



Mid-Term Community Consultation, April-May 2023

Appendix of free-text comments

This page left blank for double-sided printing.



CONTENTS

APPENDIX OF FREE-TEXT COMMENTS	4
A1 Draft vision	4
A2 Draft objectives	8
A3 Community-led renewable energy schemes	11
A4 Equality of access to our countryside	13
A5 Housing needs	15
A6 Visually important open land	18
A7 Important views	19
A8 Locally valued green spaces	20
A9 Countryside frontages	20
A10 Active travel destinations	21
A11 Countryside routes	21



APPENDIX OF FREE-TEXT COMMENTS

Several questions in the consultation paper gave participants the opportunity to comment on a particular issue in their own words. These are collated below under appropriate headings, in the order in which consultation papers were submitted, and exactly as worded by participants.

A1 Draft vision

- It all depends on how each statement is interpreted. E.g a 'safe and sustainable travel network' could be achieved with existing infrastructure by developing public/private partnership between all major stakeholders.
- More specifics re "safe and sustainable travel network" required if possible
- Yes state express protection of Green belt
- Too much development already ruining the feel of the village
- Any private or public development must be properly planned and designed. More and better use should be made of existing housing stock and space. All new developments should have full insulation (even treble glazing if that helps) and solar panels and heat pumps as standard. A sustainable travel network assumes an absolute requirement for a truly sustainable and workable network that the Council must enable. What we have at present is just not workable.
- I don't want much new infrastructure as it encourages overdevelopment
- more emphasis on infrastructure ie all development subject to improvement in infrastructure and amenities.
- The phrase 'distinct from Cambridge' is of great importance as we don't wish to see individual villages subsumed as part of Cambridge suburbs. There must be areas of land separating the villages. Green belt should be honoured.
- At the risk of being accused of Nimbyism I do not agree with the growth projected for the Cambridge area. There are other parts of the country much more in need of investment, job creation, etc. Our priorities should be in improving housing, infrastructure and amenities for those already here. Therefore I like your phraseology "focus on addressing identified housing needs within our community" but would add "...infrastructure to meet the needs of our local population."
- Perhaps include a statement regarding intention to be net zero carbon emitters by 2035?
- I want to preserve the village status and not be joined to the city
- 'Safe and sustainable travel network' does not incorporate / stipulate any cost. Safe and sustainable may well also be unaffordable and not in keeping with minimising environmental impact
- Housing development should be particularly sensitive to demands on local aquifers. Water ab
- no ewr or overdevelopment
- See later on comments
- Restricting new development is not going to help local people stay in the village. More smaller affordable developments are needed
- The draft doesn't specify any details about the NP, but generally expanding by increasing housing or business infrastructure isn't a bad thing like the plan suggests. Protecting the green spaces around us is important but can, and has been, done whilst accomodating the people that want to live here but can't because of the lack of available housing. There should also be more plans actually outlined to help reduce carbon emissions, rather than just saying it'd be nice to. Could start with supporting new public transport and cycling routes through the village.



- Safe, sustainable, affordable, carbon neutral public transport that doesn't impact on the greenbelt (maybe too wordy but you know what I mean- we don't want them to use this as some sort of argument for the bus way!)
- No
- We need more affordable housing, not necessarily modest and to include plenty social housing rather than what is deemed to be "affordable" which often is not a realistic option for many.
- It needs to be a community for ALL AGES. My concern is that both villages have a preponderance of older/retired persons. In order to thrive, the younger age ranges need to be encouraged.
- It is very good. Succinct but conveys a realistic vision.
- 'A sustainable travel network ' usually translates into buses. These are inadequate for the elderly, and can lead to abominations such as the proposed bus across the Gogs.
- The sentence on sustainable travel seems to imply that such a network does not exist. I strongly favour improved bus services over the guided busway for example as meeting this need.
- No, I think it's good, especially important that the villages are 'distinct' from Cambridge
- Not clear whether the new busway is approved of. It will not benefit residents of Stapleford
- Yes. I don't think it speaks at all to the desired demographic of a living space. Great Shelford is becoming a haven of elderly, rich people rattling around in massive houses, and by 2040 that will only be worse. It says nothing about the wonderful school, and how it will be supported, and how it will cater for the young families that are the future of any society.
- Ideally as well as having an identity distinct from that of Cambridge, the vision would acknowledge that the villages are and will remain physically separate from Cambridge. That narrow stretch of Green Belt is incredibly important.
- Refer to Cambridge Nature Network and the NP falling within landscape setting of Gog Magog Hills
- Possibly could include something about housing that covers young and old in a way that brings them together rather than segmented into retirement villages or other large estate development that suits reduce costs to developers but increase social isolation between generations
- There needs to be more emphasis on protecting the green belt. Once the green belt is gone, it's gone.
- No
- The travel element must reflect the travel needs of the residents of Great Shelford and Stapleford not just those travelling from further afield.
- Details of social affordable housing is important and assurance that schools and GP surgeries can cope
- Yes. New amenities only gets two words. We have hardly any useful shops and restaurants in these villages.
- YEs. Should include more diverse respondents such as type of work, where they grew up, their values (some would like to live as an extended family)
- Protecting green belt
- Yes. It should focus on protecting the character of the villages. There are National plans to address climate needs (such as the move to electric vehicles). These national policies will be sufficient and local ones, however well intentioned, are likely to cause more environmental detriment than benefit.
- Improved? I think it will be done in a haphazard self interested way. The draft vision sounds lovely but even now there are very limited places I can walk my dog. There is virtually no bio diversity.



