

## Appendix 9: Report of comments received from statutory consultees, local businesses, residents and other stakeholders at Regulation 14 stage

Consultation took place 9 October to 19 November 2023. Responses were received from one local resident (Resident 1), 15 statutory bodies and 2 local stakeholders (including one business).

	Reference (where applicable) with additional detail
<b>Statutory bodies</b>	
Anglian Water	Comment on specific policy/policies
Avison Young on the behalf of National Gas	Advice but not specific to NP policies.
British Horse Society	Comment on specific policy/policies
Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment on specific policy/policies
Cambridgeshire Constabulary	Seeking NP to take account of Secured by Design policies.
Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment	CCC/HET Comment on specific policy/policies
Cambridgeshire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority	CCC/LLFA detailed comments on the design guide and some of the NP Policies e.g. PAM 3
Camcycle	General advice
Environment Agency	General advice
Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Services	Very detailed commentary. See separate schedule
Herts County Council	No comments
National Grid	Advice but not specific to NP policies.
National Highways	Short response noting the NP.
Natural England	General advice with links to resources
Network Rail	Advice but not specific to NP policies.
NHS Property Services	Advice seeking stronger links to health
<b>Local business/stakeholders</b>	
Pampisford Estates	Stakeholder 1 comments on specific policies and detail of supporting documents including Design Codes and Site Assessment Report.
Solopark Ltd	Business 1, comments on specific policies

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
General		Avison Young (for National Gas Transmission)	Identifies a Gas Transmission Pipeline in the NP area and attaches information outlining guidance on development close by	No changes proposed
General		Natural England	Provides guidance on info sources that would inform if a Strategic Env Assessment is needed. Provides examples of how local environment can be enhanced and describes National Character Area framework as a useful reference.	No changes proposed
General		Environment Agency	Not in a position to review but refers to other sources of guidance: NE, Historic England, FC, LA (for flood risk) and Surface Water MP	No changes proposed although note flood risk maps have been added in Chapter 2.
General		Network Rail	Comments on level crossings, A505 over the railway and accessibility at W'sford station	Noted. Whilst the station is just outside the parish boundary, this is useful context.
General		British Horse Society	The omission of horse riders in the plan needs addressing	Concerns and points are noted. Policy PAM18 views new public rights of way, including bridleways, favourably.
General		Camcycle	Notes there is no clear steer of where cycle routes are required or existing issues on the routes. PCs can have a role in encouraging others to bring these forward. Camcycle offers to meet to discuss	As NP only applies when planning applications come forward the NP is limited in how much it can influence here. GCSP also included a comment relating to cycle routes and Policy PAM 13.  Proposed amendments to Policy PAM 10 include requirement to protect or enhance the existing network of routes for non-

Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
				motorised users. A new map will be prepared as part of this to show the London Road/A505 cycle path and Public Rights of Way network.
General		Camcycle	Acknowledges reference to cycling and its importance	No changes needed.
General		CPPF	Supports aim to maintain and enhance landscape character, achieve high quality design reflecting local character and protecting heritage assets. Supports identifying non-designated heritage assets. Asks if we will nominate these on Cambridgeshire's Local Heritage List. <a href="https://local-heritage-list.org.uk/cambridgeshire">https://local-heritage-list.org.uk/cambridgeshire</a>	Assets have been nominated via County Council Local list.
General		Business 1	Generally supportive but market housing is not addressed sufficiently – there is a need for market housing allocation	Noted. The NP is limited in options since it cannot allocate housing on land inside the Green Belt. Sections 3.4 to 3.7 explains the approach taken in considering the available development sites. This section has been amended to provide a fuller explanation.
General		National Grid	No electricity infrastructure of concern within NP area	No changes needed.
General		Herts CC	[No comments]	No changes needed.
General		CCC LLFA	Some areas of Pampisford are at high risk of surface water flooding. Surface water flood risk maps could be utilised to show potential	Accepted. Maps have been included in Chapter 2 with text provided to explain risk

