 	Accepted. See changes document.
	65. The policy justification reads well. In a similar comment to the previous batch of feedback, we would question why the policy is asking for a statement when the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan already asks for assessments on development through policies SC/10-Noise pollution, 9.54 " noise impact assessment", SC/12-Air Quality, 7. 'relevant assessment', SC/14- Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air 2 and SC/HQ-1 n, and CC/1.	Noted. The policy is included to respond to parish specific concerns with respect to employment areas in Pampisford village.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	66. It has been noted that there aren't clear environmental receptors (areas which are places that could be harmed by pollution, i.e. parks, wildlife habitats) identified in the policy.	The policy does refer to groundwater as an environmental receptor in particular with respect to the groundwater protection zone.
	67. The policy could be considered restrictive to the businesses development and operations and therefore not be proportionate. Consequently we ask that the request for an assessment of potential pollution is removed or that any assessment is proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposal.	Policy has been amended to refer to assessment proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposal.
PAM 15	68. Policy reads well. For all of the policies relating to the employment areas, you will need to include maps clearly identifying the boundary of the area to which the policy applies.	These are shown on Map 6. The policy has been amended to make this more explicit.
	69. Policy PAM 15, PAM 16, and PAM 17 are all similar. Perhaps include them under one policy? The addition of annotated photos of the areas would help illustrate what needs improving about these 3 areas of the village.	Noted.
PAM 16	70. Policy reads well. For all of the policies relating to the employment areas, you will need to include maps.	These are shown on Map 6. The policy has been amended to make this more explicit.
	71. Are either of the policy points in PAM16 distinct from PAM4?	The two policies are closely linked. The distinction is that PAM 16 refers specific to development coming forward at London Road employment area, where as Policy PAM 4 applies more broadly to proposals coming forward along London Road.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
PAM 17	72. For all of the policies relating to the employment areas, you will need to include maps	These are shown on Map 6. The policy has been amended to make this more explicit.
	73. It might be useful to identify heritage assets on a map. Historic England offers a free service which could be used: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/map-search/ If you are using ParishOnline, they are also available to view on one of the layers.	The conservation area boundary is shown on Map 2 as is the historic parks and gardens. Further designated heritage assets are shown on Map 11. A new map to be inserted to show close up of heritage assets and the policy to be amended to reference these. See changes document
	74. The use of the word “harmony” is not generally used when it comes to considering the impact of development on heritage assets. We refer you to Paras 199 to 208 of the NPPF which identifies that the impact on heritage assets should be measured in terms of “harm”. The policy would be clearer if it referenced proposals not causing unacceptable harm to heritage assets.	Policy amended to refer to “conserving or enhancing” heritage assets. See changes document.
	75. While protecting the existing landscape and heritage assets is important, is the wording of the policy too restrictive to the extent that it would be detrimental to businesses? It is important to ensure that neighbourhood plan policies are proportional.	4 th bullet point has been amended to read <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing features of landscape value (including mature trees and established hedgerows) being recognised, appropriately protected or complemented through additional planting.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	76. The policy refers to 'New Build', it is unclear if this applies to all development, i.e. expansion of existing buildings or just new buildings.	It means both. Policy has been amended to make this clearer.
PAM 18	77. Policy reads well.	Noted.
	78. Any new country walking routes and access to woodland should include gateways and styles that are accessible for mobility scooter users, wheelchair users and walkers using sticks for guidance or balance. If any pathway surfaces are constructed these surfaces need be usable by these groups as well.	Community Action Point 4 has been amended to refer to "all users".
	79. The long-term maintenance of any proposed PROW will need to be sought – maybe some further guidance could be included in the supporting text regarding legal agreements	Noted but no changes made.
	80. How would a development ensure that existing PROWs within close proximity to a site are maintained in perpetuity? Would all applications need to submit a management and maintenance programme to demonstrate this?	It is not clear which part of the policy this comment applies to.
PAM 19	81. Policy reads well.	Noted
	82. It should perhaps be added that Designated Heritage Assets are also protected by law.	Ok. Amendment made to paragraph 6.19.3
	83. The location and extent of Non-Designated Heritage Assets must be identified on a map.	Map has been prepared to show location of non designated heritage assets
	84. There is currently a county wide project to develop a Local List: https://local-heritage-list.org.uk/cambridgeshire . Have the assets identified been nominated for this local list? The water pumps should also perhaps be considered for this list?	The water pumps are designated heritage assets, as Grade II listed structures.