- Cars are a necessary way of life for many and should be born in mind
- Be more specific
- I don't agree with the statement about "addressing identified housing needs within our community": The area is vibrant and growing and people from outside the community, of all ages, want to live here. New development to meet the demand from some people moving to the area from outside the community is inevitable and therefore what we want from developments for these people should be considered - schools, shopping, transport and so on. I also struggle with biodiversity as a concept - its overly soft and very much reliant on individuals' opinions.
- the travel network should be sustainable both in its construction and operation.
- I do not see our village's contribution to climate change to be at a level that warrants setting its reduction as one of the 3 top goals. Nor do I think that neighbourhood planning can realistically achieve a measurable reduction (or increase), whatever the metric is.
- I believe that a vision of 100 homes being considered is false as Graet Shelford /Stapleford is already listed as a rural centre and in the existing statement on such centres states that so long as potential developers can include relevant services greater and virtually unlimited developments can be considered. This is already born out by the imminent building of 100 homes between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane and 146 "Retirement homes" adjacent to Chalk Hill, Stapleford. all part of a thinly disguised development corridor supported by the guided busway (£130m)
- Its pursuit of perfection is the enemy of the good
- Until improved infrastructure is in place no new developments should happen. Promised infrastructure improvements never seem to catch-up with new housing.
- The part about Sustainable travel sounds a bit like you are supporting the congestion charge. It has been said by the GCP that the charge is the only way of getting better travel
- Think it should be mentioned/made clearer that travel network should be sensitive to local environment
- No
- If it is appropriate, something about enhancing opportunities for community engagement and strengthening local ties would be great
- It's a noble vision but ultimately the needs of Cambridge will override the villages as they already do. We will be subsumed but development & new infrastructure.
- Affordable housing should be more prominent, including rental properties. Right now (young) people in the villages are unable to stay and properties are bought by people with no connection with the villages.
- I think it's a bit vague
- It feels quite vague. Even a high level vision would benefit from specificity
- No
- Yes! As there will be at least some new development, amenities HAVE to be improved. Its not viable to preface amenity improvements with "where appropriate"
- It implies that the current level of amenities and infrastructure is sufficient, but it isn't. It needs to be improved from here even if we don't have more housing.
- Houses should not be built on green belt. "Modest new development " is poorly defined and not clear how many houses are involved.
- I would like to see a more explicit commitment to affordable housing.
- Protection of the 'landscape setting' is very, very important!
- I's good but I'm concened about the last sentence regarding the travel network. I am extremely worried about the possible Busway and Railway proposals that could damage the environment so extremely badly.
- The wording is not enough about sustainability.



- Add that the Stapleford and Great Shelford should maintain its distinctive identity and not become a suburb of Cambridge not becomes
- New development should not be limited to just housing to create the thriving communities eg retail but also business maybe; nor (in my view) should it solely be 'affordable' housing - a mixture consistent with the existing character
- 'More council houses' is probably beyond your remit.
- I don't like this insistence on "distinct from Cambridge". Is Cambridge such an evil place? You "can't see the join" as the A1301 changes from Cambridge Road to Shelford Road, for example. If that boundary were to be moved, would it really make a difference?
- There should be a commitment to making the villages an attractive prospect for opening a variety of shops which will make it easier to shop here
- Focus more on amenities and infrastructure over more developments.
- Provision of more green space
- YES
- NO MORE HOUSING. NEED more infrastructure, schools, bus services and DOCTORS SURGERY
- It needs to address the stark inequality between different parts of the villages. It sounds a protectionist vision for the wealthy indigenous. it also fails to recognise or capitalise on our connection with Cambridge from which, past and present, our local prosperity, is derived. It fails to recognise the major new housing and transport developments already under way that are and will impact us, for good or otherwise: how should we respond these major neighbouring infrastructure changes? Finally transport is a major issue, and lack of provision sustains inequality. But of course we need to agree where how and where we link in to these.
- It's wordy
- Include upkeep of current facilities and shops etc
- I think modest is too wishy washy - most people will see that as a couple of infill sites. We need more than that
- Add that the safe and sustainable travel will run alongside existing roads, and not be allowed to plough through greenbelt.
- I think it would be appropriate to recognise that as Cambridge expands to provide desperately required housing, it will encompass Great Shelford, Stapleford and other surrounding villages becoming Greater Cambridge. I think this will benefit the villages and give more access to amenities and the ability to travel sustainably to workplaces within the city.
- More amenities, such as banks, would be helpful.
- I suggest putting the community first and the development needs second, throughout the vision and the entire document - in order to make a consistent and symbolic point. e.g. "In 2040, Stapleford and Great Shelford will continue to constitute a vibrant, sustainable and thriving local community with its own distinctive characteristics, separate from Cambridge yet complementary and benefiting from proximity. Both villages will maintain a distinctive built and natural environment and a wide provision of local services, strongly supported by the local community. New development will ensure the ongoing success of the locality, focusing on identified housing needs for the existing community. The creation of new amenities and infrastructure to meet the needs of our population will also be encouraged.. Part of this infrastructure will be a safe and sustainable travel network supporting everyday journeys and healthy recreation. , employment, leisure facilities and local services whilst protecting and enhancing its natural and built assets for future generations.
- the protection of the green areas is paramount and need to be given priority over new developments where possible.



- No, because I understand that the scope of the NP is limited and excludes the major infrastructure programs that are in planning.
- If we allow some farmland/green belt to be developed every 20 years we will end up being greater Cambridge!
- I wish we could also shape the large transport infrastructure projects that are planned, but I know that this is outside the scope of the NP.

A2 Draft objectives

- Active travel & travel-related aspects of others. Again it depends on choices within. Eg 'sustainable transport can mean building on current networks (yes) or drawing busways across green belt (no).
- Shortage of water should be mentioned in any context of new development.
- Traffic: this can be improved a lot by do things properly, for example by having really good roads, cycleways and paths and not just patching potholes. Traffic lights and road 'management' must be optimised. The very bad traffic mis-controls at the Addenbrookes roundabout are a classic example of what must be improved. This has a knock-on effect on areas far away from it. The parish council should say so. Any new roads must be better laid out. The 'new' road to the hospital is crazy. This too has a big knock on effect to other areas. Traffic again - cyclists must use good lights front and back in the dark and they must have light clothing and reflectors in the dark. Accidents are waiting to happen and if a car hits a cyclist both the cyclist and the driver are affected. Countryside access - we should facilitate more use of footpaths by keeping them clear and clean - do we need a more active village handy person? Active travel demands ready, easy on-time, reliable and inexpensive train, tram and buses. We must be able to use the trains more. Busways especially concrete ones are NOT the answer. The 5 objectives that I have highlighted are to emphasise that we must try to maintain the character of the village. If we don't we will just become another Cherryhinton -i.e. a Cambridge suburb.
- No. 5 - no mention of green belt. It seems that planning currently disregards green belt land which should be used for agriculture and farming primarily, not for building and access.
- Excellent objectives. 7 - the healing is 'Active Travel' but the text talks about sustainable travel, which isn't the same thing (green buses, etc?). Safety of non-motorised users doesn't necessarily give them more routes. Interestingly, your draft objective 7 on p10 is not the same as that on p15. I prefer the version on p15.
- Biodiversity - is there opportunity to put in percentage increase across the parishes in a timeframe?
- They are not particularly SMART and leave ambiguity. However they do amplify the vision and could probably do for now and become more specific later.
- Countryside access - what is meant by non-motorised users? Does this just refer to foot and bicycle traffic ?
- We need to look after the green belt, reduce the developers building expensive unaffordable over development, and not allow EWR to destroy the village
- Focus on lower cost housing not 4 bed executive homes
- By specifying how these will be done, as although they are good in theory the execution could have negative side effects. Need to remember that not only primary school kids and elderly people live here.
- I really like the draft objectives and think you have done a great job
- ACTIVE TRAVEL - The objective seems to set the motorised and non-motorised users in conflict with each other. I don't think one should take precedence over the other but rather a means should be found so that they work more in harmony.
- We must allow for modern, sustainable housing and not stick to pastiche housing.



