

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Landscape and Townscape Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

January 2022

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) require a local planning authority to consult the public and stakeholders before adopting a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Regulation 12(a) requires a statement to be prepared setting out who has been consulted while preparing the SPD; a summary of the main issues raised; and how these issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.2. This statement sets out details of the consultation which has informed the preparation of the SPD.
- 1.3. The Landscape and Townscape SPD has been prepared to provide guidance on the implementation of landscape and townscape guidance to support the implementation of the planning policies contained within the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036. Such policies address matters of heritage, conservation, landscape, design, amenity, renewable energy. It expands upon and updates the guidance provided within the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment SPD adopted in 2007.
- 1.4. The SPD has been prepared to provide further guidance on landscape and townscape considerations to support the policies in the Local Plan. It will assist applicants, developers, agents, landowners and parish councils in preparing planning applications for submission to the District Council and commenting on planning proposals. It will also help the District Council in determining relevant planning applications.

2. Consultation Undertaken

- 2.1. The SPD has been prepared by Huntingdonshire District Council.
- 2.2. Formal public consultation on the SPD was undertaken from 15 October 2021 until 10 December 2021. The draft Landscape and Townscape SPD was consulted on for eight weeks between 15 October 2021 and 10 December 2021. Comments could be made online using Huntingdonshire District Council's [consultation system](#). Due to the size of the draft SPD, it was decided to undertake a longer consultation than that required under the Regulations. Annex A lists all of the organisations that were consulted, any residents registered onto the consultation database also received an event notification.

2.3. A total of 141 representations were received on the draft SPD, of these one was inadmissible. Of the remaining 140 comments, the breakdown was as follows:

- 10 support
- 6 object
- 124 have observations

3. Issues Raised During the Production Stage of the Draft SPD

3.1. Discussions were had throughout the production of the draft SPD with urban design, conservation and landscape colleagues at the Council. This has shaped the content and structure of the draft SPD particularly so that the draft SPD complemented the existing Huntingdonshire Design Guide (2017) and existing Conservation Area Character Statements, providing a holistic package of supporting documentation and practical guidance to aid the planning process and deliver sustainable and sensitive development across Huntingdonshire.

4. Issues Raised During the Public Consultation

4.1. The following issues were raised as part of the public consultation:

- How can unique parts of localised landscape be drawn out within broader areas.
- Several comments mentioned that the draft SPD should cross refer to neighbourhood plans where there are made plans.
- Amend references to 'Ouse Valley' to include its full name 'Great Ouse Valley' for geographic accuracy.
- Additional information regarding the importance and characteristics of the Great Ouse Valley.
- Comments relating to key landscape changes as a result of the A14 improvements work and highlighting that a review of the Great Ouse Valley boundary may be necessary.
- Changes to development proposals relating to heritage assets to ensure consistency with national guidance policy and guidance.
- Additional information and/or minor corrections to the townscape character assessments for Buckden, Godmanchester, Sawtry and Yaxley.
- Map depicting Green Infrastructure Priority Areas and projects missing.
- Potential data anomalies within the agricultural land class layer on the interactive map.
- Amendments to and additions of definitions into the glossary.
- Spelling and grammatical corrections.

- 4.2. Annex B records all comments received during the public consultation, together with the Councils' assessment of them, and where appropriate any changes that have been made to the SPD.

A - List of Organisations who were consulted on the draft Landscape and Townscape SPD