General	85. The front cover of your Plan should say that the plan was prepared by Pampisford Parish Council as you are the 'qualifying body' for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan.	Noted
Maps	We highly recommend that one overall "Policies Map" on an Ordnance Survey base is included in the Plan with, where necessary, more detailed Inset Maps for	See paragraph 1.8 in the NP.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	<p>specific areas – there could be one showing the whole parish and insets for the village centre, for example. Where planning policies relate to a specific site or area of land it is essential that the boundary of that designation can be clearly identified on a map. See, for example, the referendum version of the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan. Alternatively, you could also copy the method that SCDC uses in its Policies Map and have a series of A4 maps to include the whole parish at a larger scale, so all is clearly shown. The most recently made Neighbourhood Plans for Gamlingay, West Wickham and Waterbeach all have well-presented maps prepared using a variety of systems. Our support offer sets out what we may be able to provide in terms of support on mapping.</p>	
Plan period	<p>88. It is noted that the Plan period is to 2041. South Cambridgeshire’s adopted Local Plan covers the period to 2031. The Council is preparing a new joint Local Plan to the same time frame (2041) but this process is not expected to conclude until after your neighbourhood plan has been adopted. This may result in future differences between the two plans reflecting the context within which both plans are being prepared (and changes arising from the national planning reforms which may shape our Joint Local Plan). We will nevertheless seek to minimise any potential policy conflicts through that process, but it is important to be aware of the possibility of such conflict at this stage.</p>	Noted
Design Code in supporting text	<p>For a lot of the policies, content has been pasted from the Design Code. It would be advisable to surmise the Design Code information rather than copying all of it. If the reader wants to find out more about the Design Code, they could also read this document. By slimming down the supporting text, the size of the document would be shortened which would have the beneficial effect directing attention to the policies, which is the most important element of the Plan.</p>	<p>The Design Guidance and Codes is a separate stand alone document. For the purpose of implementing Policy PAM 6, Appendix 2 to NP sets out the Design Codes Appendix 3 includes a checklist. Note also that some of the content in Appendix 2 and 3 differs from the Design Guidance</p>

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
		<p>and Codes to take on board comments provided by GCSP at Reg. 14 stage.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy PAM 3 and Policy PAM 6 has however been slimmed down in response to this comment.</p>
Old Documents referred to in Plan	A couple of references (e.g. 6.11.1 + 6.12.3 + 6.12.5 refers to quite old documents). Are there more recent documents that could be referred to?	Further references included in 6.12.3 and 6.12.5.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
Plan policies in supporting text	91. It is not necessary to repeat all of national or local plan policies within the supporting text of Neighbourhood Plan policies. This is especially the case given that a new NPPF is expected to be published imminently. This would have the same beneficial effect as outlined above.	Where these are included they are there to help provide context to individuals who may be less familiar with Local Plan and national policy. It is helpful context.
Inclusivity	92. If in future iterations of the Plan, there are requests for public realms or play equipment improvements, these improvements should be inclusive for users and if they have guardians with them.	Noted.
Acknowledgements	93. You could celebrate the work you have put in by acknowledging all the participants and the hard work which has occurred, perhaps on the inside cover.	This is already included just before Appendix One.
Grammar and typographic matters	We recommend that a review of the draft Plan is undertaken to correct anomalies in the use of abbreviations (ensuring that the full name is used in the first instance), capital letters, and footnotes (putting them after full stops if at the end of sentences) to achieve consistency through the document.	Agreed.
	Please refer to the emerging Local Plan as the Greater Cambridge Local Plan	Noted and accepted.
	The Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government is now referred to as Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. The acronym MHCLG should be changed to DLUHC.	This is referred to in Chapter 3 intentionally. A footnote is provided clarifying the name of the department has now changed
	Pg.67 should Community Action point refer to plural initiatives not initiative as currently written?	Agreed.
Chapters 1 - 5.	98. The narrative about which evidence has been used and the consultation that has occurred is clear and easy to follow.	Noted.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	99. 4.18 states that the 'loss of the Chequers Pub was a devastating blow'. As was mentioned in the previous batch of comments, this statement needs evidence to support it.	Noted.
	100. In chapter 3 evidence supporting the neighbourhood plan could also refer to South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide (2010) as this is an adopted SPD. In the District Design Guide, Pampisford is part of the 'Chalklands' character where a series of design principles are stated. Recently 'made' neighbourhood plans in Waterbeach and Gamlingay refer to the District Design Guide. Could also refer to the National Design Guide (2021).	Text has been added to refer to other evidence base work that has informed the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.
	101. NPPF has recently been updated so is now NPPF (September 2023), but as mentioned above this might change soon.	Now December 2023. Noted.
	102. You may wish to include a flow chart to show the different stages the Plan will go through to make it clear at what stage you are now. See the chart in the Introduction guidance note: https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/2290/neighbourhood-planning-toolkit-introduction-february-2018.pdf	Noted
Appendix One	103. In reference to one survey respondents' aspiration to increase church use, could this be moved to a community aspiration? Could link it with history community aspiration, i.e. boards could be put in the church explaining the history of the village?	See Community Action Point number 6.