- Far from sure that the more elderly or less mobile residents will be able to change their use of transp Neither will anyone else whilst the services are so sporadic. It is truning the clock back to fifties- theweathly use cars the rest walk, cycle or use the bus which at least did have frequent services then..
- In the case of active travel I am keen that we make better use of existing roads or rail rather than create new infrastructure if it can be avoided. If we must have new housing I think it is important that it build with reasonable gardens houses for people to live in not for developers to profit from
- I think they are all well thought out and important
- The draft smacks so much of nimbyism. Shelford is not rural, and pretending it is is another way of limiting developing affordable housing for young families. How many of these objectives are focused purely on protecting the status quo? It seems like most of them.
- Active Travel: I am uncomfortable with, and unsure of the implications of, the phrase "safety of non-motorised users will be prioiritised over the needs of motorised users" Whilst I wholly support improved safety of pedestrian and cyclists and welcome enhanced options for safe travvel it should be recognised that many households continue to rely on motorised vehicles for work and shopping and this also needs to be protected.
- Active travel - "the safety AND NEEDS of non-motorised users will be"
- Linking the objectives to the objectives of the Cambridge Nature Network
- Maybe under housing needs consider housing designed specifically to facilitate families caring for older relatives. Granny annexes or close mix of housing to facilitate intergenerational co location rather than isolation into estates
- I feel that any development should minimise impact on residents and minimise impact on countryside views and scenery.
- Different mixed of sizes of houses should be built for families who want to live as extended families, much better public transport to support non car journeys. Trains very hour is just not good enough
- Protect green belt
- Active travel. As idyllic as it sounds to have people abandoning their cars in favour of sustainable, more environmentally friendly transportation, you must not ignore the fact that motorists are here to stay and many people will be using cars who have no alternative. Don't ignore the needs of motorists.
- The survey is corrupt. It forces answers that fail to take account of the complexity of the issues it seeks to represent. Of course the impact of traffic should be mitigated, but this can best be done by restricting development to a smaller number of large residential homes not cramming in affordable housing.
- Tighter controls on new builds
- Countryside access define routes ? Roads, footpaths, cycleways, bridelways
- THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT could specifically mention the limiting the height, bulk and density of new buildings. ACTIVE TRAVEL - prioritising non-motorised users is fine, provided that there is clear evidence that a problem exists and that we would not be creating a new one. Recent highways interventions by the County Council (for example at the BP roundabout in Sawston) which were introduced to improve the safety of cyclists and pedestrians have created new delays and dangers for motorised vehicles. We should be careful not ensure that this this objective is used to reduce the quality of provision for motorise car users.
- All are laudable but Cambridgeshire is already one of the least tree covered areas of the UK (2%) particularly as a result of the Agricultural nature of the area. I believe it very unlikely that future development will actively encourage development of pleasant housing, rather more of the same block housing manifesting in all areas around Cambridge. Housing would



be easier to accept we're it not so unattractive so as to appeal to the cheapness of build and lack of thought to landscaping to minimise its intrusion.

- Active Travel Whilst this is good you need to realise that there will still be a lot of necessary vehicle movements and it does not make any sense to make vehicle travel more difficult than it already is, rather needs more emphasis on providing realistic and affordable alternatives that actually work.
- Focus on building/prioritising brownfield land for new housing. The greenbelt and agricultural land must be left untouched for future generations.
- I feel that development should be limited. We cannot build on all our free spaces. For example- first came the park and ride and then housing followed at Babraham Road and Trumpington. If the guided busway is built across the fields in Stapleford housing will follow. Where will it end?
- I think there could be more stress in the villages not expanding (e.g. Unaffordable retirement villages/homes being built) but the focus being on affordable houses for young families.
- Housing objective is very vague in its wording
- No
- It is not sensible or realistic to prioritise non-motorised transport "throughout the plan area" - and this statement has been unhelpfully confounded by prefacing it with "safety". As much as possible, cycling and walking routes should be segregated from motorised transport.
- I believe these questions and objectives are poorly worded as this assume the objectives are achievable. Re housing: I do not believe that the building of new house on the green belt can be done whilst maintaining the rural feel of the village and will therefore destroy its character. There will be an infinite "desire" for houses in this area which cannot be satisfied. Re countryside access: I do not believe countryside access needs to be changed, just maintained.
- Housing needs: I see affordable housing as critical. We have more jobs than affordable houses, which pushes people to live far away. This is bad socially and environmentally.
- Perhaps make the position on cars vs active travel clearer
- They have to indicate climate appropriate planning literacy, which is in short supply.
- I dont entirely agree with the travel - many of those that live in the community (myself included) depend on motor transport into Cambridge or to stations, and this wont feasibly change. We should recognise this (eg busway - as currently proposed - of value to some who pass through but not of great value to those of us who live in the community.
- No. Phew!
- I don't think we have a "distinctive rural look" to be reinforced. Most of Great Shelford is essentially suburban; certainly nothing like a rural village with a population of a few hundred. Let's not pretend the place is something it isn't.
- None of these will be addressed as the council has shown no ability to do this in previous years, so why would they start now? Developers and the ones with the money are the ones who will continue to push. All talk, no action.
- As in my earlier note, this seems very protectionist, and ignores the major developments around us. How are we going to contribute to our neighbours in the region? How are going to make our area diverse and attractive to those that are not well off or otherwise disadvantaged? Do we want to continue to attract lots of wealthy professionals (speaking as one of that number) and increase inequality?
- Clearer vision about where the sustainable travel should be. When it comes to housing, no more little boxy estates like Chalk Hill: we can do better!
- Climate change - can we push for strict building regs for energy insulation, solar panels, water butts, heat pumps, etc etc