3D Planning	AONB Interested parties	Bellway Homes Limited
Abbey Properties (Cambs) Ltd	Apex Planning	Bendall and Sons Solicitors
Abbots Ripton Parish Council	Appletree Homes Ltd	Bewick Homes
Abbotsley Farms Ltd	Architectural and Surveying Services	Bidwells
Abbotsley Parish Council	Arcus Consultancy Services Ltd	Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council
Adlington	Armstrong Rigg Planning	Bletsoes
AgRESERVES	Arup	Bloor Homes
Alconbury and Ellington Internal Drainage Board	Avison Young (National Grid)	Blue Sky Planning
Alconbury Parish Council	Axiom Housing Association	Bluntisham e-petition signatories
Alconbury Weston Parish Council	Ayres	Bluntisham IDB
Aldi Store Ltd	Banks Trustees	Bluntisham Parish Council
ALEXANDERS	Barford+Co	BNP Paribas Real Estate
Alsop Verrill Town Planning and Development	Barham & Woolley Parish Council	Borough Council of Kings Lynn & West Norfolk
Altodale Limited	Barker Storey Matthews	Bovis Homes Ltd - Eastern Region
Alwalton Parish Council	Barratt Homes	Boyer Planning Limited
AMEC E&I UK	Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	Brampton Bridleway Group
Amec Foster Wheeler	Beam Estates	Brampton Little Theatre
Amesview Developments Ltd (ref A134)	Bedford Borough Council	Brampton Parish Council
Andrew P R Love architecture.design.planning ltd	Bedford Group of IDBs	Brampton Youth Forum
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Bedfordia Developments Ltd	Brimble, Lea & Partners
	Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association	Brington & Molesworth Parish Council

British Horse Society (Cams)	Cambridgeshire County Council	Clients of Andrew S Campbell Associates Ltd
Britten Investments Ltd (In Administration)	Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service	Coda Planning Ltd
Broadview Energy Ltd	Cambridgeshire Police Authority	Colne Parish Council
Broughton Parish Council	Cambs Homes Improvement Agency	Colne Road Action Group
Brown & Co Barfords	Cambs LTA	Commercial Estates Group
Buckden Parish Council	Campaign for Real Ale (Huntingdonshire branch)	Conington Parish Council
Buckworth Parish Council	Campbell Buchanan	Connecting Cambridgeshire
Building Research Establishment	Campbell McCrae	Connexions
Burgess and Walker Transport	Camvil Developments Ltd	Corpus Christi Group
Bury Parish Council	Canon House Properties	Cotton Farm Residents Association (CFRA)
Bythorn & Keyston Parish Council	Capita	Cotton Windfarm Action Group
Caddick Land	Carter Jonas	Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd and The Huntingdon Freemans Trust
Cadent Gas	Catesby Properties	Countryside Properties Plc
Cambridge City Council	Catworth Parish Council	Covington Parish Meeting
Cambridge Housing Society	CBRE	CPRE
Cambridge Sub-Regional Housing Board	Central Bedfordshire Council	Craegmoor Ltd
Cambridge Water	Cerda Planning	Crest Nicholson
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough CCG	CFAG	Cromwell Park Primary School
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group	CgMs Consulting	Cross Keys Homes
Cambridgeshire ACRE	Chaplin Farrant	Cushman& Wakefield LLP
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	Cheffins	Cyclists Touring Club for Huntingdonshire
Cambridgeshire Bat Group	Chesterton Parish Meeting	D H Barford & Co
	Church Commissioners	David lightfoot Design
	Civic Society of St Ives	David Lock Associates
	Civic Trust	David Shaw Planning
	Clark-Drain	

David Turnock Architects	Elton Estate	Folksworth & Washingley Parish Council
David Wilson Homes	Elton Parish Council	Fox Land Property
DC21 Limited	Ely Diocese/HS&P	Framptons Planning
de Clifton Associates	Empowering Wind Group	Francis Jackson Estates Ltd
Defence Estates (Ministry of Defence)	Endurance Estates	Francis Jackson Homes
Defence Estates Operations	Endurance Estates & Cambridge Project Management	Frank Shaw Associates Ltd
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Energie Kontor	Freeths LLP
Deloitte LLP	Engena Ltd	Freight Transport Association
Denton and Caldecote Parish Meeting	Entec UK Ltd	Friends of Holt Island Nature Reserve
Dev Plan UK	Environment Agency	Friends of Paxton Pits Nature Reserve
Diocese of Ely	ESCA Eatons Community Association	Friends of Somersham Nature Reserve
Disability Information Service Huntingdonshire	Eversheds LLP	FSB Huntingdonshire
DPA Architects Ltd	Evolution Town Planning	G L Hearn Property Consultants
DT Architects	Farbon Farms	Gallagher Estates Ltd
E and P Building Design	Farcet Nurseries	Gamlingay Parish Council
E.ON UK	Farcet Parish Council	GamPlan Associates
Earith Parish Council	Fenland District Council	Gatehouse Estates
Earith Timber Products Ltd	Fenstanton Parish Council	Gates Hydraulics
East Cambridgeshire District Council	Fields In Trust	Gillespies Ltd
East Northamptonshire District Council	First Capital Connect	GL Hearn
East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Firstplan	Gladman Developments
Easton Parish Council	Fisher German Chartered Surveyors	Glatton Parish Council
Ecoexcel Ltd	Fitch Butterfield Associates	Godmanchester in Bloom
Education and Skills Funding Agency	Flagship Group	Godmanchester Rovers Youth Football Club
Ellington Parish Council	Flaircross Properties Ltd	Godmanchester Town Council
	Floodline Developments	