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
			flood risk within Pampisford, and the specific locations that are most at risk.	of flooding from rivers, surface water and groundwater.
General		Highways Agency	[No comments]	No changes needed.
5.4 Local Economy Goal		Stakeholder 1	The report was prepared whilst the pub, a valuable community asset, was still extant. Now we have lost 50% of our amenity facilities. We should support the rebuilding of the pub rather than the redevelopment of the site.	We also support the rebuilding of the pub and would prefer this to come forward on the site. However, of key importance is that a viable development comes forward that preserves or enhances the special qualities of the conservation area. Policy PAM 8 has been updated to reflect this priority.
2.3		Stakeholder 1	Why has the old station area including Solopark been excluded from this?	Solo parks is mentioned in Section 6.14 but plan is amended to provide reference in Chapter 2 too. See changes.  Map 9 will also be amended to show the location of solo park.
3.4		Business 1	For Site 5, the refusal of an application on the site does not preclude its allocation within the PNP. The allocation of Site 5 would further help address the housing need	This is accepted. The text in Chapter 3 of the plan has been amended to provide a clearer explanation as to why sites are not allocated as part of this plan.  Any site within the development framework can come forward under existing Local Plan policy. For sites that fall outside the development framework, Policy

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
				PAM 2 would support in principle the delivery of rural exceptions housing.
3.4, 3.7		Business 1	Landowner of No. 10 High Street (Site 4) be and request it be allocated for residential development within the PNP with an indicative capacity of 1no. dwelling. Refers also to 5.4, site options assessment and housing survey	Any site that is located within the development framework is in principle supported by South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan and there is no need to allocate the site through the NP.
(3.4, 3.7)		Stakeholder 1	Why have no commercial / employment sites been examined? Many other neighbourhood plans have.	Finding additional employment sites has not been a priority driving the NP. Also note that development potential of parish is heavily constrained by Green Belt, see Map 2.
Chapter 4		Business 1	Section 4 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan summaries the key issues underpinning the Neighbourhood Plan. This section identifies affordable housing as a key issue but it does not mention market housing. However, as noted in respect of Paragraph 3.7, the need for housing generally (including market housing) is a key issue identified within the Neighbourhood Plan Survey (2018) and the Housing Need Survey. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that Section 4 of the PNP be updated to give equal consideration to market housing.	Noted. In the supporting text to Policy PAM 1, Paragraph 6.1.10, last set of bullets recognises the lack of availability for suitable open market properties.
5.1		Stakeholder 1	If it is land use why does it not consider other sites in terms of employment opportunities?	The parish has a high number of employment site relative to its population.

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
				Finding new employment sites is not a neighbourhood plan level priority.
5.4		Stakeholder 1	is there a reason we do not consider the creation of other community facilities?	Goal 3 in the NP is to “protect and develop the village social structure focused on the area of the Chequer’s Public House, Village Hall and Church”. This is underpinned by Policy PAM 8 that encourages development on the site of the Chequers’ pub for future use as a community meeting space and preferably as a public house. Policy PAM 18 seeks to enhance as well as protecting access to a and enjoyment of the countryside. The scope of influence of a planning policy is restricted to development that requires a planning application. Chapter 7 provides an additional set of community action points to complement the planning policies. Community Action Point 6 is amended to refer to both the Church and the Village Hall.
(6.1)	(1)	Resident 1	Council housing stock needs to be allocated to people whose need is relevant to the housing ie bungalows in Glebe Crescent should be given to elderly or disabled tenants, not young families who move out quickly and have no interaction with the village	The process of allocating Council housing stock is administered outside the planning system. Although any future rural exception housing will be prioritised for households with a local connection.
(6.2)	(2)	Resident 1	New housing estates should be avoided as the village (and Sawston GP, schools etc) doesn’t have necessary infrastructure	Noted