- Change order - so that community issues come first and planning considerations last. Re impacts of travel movements obj - instead of 'identified and mitigated', I would use 'evaluated and given significant influence.
- If the farmtrack pathway from the granary all the way to Babraham was paved and made bicycle friendly, this would be a minimal disruption and maximal effect as it would enable people to travel to work (Babraham and Grant Park). Could that be please considered?
- Don't ignore motorised users! These need to be able to travel in (or preferably around) the plan area easier as well! It is a nightmare driving through Great Shelford! Especially Church Street near the school. The objective makes it sound like you want to put cycle lanes in everywhere regardless of motorised vehicle needs!

A3 Community-led renewable energy schemes

- Need to consider options very carefully because there may be negative as well as positive impacts
- This should be actively encouraged
- I think solar is preferable from a visual standpoint: little different in visual impact from a field full of oilseed rape.
- Why not - why aren't there solar panels on the school already?
- Many roofs could benefit from solar panels. Community led schemes for installation of solar panels save money.
- Buildings should be built to passive house standards.
- A local scheme has the potential to safeguard energy supply for the community and reduce reliance on expensive central energy production
- The new approach to Vertical Axis wind turbines should be considered eg as on the London dome. They are less efficient but are easier to maintain and less damaging to visual views
- Financial help with cost of installing solar panels. Group buying to reduce costs.
- If it can help reduce bills it would be good, as long as wildlife and birds are not affected
- If financially viable
- If economically viable
- If economically viable then yes
- Let's get on it!
- It seems obvious to me that many more decisions like this should be devolved to communities
- Solar panels on community buildings
- I would love to help get involved in this. I work in the field. Great idea - would be happy to help develop a plan.
- The best place to site a wind turbine could be on the site of the old Windmill. Some form of link with the past?
- Supporting the principle of community-led renewable energy schemes should be included. I think it will be difficult to achieve unless there is a strong group willing to put in the work necessary to achieve this.
- Existing schemes that have renewable energy should not be adversely affected by any new proposals.
- Love the idea - difficult to implement.
- It depends entirely on the renewable. A deep heat pump system might be good but I disagree with a wind turbine.
- Great idea. Other schemes incentivise residents by reducing electricity bills, but I also like the idea of profits going to local causes
- Community provision of energy to support our aim for net zero is an excellent plan. I fully support this and would be willing to give time after retirement (3 to 4 yrs)



- It would be very important to ensure no areas of the villages are adversely affected by such schemes.
- [Bhttps://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/climate-change-energy-and-environment/climate-change-action/low-carbon-energy/community-heating/swaffham-prior-heat-network/about-swaffham-priors-heat-network](https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/climate-change-energy-and-environment/climate-change-action/low-carbon-energy/community-heating/swaffham-prior-heat-network/about-swaffham-priors-heat-network) - is wording wide enough for this kind of thing?
- They must also not negatively impact important views in the landscape.
- Not sure on the current feasibility of them but good in principle
- Possibility for doing this in collaboration with nearby neighbouring villages could potentially have a larger impact.
- Concerned that they are counter to protecting countryside and views
- It's difficult to install an energy saving scheme which is compatible with the other objectives
- Needs to be overseen by an independent expert
- Is it economical a good idea
- They are likely to be inefficient, badly managed and expensive compared to the immense investments in renewable energy schemes nationally.
- Too early in the development to commit.
- Not sure if it counts here but, I did take part in a Solar auction in 2022 and now have Solar PV but this scheme has so far failed to deliver the batteries required to store and reuse my own generated electricity. As someone previously interested as a previous parish councillor I was disappointed at the confused and random way communal schemes were being handled (circa 2019/2020) with little joined up thinking particularly from full time employed council. If political and other dogma could be set aside and groups get together to offer shortcuts to those parishes or individuals who want to do something for the environment, that would be a major step.
- Do not use agricultural land to host solar panels.
- Group purchase on solar to get discounted rates could work well.
- No
- An idealistic but totally impractical idea!! Capital outlay and maintenance of a wind turbine is not realistic for a village community. A community owned pub would be more realistic!
- Has to be effective and not just tokenry
- If we offer reduced prices for locally generated electricity we will likely influence people who might otherwise be opposed.
- We should definitely be introducing renewable energy schemes.
- I am aware that wind turbines can be damaging to local wild life (and the vibrations be similarly unpleasant to humans) therefore they can be difficult to site
- turbines add to global warming unless used only for refrigeration
- It depends; I would favour some wind, but not solar in fields
- Brilliant in enhancing community sense of community.
- One would have to carefully consider the impact of for example a turbine , on those living nearby and being adversely affected
- Help improve existing homes to make them more energy efficient.
- low frequency noise from wind turbines could be an issue if the location is not distant enough from people's homes
- This would also be a contribution to our neighbours in reducing carbon emissions locally.
- Is it practical - would it actually be considered outside the centre of the village.
- wind turbines would be good
- Be aware that the frequencies and flicker emitted by wind turbines can cause health issues.
- This should be a no-brainer, given our flat and windy location.
- Great objective and successful local model that could be replicated.



- It would be important to people that these projects do not have an effect on the rural characters of the villages. Perhaps more discreet projects such as small water turbines would be a good fit.
- I like the idea of distributed networks for energy production to make us less reliant on the big utility companies. I'd like to see more solar energy ideas.