Gooding Holdings Ltd	Headley Stokes Associates	Huntingdon Mencap
GPS PE Pipe Systems Ltd	Heatons	Huntingdon Town Council
Grafham Parish Council	Heine Planning	Huntingdonshire District Council
Granta Housing Society	Hemingford Abbots Golf Club	Hunts Cricket Board
Great and Little Gidding Parish Council	Hemingford Abbots Parish Council	Hunts Forum for Voluntary Organisations
Great Gransden Parish Council	Hemingford Grey Parish Council	Hutchinsons
Great Ouse AONB Working Group	Henry H Bletsoe & Son	Iceni Projects Ltd
Great Ouse Boating Association	Highways England	Ignis Asset Management
Great Paxton Parish Council	Hilton Parish Council	Indigo Planning Ltd
Great Staughton Parish Council	Hinchingbrooke School	Inigo Architecture
Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership	Hinchingbrooke Water Tower Ltd & Landro Ltd	Insight Town Planning
Greater London Authority	Historic England	Januaries
Green Planning Solutions	Holme Parish Council	Jehovah's Witnesses
Grounds and Co Auctioneers Valuers and Estate Agents	Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council	Jockey Club Racecourses
Guinness Trust	Home Builders Federation Ltd	John Huggins
GVA	Homes England	John Martin & Associates
Haddon Parish Meeting	Houghton & Wyton Neighbourhood Plan	Joint Strategic Planning Unit
Hail Weston Parish Council	Houghton & Wyton Parish Council	Juniper Consultancy Ltd
Hail Weston Residents	Houghton and Wyton Neighbourhood Plan Working Party	Kier Group plc
Hallam Land Management	Howard Sharp & Partners LLP	Kier Residential (part of Twigden)
Hamerton & Steeple Gidding Parish Meeting	Huntingdon and Godmanchester Civic Society	Kimberworth Holdings Ltd
Harston Parish Council		Kimbolton & Stonely Parish Council
Hartford Conservation Group		King West
		King's Lynn Drainage Board
		Kings Ripton Farms Ltd
		Kings Ripton Parish Council

Kingspan Timber Solutions Ltd	Loves Farm Community Association	National Grid
Kirkwells	LSR Solicitors and Planning Consultants	Natural Cambridgeshire
Knight Developments Ltd	Luminus Group	Natural England
L&Q	M Topham Esq.	Neale Associates
Lakeside Lodge Golf Centre	MacDonald Planning Consultancy	Nene Valley Gliding Club
Land Promotions & Developments Ltd	Marine Management Organisation	Network Rail
Land Value Alliances LLP	Marlborough Developments Ltd	NHS Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group
Landscape Access and Recreation Planning	Marlborough Properties Ltd	NHS Property Services
Lanes New Homes	Marrons Planning	Noble's Field Trust Committee
Lanpro	Marshalls Plc	North Herts District Council
Larkfleet Homes	Matrix Planning Ltd	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit
Leighton Bromswold Parish Council	Maxey Grounds LLP	O&H Properties Ltd
Leith Planning	Maze Planning	O2
Lely (UK) Ltd	MBA Planning	Office of Rail and Road
Level	Measures Farms Ltd	Offord Cluny and Offord D'Arcy Parish Council
Lidl UK	Middle Level Commissioners	Old Hurst Parish Council
Linden Homes	Milton (Peterborough) Estates Co	Old Weston Parish Council
Little Paxton Parish Council	Mobile Operators Association	Oliver Russell Property Consultants
LJA Miers & Co Ltd	Molesworth Action Group	Optical Activity Ltd
London Gypsies and Travellers Unit	Mono Consultants Ltd	Optimus Consulting
Longhurst & Havelok Homes Ltd	Morborne Parish Meeting	Ove Arup & Partners
Longhurst Group	MP North West Cambridgeshire	Oxalis Planning
Longsands Academy	Nash Partnership	Oxmoor in Bloom
Looker Energy Limited	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Parker Planning Services
Lordgate Eng Ltd		Parkin Planning Services