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
6.2.11	2	Stakeholder 1	The policy from the 2021 ministerial statement cannot apply in Pampisford because all of the land adjacent to the village is in the green belt.	It is agreed it may have limited relevance. But it cannot be ruled out that some sites within the development framework could come forward.
6.3.3	3	Stakeholder 1	Should there be a design code stipulation that any commercial development must be screened ?	Policy PAM 3 would apply to all land uses that are located on the settlement edge. In addition, bullet point 3 under the second clause requires proposals to “work within the context of existing features in the wider surroundings”.
6.3	3	Stakeholder 1	New developments could include planting schemes that would help enhance the landscape character through screening?	Policy PAM 3 requires development to incorporate landscaping schemes that work within the context of the site. A Clause has been added to require planting schemes to be designed to mitigate adverse visual impacts. Not also the final clause of the policy that requires landscape buffering at settlement edge as well as Policy PAM 6 that deals with boundary treatment.
6.6	6	Stakeholder 1	Materials; ought there be a preference for Cambridge White Bricks not just orange and yellow hues? Should thatched and slate roofs be preferred in the historic core? Should there be guidelines on the colour that windows, doors, fences and indeed buildings are painted?	Policy wording has been amended to refer to Cambridge white bricks too. Development proposals in the Conservation Area will be expected to preserve for enhance its special architectural or historic interest. What will be required on individual developments will depend on the contribution to site and

Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
				<p>existing building (where applicable) makes to the significance of the Conservation Area. Where a development proposal directly affects a listed building (in or outside the Conservation Area) listed building consent will also be required. Policy PAM 19 has been amended to specify requirements that apply within the Conservation Area.</p>
(6.8)	(8)	CCC Historic Env Team	<p>Future development of Chequers site should include archaeological investigation and recording historic remains of the pub</p>	<p>Agreed. This would be required as part of Policy PAM 19.</p>
(6.6)	(6)	NHS property services	<p>Recommends that the Healthy Planning requirements (listed in letter) be incorporated within the Neighbourhood Plan in order to achieve high quality design. Welcome opportunities for engagement with us on how to incorporate them in the Plan.</p>	<p>A number of the planning policies are compatible with delivering health outcomes as follows. For example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAM 1 and PAM 2 are focused on delivering housing mix suitable for population</li> <li>• PAM 3, PAM 6 and PAM 19 are focused on delivering development that respects the context and heritage of the parish</li> <li>• PAM 5 is focused on securing open space, including space where people can meet</li> <li>• PAM 4, revised PAM 10 and PAM 18 are focused on facilitating easier, safer and more attractive active travel routes</li> </ul>



Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
(6.6)	(6)	Cambridge Constabulary Crime Prevention Design Team	Security and crime prevention should be considered in developments (10 issues listed)	Local Plan policy HQ/1: Design Principles provides a comprehensive coverage at the district level including issues applicable to designing out crime. The policies in in the Pampisford Neighbourhood Plan are compatible with this strategic level policy.
(6.8)	(8)	Stakeholder 1	50% of community facilities gone due to loss of Chequers	Noted
(6.8)	(8)	Resident 1	It is vital to engage villagers to use the Village Hall and the Church as these are in jeopardy of closing.	Agreed. Both facilities are greatly valued. Both uses are given land use protection via Policy SC/3 in the Local Plan. The NP supports this approach. See also Community Action 6 in Chapter 7.
(6.8)	(8)	Resident 1	Doesn't support new pub; housing more appropriate on Chequers site	Noted but not accepted. See Policy PAM 8
6.9	9	Stakeholder 1	For commercial buildings this may well be unviable. Neither ground nor air source heat pumps or indeed solar heating are efficient enough to be viable in larger spaces. Gas or oil are the only viable alternatives.	Noted
6.9	9	Anglian Water	Would welcome a wider reference to both energy and water efficiency: <i>"Anglian Water supports the aims of the policy and encouragement of highly sustainable homes, which aligns with our own net zero ambitions. We would welcome a wider reference to both energy and water efficiency, as a significant</i>	Noted. Amendments have been made to the policy in light of this comment.

Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
			<i>proportion of energy used in the home is for heating water. Water efficiency measures help to reduce the amount of hot water used through taps and showers, and minimise the amount of water needing to be treated at our water recycling centres, further reducing energy demands"</i>	
6.12	12	Stakeholder 1	Perhaps one could look to create screening to obscure development.	This is addressed in Policy PAM 3, Policy PAM 6 and Policy PAM 15.
(6.13)	(13)	Resident 1	Traffic is too fast along Town Lane/Brewery Road; supports 20 zone	Noted. The Parish Council is seeking traffic calming measures in this area.
(6.13)	(13)	Resident 1	Parking is a problem around the Chequers junction and Brewery Road near the allotments	Paragraph 6.13.4 recognises parking issues around Chequers junction. The text has been updated to include reference to Brewery Road near the allotments.
(6.13)	(13)	Resident 1	Lack of sufficient pavements around Glebe Crescent and the Chequers	Noted. Policy PAM 10 has been amended to strengthen the position of the plan with respect to adequate infrastructure for walking. Do note that the planning policies are only applicable if development comes forward.
6.14.4	4	Anglian Water	Provides commentary on surface water management and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (with reference to Brewery Rd sewer overload): <i>"It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan refers to historic problems with overloading the sewer along Brewery Road. Pampisford is within the</i>	Additional flood risk maps provided in Section 2 and new paragraph added to Policy PAM 9 – Development and Climate Change.

Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
			<i>Sawston water recycling catchment and our Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan 2025-2050 identifies a medium term strategy of mixed strategies with the main solution of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to address infiltration of surface water into our network, with a 2050 strategy to achieve 50% surface water removal from our network. SuDS are therefore a significant factor in helping to reduce run-off from new development. Whilst the neighbourhood plan does not include a policy for surface water management and SuDS, this is addressed by the Design Codes 5.5-5.8 and policies in the adopted and emerging local plan. In addition, it is the Government's intention to implement Schedule Three of The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to make SuDS mandatory in all new developments in England in 2024"</i>	
(6.14.3)	(14)	CCC LLFA (SuDS and Flood Risk Officer)	South Cambs Local Plan Policy CC/7 is particularly important for protecting existing watercourses and groundwater bodies from pollution. It would be beneficial to include reference to this within the NP as Pampisford is within a Source Protection Zone.	Reference to Policy CC/7 is included at paragraph 6.14.7. Paragraph 6.14.3 also explains that parish falls in a source protection zone for groundwater.
(6.15-17)	(15-17)	Resident 1	Avoid new industrial or business premises (or enlargement of the ones we currently have). Farming should be encouraged.	Policies PAM 15, PAM 16 and PAM 17 provide guidance for development coming forward on existing employments sites in

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
				the village. Development potential in countryside locations is constrained by Local Plan policies including the Green Belt policy.
6.18	18	British Horse Society	Specific need and suggestions for new bridleways, not just footpaths, especially with the riding school in Sawston (incl for disabled riders). Also makes point that any change to road layouts (incl to benefit cyclists) should take into account safety/needs of equestrians.	Policy PAM 18 views new routes including new bridleways favourably.
6.19	19	Historic England	Pleased to see that the historic environment features throughout and policies which seek to sustain and enhance the character and setting of Pampisford's historic environment and landscapes	No changes needed.
6.19	19	Historic England	Encourages an appraisal document for the Conservation Area, or local character study or historic area assessment, to underpin a historic environment section	The NP is supported by the Design Codes document, produced in August 2021 by AECOM. This report includes a brief assessment of the historic core.
6.19	19	Historic England	Strongly recommends that the community identifies the ways in which Community Infrastructure Levy can be used to facilitate the conservation of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, and sets this out in the neighbourhood plan.	Currently, GCSP does not collect CIL so this comment has limited relevance.
(6.19)	(19)	CCC Historic Env Team	Welcomes this policy; Local Heritage List may have some new additions in the future and	Noted. This has been followed up. No known new information.

Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
			this should be checked before adoption of plan	
(6.19)	(19)	CCC Historic Env Team	NDHA focus on built environment, no reference to below-ground features e.g. A505 follows prehistoric Ickniel Way, and to S of village remains of Roman settlement and possible Roman villa complex; suggest contacting HER to improve the list	Noted. It is also noted that the list of designated heritage assets in the parish include the following below ground features: - Brent Ditch scheduled monument - Two moated sites 150 m east of College Farm
6.19	19	Stakeholder 1	We would like to understand the future implication of the buildings being included by the village as non-designated heritage assets.	A non-designated heritage asset does not have the same status as a 'listed' building and listed building consent will not be required for future works. In the event that a planning application is submitted and the proposal is found to have a potential impact on the building or structure, the importance of preserving the historic significance of it will be considered. There will be a presumption to preserve the particular significance of the non-designated heritage asset, but this will be balanced against other material considerations. Policy PAM 18 in the consultation draft Neighbourhood Plan states <i>"a balanced judgement will be applied having regard to the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset"</i> .