A4 Equality of access to our countryside

- Access should not be detrimental to existing routes
- Some access to countryside should remain 'natural'-to avoid too much disturbance to the natural environment.
- Adds variety and opens up land into public use
- Horses make paths very muddy and can be inaccessible on foot - experienced in Epping Forest, need to be separate? Not found issues near here.
- I think the equality is already there and that we are naive if we think people will stop using cars if they can, and they will want to anyway when the weather is inclement.
- Concerned about bikes and people on same patches as not all bike riders considerate of walkers and go at high speed .this has potential for accidents
- Any sensibly funded routes for all non-motorised users should be pursued.
- The community needs safe, car free transport to enable access to enable a reduction in carbon, but also to encourage people to value the landscape for its intrinsic qualities. If people don't visit, they won't value it.
- There are already existing routes. New routes would destroy the open environment. The existing routes are there because historically that is where people want to go.
- What does this mean? What about runners and joggers who might want circuits that are easy on the foot. As written, equal priority seems to be given to pedestrians (the majority), Cyclists, and horse riders (the minority). However it is likely that horse riders may command the greatest investment in land purchase or segregation. Should the minority have a far greater amount of resource per person spent on them for equal access to a new bit of countryside. Note that the purpose of countryside access is 1) utility eg commuting, avoiding unsafe areas. This perhaps is the priority and should be weighed by potential users, frequency of use, and CO2 reduction/. 2) The second purpose is Mental and physical well being. A good criteria here is whether this is maximised for residents and this means the balance should be weighted to pedestrian access. This form of analysis does not give equal access for all groups. Perhaps the criteria should be equal investment pro rata the number of likely users.
- We are currently well served in term of path for walkers and cyclists
- In terms of access, 'improve' is recognised as acquisition for another user. 'Improvement' of an existing soft surface by the use of tarmac or some other sealed surface for commuter cyclists whilst actively damaging the amenity of other users is not acceptable. Some other LA's consider that a mile from central city, routes should be rural and not tarmac 'commuter' routes. Stapleford would fall into this category. On rural bridleways and byways all users have shared access since the horse riding community supported allowing cyclists to use bridleways back in 1968. The perception of 'conflict' between users is not the reality. There needs to be recognition that if someone wants to cycle, walk or wheel on tarmac they should use the route already provided - the road / pavement. Moreover, the Council has a biodiversity duty- that means they should not be tarmacking the countryside (strong opposition to the busway for this very reason). Soft surface users (walkers, runners, dog walkers, off road cyclists, horse riders and the environment) need soft surfaces - there is already equality - rural rights of way for those who want / need it and tarmac for those who don't. The statement that new routes must link to existing is misguided. Creation of a new standalone public right of way can be a catalyst for further routes in the future. You have



not included carriage drivers - many of whom have mobility challenges and their carriage is their 'mobility vehicle'. Currently, carriage drivers have access to only 5% of the PROW network and in Cambridgeshire, including Stapleford, carriage drivers are excluded from these routes by discriminatory and out of date TROs. This plan needs to acknowledge this discrimination and actively seek to improve the access opportunities for carriage drivers. The Plan should also have consulted with ALL the user groups on this matter.

- we need to be able to access the countryside - and respect it. Clear signs for people to read what is expected, and highlight removal of dog poop/bags and not to dump rubbish
- We are surrounded by countryside but have little access to it. We are not well served with footpaths
- New routes should not be held back because it is too expensive to make them accessible to all
- Whilst not against horse riders, we should recognise that most users will be on foot or cycle. I would be concerned if the cost of providing horse access deters the development of new paths on the basis of being too costly
- The aim should be to achieve routes that can be used by all forms of non-car use. In practice, I suspect it is always easier to get agreement for footpaths alone rather than anything else.
- Bikes and horses damage the paths and are not relaxing for other countryside users. While there should be provision for access to the countryside on horse and on bikes it can be limited and should not be everywhere
- I think the routes to the countryside are generally sufficient. There isn't a great deal of 'countryside' to explore in Great Shelford, but access to the little pockets that exist (Rec, Jenny's path, Nine Wells) is OK. I think the nature park at the top of Hinton Way will provide a nice place to walk. This will link in to the Magog Down - perhaps the path from the park to the Down could be improved along Haverhill Road
- I am not sure that equality should be the objective. I think some should be positively encouraged so better footpaths and lighting to encourage young and old to venture out on foot or on mobility scooters
- Countryside access on foot isn't very good.
- Equality of access sounds admirable but it is really worthy nonsense. Who can not access the countryside currently should they really want to? The barriers are not significant and I say that as someone who has a profoundly disabled relative.
- Horses should be restricted to a few chosen routes
- Great Shelford is surrounded by countryside but access to it is difficult as there are very few footpaths compared to many other villages
- Foot yes, bikes - some routes where providing route rather than leisure purpose; horses - far too few people to justify any incremental investment
- Depends upon the route under consideration.
- Access is a contentious issue, rights of way exist but are occasionally interfered with but in general exist well enough. The needs of a few with horses seems at odds with the majority who do not or cannot countenance such expensive hobbies (mobility devices and in particular bikes (non motorised)) make more sense for the development of an area likely to double the size of Cambridge in the coming years.
- I do not like the idea of new routes - the proposed bus route cutting up the greenbelt
- From what I have seen of improvements to access to the it has meant further destruction of the countryside by removing trees and hedges and widening paths putting more ground under tarmac
- Joining up of footpaths would be welcome
- We have to be careful new routes do not cause a negative impact on nature



- I regularly use the DNA path and it is not safe. Both personal safety, and increasingly bodily safety from speeding electric bikes and scooters. Opening up more path to bikes and scooters will make these unsafe and possibly increase Criminal behaviour.
- This is nonsense! Most public footpaths are not suitable for use as a bridleway. Our villages desperately need more public footpaths. If all new public footpaths had to be suitable for use by horse riders, very few would ever be created.
- Not a priority over housing and transport
- You can walk into Wandlebury, Gog Magog down and footpaths to Babraham from the edge of the village. It is very important that this access is maintained and these areas not developed, but no other access to countryside is required. A “country Park” as they have in Trumpington Meadows is just not the same and is too artificial.
- Let’s try to avoid poorly implemented paths, like the DNA path into Cambridge, which is great but too narrow to be used safely on occasions.
- Path segregation for safety is vital. For my rather deaf, partially-sighted elderly parent, bicycles & scooters can be very hazardous. Disabled access for parking should also be considered.
- I do not agree that all routes in the countryside should be accessible to all users. This would be intrusive to wildlife and create an artificial environment.
- While obviously this sounds like a good goal I’m unclear what the implications of it would mean, hence the more neutral response
- It is already dangerous with bike flying past you on footpaths especially with a dog
- Not sure I am in favour of a focus on ‘new access’
- I've used countryside & amenities here for many years & want improvement & all ages to benefit.
- Currently cycling to more rural locations can feel dangerous because of having to negotiate traffic that is fast moving
- Get the county council to improve the path from stapleford to gog Magog into a bike and pedestrian path.
- There are times when we just want to get away from the car/lorry etc. traffic
- Sounds nice in principle but less so in practice, and could seem to be discriminatory to those with less access to such routes or less capacity to use them. Are we really planning to bring back bridle-ways?
- I’m worried about new routes going through greenbelt
- If there has to be a compromise, horse use should be the area to compromise on, as there are not many horse riders
- Path segregation is one thing - purpose also needs to influence any new routes. Those wishing to walk and enjoy nature for example, do not want a high speed bicycle path running parallel. The purpose of each use needs assessment i.e. quiet leisure and enjoyment of nature, v social sports, v active travel, etc.
- Cycle paths would be particularly appreciated. Not just for easier transport but also leisure.