	104. There is a frequent occurrence of a statement being made without referring to the number of people who said it. For each bullet point, or statement include a statistical breakdown, i.e. how many people said traffic was an issue.	Noted.
	105. Could capture some of the data as pie charts/ graphs to shorten the document?	Noted.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
Appendix 2 + 3	Is it necessary to copy the Design code in Appendix 2 when it is a separate appendix?	The Design Guidance and Codes is a separate standalone document. For the purpose of implementing Policy PAM 6, Appendix 2 to NP repeats the Design Codes and Appendix 3 includes a checklist.
	This lists codes including 3.2.2 “cycle parking should be accessed by means of a door at least 900 mm”. Is this sentence missing the word ‘wide’ i.e. “by means of a door at least 900 mm wide” to make more sense to the reader?	Yes. The reference in Appendix 2 is amended.
	In relation to 4.1.3 of Appendix 2 perhaps ‘where appropriate’ should be added to ensure this not applied to outbuildings.	Yes. The reference in Appendix 2 is amended.
	There is nothing in 5.1 Low Carbon Development so consider deleting.	Not accepted as the reader is signposted to the full document at this point.
	In relation to 5.3.6, According to the GPDO planning permission is required for a heat pump within the curtilage of a Listed Building and a site designated as a Scheduled Monument. Depending on location it may require permission in a Conservation Area or a World Heritage Site. This should perhaps be clarified or removed as a weaker piece of guidance and included in the introduction.	Accepted. 5.3.6 has been removed.
	Appendix Two: Design Guidance and Codes for Pampisford - 5.5.1 – Sustainable Drainage Systems generally only contribute to biodiversity where they have been designed to do so. An attenuation basin is generally a grassed basin that is inundated once or twice a year (at most). This does not provide the pond like habitat that most perceive to be a Sustainable Drainage System. If biodiversity is a priority, then biodiversity must be designed in at an early stage, with permanent water and marginal planning, for example.	Noted. But no change required to Appendix Two.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
Appendix 4	Photos missing for this section and typos in the sub-headers. The photos start at View 14. More detail is needed about 'key features of significance' to justify why they should be protected.	No photos missing from the Reg. 14 version uploaded onto the website. Typos to be corrected. More text to be provided.
	A few of the views are of Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas. In national policy, the 'setting' of these buildings is protected, so it is worth considering whether an additional local policy will achieve something different from national policy.	Noted
Design Code	115. In relation to 2.5.9, this guidance can only really be referenced as part of a planning application /pre-application discussions should this be included here? Permitted development rights in a conservation area are different but not hugely so.	Agreed. It is really a point of information. Item to be removed from Appendix Two in NP.
	116. In relation to 3.2 the diagrams on this page are a bit blurry relating to cycling.	Noted.
	117. In relation to 4.1.3, 'where appropriate' should perhaps be added to ensure that this is not applied to outbuildings.	The item shown in Appendix Two to NP has been amended.
	118. According to the GPDO planning permission is required for a heat pump within the curtilage of a Listed Building and a site designated as a Scheduled Monument. Depending on location it may require permission in a Conservation Area or a World Heritage Site. This should perhaps be clarified or removed as a weaker piece of guidance and included in the introduction.	This item is removed from Appendix Two to the NP.
	119. Design code elements are all supported, including the elements in the architectural details and contemporary design section, many of which are related to sustainable construction. A useful addition to the plan could be some photographs of local examples of some of these design code elements, for example successful integration of renewable energy technologies or use of design features such as roof overhangs and shutters.	Noted.

Para no.	GCSP comments	Parish Council response
	120. Pampisford is quite a dispersed village and so identifying five different character areas is a suitable way of categorising / defining areas of the village in a manageable way. The document is only 2 years old and shows a good understanding of the local vernacular and best practise in the built environment. Paragraph 3.2 (page 13) of the Neighbourhood Plan summarises the document well.	Noted.
Site options and assessment	121. Mentions that a landscape assessment is being carried out. Is this work still being carried out? It would help for the justification of key views as well.	This is a likely reference to the Pampisford NP Design Codes which were then prepared by AECOM in 2021. There is no landscape study. However, as noted in paragraph 3.9 to the NP, the Design Codes document only provided examples of important views. As a follow-up from this work, the NP steering group therefore progressed work on its own process of identifying important views in the parish.
	122. NPPF is now out of date in this document, however, this is not a significant issue.	Noted.
	123. See discussion of sites above and issue of development framework.	Noted