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
				Any planning applications for works to a non-designated heritage asset will be expected to show how the historic or local importance of the building has been taken into consideration in the design process.
Map 3		Stakeholder 1	View 12 on the map is shown from private land. It is not the view shown in the appendix on pg 102. Are we right to assume the point on the map has been labelled incorrectly?	Agreed. The map will be amended.
Map 9	14	Stakeholder 1	The exclusion of the old railway station area and solopark as an employment area.	Map 9 has been updated to show location of Solopark.
Glossary		Historic England	Recommends expanding the glossary to include relevant historic environment terminology contained in the NPPF, in addition to details about the additional legislative and policy protections that heritage assets and the historic environment in general enjoys	Agreed. Glossary to be updated.
Site Assessment Report 4.1		Stakeholder 1	Proposes 4 new sites for consideration: 2 for employment and 2 for housing	Amendments made to Section 3 to explain more fully why sites are not allocated in the NP.
Site Assessment Report 5.5-5.7		Stakeholder 1	Disagree with conclusions for sites 1, 5, 6, 10, 12.	Noted. These areas of disagreement are noted. The Parish Council is not minded to revisit the detailed findings of the sites assessment work at this stage as it will not have an influence on the NP itself. It should be noted however that Sites 1, 6, 10 and 12 are all located in the Cambridge

Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
				Green Belt. The NP is not able to allocated land for development in the Green Belt.
Site Assessment report		Stakeholder 1	<p>Consultee proposes two employment sites:</p> <p>A) The Woodyard; the fenced and shielded yard immediately off the A505 on Beech lane on the left. The site was used for timber storage and processing and then more latterly for car restoration. The site has been vacant for a number of years due to a lack of power supply but this has recently been overcome. Any building here is close to the A505 and as such would not alter the traffic volumes in the village. Further the screening both of the tree held on the southern side of the recreation ground as well as a mature hedge on the site itself will prevent any views from the village from being altered.</p>	<p>The allocation of land for new employment uses has not been a key driver for the Pampisford Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, this site is located in Green Belt. It is not appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate land for development in the Green Belt. National and Local Plan policies would apply. Including Local Plan Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt</li> <li>• Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt</li> <li>• Policy NH/9: Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt</li> </ul>
Site Assessment report		Stakeholder 1	<p>B) That is the industrial site that sits at solopark on and around the site of the old station and that extends north along Bourn bridge road to include the garage. The construction of the A11, A505 fly over and Granta Park roundabouts have all taken farm land and made it redundant. There are a number of small paddocks that are uneconomical to farm and 3 of them have in the past been occupied by</p>	<p>The allocation of land for new employment uses has not been a key driver for the Pampisford Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Without the Neighbourhood Plan, a proposal would need to be considered in light of Local Plan policies:                      NH/3: Protecting Agricultural Land                      Policy E/16: Expansion of existing businesses in the countryside</p>

Para no.	PAM	Consultee ref.	Summary of Comment	Parish Council response
			<p>Travellers leaving glass, metal scraps and detritus potentially harmful for grazing livestock. As such these fields are currently unsuitable for agriculture. These paddocks, surrounded on 3 sides by commercial development seem like an opportune space for commercial activity in the village. They are remote from the historic core and would be entirely screened from the village and all other dwellings by the Pampisford Arboretum. There has been previous commercial activity on site associated with the old railway station.</p>	
<p>Site Assessment Report</p>		<p>Stakeholder 1</p>	<p>Consultee proposes 2 residential sites</p> <p>At the northern tip of the Pampisford parish Sawston has expanded. The field next to the current development is now in Pampisford. The village would be able to fulfil its needs smaller and more affordable dwellings (fig 7 Housing Needs Survey Report) as well as catering to the needs of the local working population by allowing dwellings of mixed sizes. Any building here would be well screened from the historic core of Pampisford by the Hayfield and White woods. This would comply with Policy H11.</p>	<p>At the stage of preparing the site assessment report, only sites close to the village were considered. These two sites are both in the Cambridge Green Belt. The NP is not able to allocate land in the Green Belt for development. Local Plan policies applicable to the Green Belt may be relevant. E.g. "H/11: Rural Exception Site Affordable Housing"</p>