A5 Housing needs

- Concerned that eg local need for retirement accommodation is used as an excuse by developers to market them overseas (as has happened).
- Thi k you need a mixture of housing for all
- I fear, whenever mention is made of affordable housing, developers will use this as an excuse to pack in as many tiny units as possible rather than building affordable yet reasonably sized living spaces.
- Development is inevitable but we at all levels must be able to influence this. I am dismayed that the retirement 'village' has bee decided by one 'Inspector' who lives far away. I am



dismayed how what the judgement was based on. I am very very unhappy that the parish council was only allowed 3 minutes to comment on this and that it appears that we cannot influence the detail. Who decides these procedures?? Why on earth don't we object?? What happened to democracy? ers will develop when and where they can

- Grants to housing associations to help them convert larger houses to flats? Passive house standards.
- Encourage existing 4 and 5 bed home owners to convert property to flats to provide 1 and 2 bed affordable properties. Concerned that exception sites would go on green belt land. District Council needs to enforce 40% affordable on new developments. District needs to build Council housing for local people.
- I object to the idea of affordable housing on the green belt as these people will need transport to get anywhere and we are trying to cut their costs. They should be built close to existing travel hubs.
- the affordable housing is not. At only 20% below the local rate it is way out of reach for most people - especially key workers. Maybe need some bedsit type. Or use the old caravan park at macauley avenue - and put mobile homes there - much more affordable to rent or buy
- I believe that a number of options for older people either already exist or are currently being built/about to be built so I think these will have that need met (?) There are practically no affordable homes to buy for single people or families on middle to low incomes which need to be addressed. I don't have a problem with affordable homes being a mixture if renting and buying but think it's a mistake to solely go for one or the other. We must use all powers available to us to ensure developers provide these. If house are not affordable why should they be allowed to build them? The very wealthy buy such properties as investments and then rent them out to gain huge profit which only benefits them and not the local community. Local people should be able to stay living near their family and friends if they wish to do so.
- Housing for older people to downsize must also have facilities nearby
- I think developers should be pushed to include affordable housing, rather than creating separate sites for affordable homes, communities work much better when mixed/integrated
- Preferential treatment for locals runs risk of a person buying cheap and then moving, having made a killing. Also essential that we allow people to move into the village.
- I believe it is critical that the build quality of ALL the houses built should be high and outdoor space should be available in all of them too. It should not be the case that new builds are small, cramped and packed together (e.g. Trumpington meadows is an example of what we should not do)
- For many older people facing a move to a smaller property can be daunting. A group to help older people downsizing could be of benefit.
- If so many people recognise this as a crisis in the community, why does the draft plan talk about it so little? Almshouses and cheap rent are *not* the solution and perpetuate a renting class who will never own their stake in the community. People other than the rich should be given a chance to really belong to Great Shelford and Stapleford.
- Maintain mix of housing size and development that upgrades energy performance and facilities for multigenerational living
- As I dais before mixed of different sizes og houses in one area rathe rather one size of house in one area. Shelford high stree should become a no car zone or one way traffic (there was a vote around ten years ago on one way but was rejected by the elderly population who do not want change)
- Protect Green Belt
- The area will benefit most from a small number of large, high quality homes. The economic reality is that this will always be a relatively expensive place to live. That's fine. Build more



housing and prices will drop. Recognise that if people have limited means they will have to live elsewhere. I can't afford to live in Knightsbridge so I don't.

- Just because someone is lucky enough to be born here or live here doesn't give them the right to affordable housing - this should be restricted to certain people who provide valuable local services (for example practice nurses, school teachers). There are 30,000 new small dwellings (3 bed or less) being built in the Greater Cambridge area - why would we sacrifice more valuable local land to build locally. Large dwellings are less dense, create less strain per developed acre on our infrastructure etc
- The reality is that we cannot meet the assessed need without absorbing the village into Cambridge
- Build on brownbelt land
- Less large development that only serves to build bad houses and make the rich richer please. Instead can we focus on fit for purpose smaller houses built by smaller companies with the user in mind. Also the above question about building on green belt land implies that affordable housing requirements will not be enforced on new developments. why?
- No
- housing plans should provide a balanced range of property, without a presumption for one type of property over another. Build quality and density of development are critically important
- I have low confidence that schemes aimed at providing housing for local people, ie, people who grew up in the village or provide key services like teaching, can be reserved for these people and the housing stock kept for this purpose.
- I strongly support the plan shown in Figure 2.
- the concept of 'retirement villages' is not one I find attractive. A mixture of housing with occupants across the age span of the community is much more appealing. However, the existence of some bungalows in central locations, near shops are an asset for older/disabled residents particularly if they do not drive.
- You need to have white roofs of the villages will burn by 2040
- I generally think housing should be market led rather than 'needs assessed' and I believe the needs led approach has led to generally poorer end housing stock.
- I'm nervous about this "strong local connection". People may need to move, as I have done earlier in life, to find employment. I understand the intention, but it can come across as almost racist if misconstrued.
- Doesn't matter as the developers will do as they wish.
- We need to consider how we respond to a) local demand from family formation and young people growing, and b) incoming demand from those moving into the area due to the rapid growth in high-paying jobs outside the village
- Stapleford is surrounded for the most part by green spaces. I don't see how you can build more houses unless it's on there, which is a worry. Any new housing needs to be far more attractive than the hideous vast estates that exist around Cambridge.
- Affordable/social housing should be kept that way for ever, not be able to be sold at market value in the future, unless it can be proved there is not a need for social/affordable housing any more
- It is important to provide more affordable housing for home buyers however, rent is also very important. In my view, reducing prices should be the priority
- Priority should be given to those with strong local links
- green belt should be sacrosanct. If developers don't provide sufficient affordable houses, they should be ditched.