<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
			Infill housing at the Home Farm off Babraham lane, built in the identical vernacular of the other houses on site and converting the historic structures to dwellings could further provide more affordable homes for local residents. This site is once again well screened from the historic core of the village. The houses could be tied to employment opportunities within the village or offered to those with strong ties to the village. This would comply with policy S11	
Site Assessment Report		Business 1	However, it is noted that the site assessment proforma refers to an application for two dwellings on the Site 4 being withdrawn (reference S/0716/19/FL). We could not identify this application on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service search function. As such, it is respectfully requested that this be cross checked and updated accordingly.	This comment on the Site Assessment report is noted. This is likely to have been a typo in the Site Assessment report prepared in 2021 by a third party to support the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is not considered necessary to seek a correction at this stage as it will have no influence on the NP content.
Housing Needs Survey		Stakeholder 1	Limited opportunities for young, newly formed households non bungalow 53% in favour of small dev of affordable fig 5. Sig need for smaller scale affordable housing Majority of home unsuitability due to too large, too expensive, no suitable homes locally. Figure 7.	Agreed. Policy PAM 2 allows rural exception sites to be delivered in the village.
Design codes		Anglian Water	Supportive of content of design codes	No changes needed.

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
Design Codes		Stakeholder 1	Materials; should there be a number of preferred options for housing materials in the historic core of the village? This could ensure keeping the right vernacular.	Noted. It is felt no more detail needs to be provided in the Design Codes document.
DC 1.1.1	3	CCC LLFA	Policy PAM 3 refers to flood risk zones in relation to new developments, however, the LLFA would recommend that surface water flood risk is also included in Policy PAM 3 Design Code 1.1.1 where new developments must demonstrate an understanding of the landscape sensitivities and designations of the area. It is also recommended that the use of SuDS is encouraged	Section 2 now includes maps showing sources of flood risk in the parish. Policy PAM 9 has been amended to ensure flood risk from all sources in the parish is considered when proposals are assessed against national and Local Plan policy.
DC 4.7		Stakeholder 1	Does not go into enough detail about colours allowed. The colours in the core of the village tend to be black / white and green. What whitewash from chalk historically sourced in the village under our feet. We should be careful that very bold and bright colours do not interrupt this peaceful character	Noted. It is felt no more detail needs to be provided in the Design Codes document.
DC 4.7.2		Stakeholder 1	Cambridge white bricks are not mentioned which are a key material.	Noted. The text has been updated.
DC 5.1		Stakeholder 1	The airtight 'pasivhouse' school of thought is just one view. Traditionally houses were insulated with much better performing natural materials such as hemp which are carbon negative and allow houses to naturally breath	Noted

<b>Para no.</b>	<b>PAM</b>	<b>Consultee ref.</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Parish Council response</b>
			and filter the air rather than using electricity to mechanically recycle the air.	
DC 5.1		Stakeholder 1	Vehicle charging on new builds; the local electricity grid is already very stretched and the provision of effective car charging ports may be impossible dependent on the capacity of the grid in the vicinity.	Noted
DC 5.2		Stakeholder 1	Solar panels are of course of benefit but only in the right context. On thatched roofs they diminish the look and character of the building and can also cause terrible leaks.	Noted
(DC 5.4/5.5)		CCC LLFA	LLFA encourages reference to Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG), and discussion of a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, with reference to surface water flooding within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Maps have been added to Chapter 2 to show the different sources of flood risk in the parish. Policy PAM 9 has been amended to ensure flood risk from all sources in the parish is considered when proposals are assessed against national and Local Plan policy.
(DC 5.5)		CCC LLFA	LLFA are pleased to see the promotion for above-ground open SuDS	Noted. Policy PAM 9 has been amended to ensure flood risk from all sources in the parish is considered when proposals are assessed against national and Local Plan policy.
(DC 5.5, Figure 50)		CCC LLFA	The flood zones map would benefit from a legend to distinguish between Flood Zones 2 and 3.	Noted. The NP itself includes clearer maps.