A6 Visually important open land

- Check Cambridge Nature Network.
- Haverhill Road; views to magog down and linton and elsewhere
- Field opposite 11,13,15 Haverhill road stapleford.
- Track across open fields to the Black Barn in Stapleford which gives access to Babraham Woods and The Down and Wandlebury
- Great Shelford is much bigger than the square you show here. The visually important bits of our village aren't just limited to its centre.
- Land around Stapleford Cemetery: it helps maintain visual separation between Great Shelford and Stapleford
- All the space is important. The gaps and the views are an essential part of the village.
- Magog downland and areas around that.
- Either side of Haverhill Rd, Stapleford, towards A1307 - green belt potential busway site. I am opposed to the busway development, preferring a solution using existing roads.
- Stapleford Cemetery, Mingle Lane and the views to the hinterland
- Mingle Lane/Hinton Way
- Horse field opposite DNA pathway
- The space between addenbrooks and Haverhill Road/ the gogs is key and the fields between addenbrooks and the level crossing- where the DNA path is.as is the fields where the black barn is
- Either side of the track through farmland from The Stapleford Granary
- What about the land as you walk on the path from The Granary towards the black barn and the woods (the path to Babraham)?
- Sensible development fills in gaps rather than taking over huge tracts of land. Views from a railway bridge are irrelevant; no-one stands on a railway bridge to admire the view.
- Not exceptionally visually important, but I often wonder about 'pocket park' on Granhams Road. I did walk here a few times with my children a few years ago and thought that more could be made of the space perhaps by a wildlife group - bird boxes etc.
- The community orchard and new allotments?
- The area behind the slaughter house in stapleford off church st and the green triangles on gog magog way provides green space verges, and the cemetery in stapleford set in open country are important to the rural character of the village
- cambridge road to White hill Parochial charities
- Yes. The fields next to Mingle Lane.
- land on Hinton way in stapleford boundary just below the crest of the hill going down to shelford stn.
- The land between Mingle Lane and Hinton Way - agricultural land should never be built on and it provides fantastic views in the cemetery.
- The fields off Haverhill Road. Granhams Road hills
- Area between Stapleford Granary and Gogs
- The allotments behind Cambridge rd onto the railway tracks.
- Granham's Road
- The land north east of Mingle Lane. All the land east, north east and south east of Haverhill Road.
- Yes, open land around rugby club and Westfield Road
- Durnford Gravel Pit lake and the surrounding land
- How can you not have included the fields off Haverhill rd in Stapleford, including the "pirate ship" clump of trees and the view to the Gogs? Also, the footpath and surrounding views from the Granary at the SE corner of Stapleford



- The land to the north of Mingle Lane and east of Hinton Way is VERY, VERY important. It's the only hill we have in this area.
- All the land up either side of Granhams Road, across to Hinton Way and Haverhill Rd up from the village toward the hill tops is visually very important
- Gif Magog down
- The arable fields and meadow between Stapleford cemetery, Mingle Lane and Hinton Way. They are planning on building over this land with a plan that makes a mockery of their prioritised environmental and biodiversity claims. The meadow that backs onto the homes has been grade 5 unfarmed meadow land for decades and is inhabited by a broad range of flora and fauna, some very rare. That sort of land should NEVER be built over when there is Grade 1 (poor) heavy use arable land right next to it. That open countryside, nature and views are the reason why people have moved into the neighbouring houses. If such green belt needs to be concreted over, they should keep meadowland safe at least for environmental, biodiversity and community benefit. It also helps to retain the separation between the Shelford and Stapleford villages, fatten it out with houses and Shelford and Stapleford would be indistinguishable..
- The "Jenny's Path" walkway to hauxton, Stapleford Granary Walkway & the meadow behind hinton way/Mingle lane
- Any green belt land - may not always be beautiful but still important
- Land at the back of Haverhill Road
- Land diagonally opposite no 8 ie on the right of Haverhill Rd as you go out of the village, looking up towards the Gogs (I've just seen it's G below)
- The path from the Stapleford Granary towards the Babraham Institute
- Hinton Way, either side, mingle lane!
- Views from Hinton Way, both towards the Gogs and towards Addenbrookes?

A7 Important views

- Apologies if already mentioned (quite a few to recognise above!) ...the panoramic view across miles of open countryside from the wooden walkway on the Gogs. Looking across Stapleford and surrounding countryside, towards Sawston and towards The Shelfords and beyond.
- We rightly focus on our views. This is especially important in a relatively flat landscape
- 122-154 Hinton Way looking across to the house on Granham's Road and beyond to the Biomedical campus
- all of these are important for mental health and the air we breath
- Unable to access the Appendix photos so cannot comment
- From Haverhill Road, Stapleford looking towards allotments and horses field/farm.
- I value the view of what was the Village Pond, on the corner of Stapleford Road/Bury Road. This is currently listed as a Village Amenity Area in the current local plan (Policy NH/11). Is this still going to be protected?
- The high point on the new country part looking SW to SE
- Many of the views are very important to the village but the views of the Gog Magog hills from the edge of Stapleford and the views from the DNA footpath are particularly vital to retain
- Very well researched vantage points! Once the new nature park is built between Hinton Way/Haverhill Road there should be a good vantage point there as well. Vantage points are important as 'food for the soul'
- We are keen walkers and cyclists so visit all over!
- Protecting views is just another way of excluding more people from land and home ownership.



- View from NW boundary of Wandlebury CP towards Cambridge City
- Some view points like g an v are valued in more directions
- Protect green belt
- views further over the hill travelling towards shelford stn, facing the opposite way to V ie south
- You should be able to submit form without being forced to answer all questions
- The panoramic (all directions) view from the SE-most pint of Stapleford CP boundary (a few feet away from the footbridge over the Cam)
- Yes, Westfield Road looking north and east
- Ninewells Nature Reserve - view within and footpath view to white hill and Gog Magog Down
- The night sky.
- The view of the Gog Magog hills and open farmland from the properties on Hinton Way

A8 Locally valued green spaces

- Stapleford allotments. Just ask people who walk or cycle there.
- Stapleford Cemetery
- Views from the Drift Track in Stapleford - a path with public amenity which should be on the Definitive Map.
- It would be good to know which ones apart from the rec already have protection
- Stapleford Allotments! Very important green space. Not just for allotment holders but also the local community who walk and sit here. It's has fantastic biodiversity and wildlife areas.
- I value the beautiful greenspace of the Village Pond, on the corner of Stapleford Road/Bury Road. This is currently listed as a Village Amenity Area in the current local plan (Policy NH/11). Is this still going to be protected?
- Meadows around allotments stapleford
- community garden with views to white hill behind The Hectare
- Horse fields between Granham's Road & the railway line.
- Darnford Gravel pit Lake and surrounding land
- Villerdomer gardens
- The area east of Hinton Way and north of Mingle Lane is very, very important because it's the ONLY hill/undulating countryside in our area.
- t would be wonderful if Grange Field could be added to the Rec!
- Haverhill Road allotments and Greenhedges Farm paddocks.
- I did not think Collier Field is a public space?
- Yes. The meadow behind Hinton Way and Mingle Lane that is already in danger of being concreted over. Such environmentally important land should never be built on.
- your numbering and naming above is incorrect
- Consider land between Westfield Rd and Stonehill Rd - this is greenbelt but would be ideal as a local green space
- You've got 1 and 2 the wrong way round.
- Funstons path leading from Gt Shelford to Hauxton, with river and meadows on left and arable field on right.

A9 Countryside frontages

- the frontage from the corner of Stapleford Rec out onto the open fields.
- Hinton Way overlooking Granhams Road and the north side of Coppice Avenue



- Green Hedge Farm and the recreation ground is described by Planners as a Green Lung for Stapleford keeping an open feel to the village which could otherwise become a solid infill. This should be protected.
- Unable to access the Appendix so cannot comment
- Visually important open land either side of the Black Barn track
- Again, this is just preserving the privilege of a few landowners.
- granary corner bury in Stapleford
- hinton way - top of hill both left and right either side of hill with long views
- Opposite junction of Gog Magog Way and Haverhill road, with view to NE
- not sure if this it is considered a frontage but the existing rails at junction at Shepreth Branch Junction adjacent to Abberley Wood estate could to be badly affected by a grade-separated junction proposed by EWR southern route
- Funstons path leading from Gt Shelford to Hauxton, with river and meadows on left and arable field on right.

A10 Active travel destinations

- We don't need additional routes. We just need to make the ones we have work as they should.
- Too many factors to consider; impossible to prioritise.
- You have not defined 'Active Travel'. The Greenways are supposed to be multi user although that is not how they have all been delivered (Sawston). If you mean tarmac paths then as few as possible across the countryside. There is a need for a safe rural route for ALL USERS from Rectory Farm Gt. Shelford to Trumpington Meadows Country Park including a safe crossing of the A10. There is also a need for safe access for farm machinery at this point.
- Existing bus routes could be shortened by taking more direct routes
- Active travel routes need to be joined up. Even a 50m stretch of unsafe Road disallows many from using them.
- Sawston employment sites?
- Protect green belt
- No requirement for Busway
- Existing routes should be looked.
- I didn't want to answer the above question for fear that half the countryside will be concreted over
- Please improve the DNA path!
- Havehill Rd Pk and Ride
- Safe non car routes to Biomedical campus and Cambridge city are important but more important is movement of people from out side the area into this zones, without coming through our rural villages. Better park and ride and bus service on existing routes but not the guided bus which is a poor value and destructive way to move a small number of people.
- Not in favour of this (but was forced to pick 3!)
- As a non driver, I can get around perfectly well with the existing bus routes. The CSET is a terrible idea, and unnecessary. Just run extra buses on existing roads! Improve the cycle ways, and you are sorted.
- Route from Stapleford to Babraham Campus to be made 'all weather' to allow commuting all year round. Some parts become too muddy to use in winter.

A11 Countryside routes

- Again - make the existing routes work much better and as they should. There is no point in just adding more routes that are poorly designed, constructed and operated.
- Improved route (esp for bicycles) along Hinton Way up to Babraham park and ride



- The point has been missed that many of the destinations do not welcome equestrians. Once again, you have omitted to include provision for carriage drivers although I doubt you would consider excluding bicycles with either cargo bikes, commercial boxes, carts of any kind and often these 'vehicles' are to be motorised.
- The Haverhill Road would be aspirational if it were to be protected from the road. It has become increasingly unpleasant to walk the path there due to the number of cars now using the route and speeding cars. It will only get busier sadly. Traffic calming measures don't seem to work anywhere and a really ugly with huge yellow signs and cameras. If that area is to become more built up with the 'country park' and the 'retirement village' it will be busier and warrants some thoughtful sensitive planning to reduce traffic noise, pollution and encourage people to use the route in sustainable ways. Separate the traffic from the cycle / walking route. Find ways to deter the motorists rat run.
- I am commenting here as not sure there will be further opportunity to comment. I am concerned not to see a mention of protecting the status of the village pond on the corner of Greenfield Close/Bury Road/Haverhill Road in Stapleford. In the current South Cambs neighbourhood plan this is listed as a Protected Village Amenity Area, policy NH/11. Is this still included in proposals for the new neighbourhood plan? Otherwise, you need to consult people on the change of status. This is a beautiful view and important place for the village which should be protected and the views preserved. It's private land but if we were to see any type of development around it the view and sense of place would be ruined.
- From Bury Farm lane past the black barn to river crossing then left to Magog Down
- From the river crossing on Rowley way where it joins with the path from Stapleford to Babraham along the back of the field to Magog Trust land.
- Protect green belt
- Connect Sawston Greenway to proposed new route 2
- if new route 2 is created, there could also be a new path following stream from Gt Shelford Rec, linking to existing path from Durnsford to Whittlesford Rd.
- people living in the area need to be able to walk safely along the footpaths. s
- make farmtrack parh from Granary to Babraham cycle friendly
- Access to old chalk pit off Granham's Road?
- Route 4 is really needed
- Connect route 3 to Granary track (Rowley Lane) and Vestey Wood (Magog Down)
- Route 3 would be a much nicer route from Stapleford to Magog Down
- Route 8 is a great idea to improve safety and open up Roman Rd access