Partners in Planning and Architecture	Ramsey Golf Club	Rural Solutions Ltd
Pegasus Planning Group	Ramsey Internal Drainage Board	Ruston's Engineering Co Ltd
Perry Parish Council	Ramsey Million	Ruth Jackson Planning Ltd
Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd	Ramsey Neighbourhood Trust	Rutland County Council
Peterborough City Council	Ramsey Town Council	Savills
Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd	Ramsey Upwood & Great Raveley IDB	Sawtry Internal Drainage Board
Phillips Planning Services Ltd	Rapleys Planning Consultants	Sawtry Parish Council
Pidley-cum-Fenton Parish Council	RB Organic	Scotfield Ltd
Planit Consultants Ltd	RDC	Scott Whight Ltd
Planning Aid	Redrow Homes	Seabrook Farms, Somersham Town Football Club, Camvil Developments Ltd
Planning Potential	RES UK and Ireland Ltd	Sealed Air Ltd
Planning Potential Ltd	Residents of Bluntisham	Serjeant and Son Solicitors
PlanSurv Ltd	Reynolds Family	SHED Group
Planware Ltd	RFU	Sibson-cum-Stibbington Parish Council
Portedge Ltd	RGE Engineering	Sirius Planning
Portess & Richardson	Richardson Chartered Surveyors	Smiths Gore
Premier Composites Ltd	Richborough Estates Ltd	Somersham Parish Council
Preseving Upwood	RLA Planning	South Cambridgeshire District Council
PRP Planning	Robinson & Hall LLP	Southoe & Midloe Parish Council
Quality Solicitors Winters	Rochester Bridge Trust	Spacelab
Quora (St Neots) Ltd	Rossin Associates	Spaldwick Parish Council
R B Organic	Royal Air Force	Spires and Squires
R2 Developments Limited	Royal Mail Property	Spitfire Properties LLP
Ramsey Club Co Ltd	RPS Planning	Sport England
Ramsey First (Hollow)IDB	RSPB	SSA Planning Ltd
Ramsey Fourth (Middlemoor) IDB	Rural Resources Recycling	

St Edmundsbury Borough Council	T C Harrison Ford	Travel for Work Partnership
St Ives Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Tarmac Trading Ltd	Traveller Law Reform Project
St Ives Football Club	Taylor Wimpey	Travis Perkins
St Ives Golf Club and Mr and Mrs R Wadsworth	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	Troy Planning & Design
St Ives Town Council	Tesni Properties Ltd	Trustees of Sir Ernest Shepperson
St Ives Town Initiative	Thakeham	Turley
St Ives Town Team	The Abbey Group (Cambridgeshire) Limited	Turnberry Planning Limited
St Ivo School	The Colin Sanders Innovation Centre	UK Land Investments
St Neots and District Chamber of Commerce	The Crown Estate	Upton and Coppingford Parish Council
St Neots Town Council	The Design Partnership (Ely) Ltd	Upwood & The Raveleys Parish Council
Stecen Abbott Associates	The Elms Facilities Ltd	Urban and Civic
Stewart Ross Associates	The Environment Agency	Uttlesford District Council
Stilton Community Association	The Fairfield Partnership	V G Energy
Stilton Parish Council	The John Phillips Planning Consultancy	Vincent and Gorbing Chartered Town Planners
Stop Molesworth Wind Farm Action Group	The Landscape Partnership	Vodafone
Stow Longa Parish Council	The Robert Doughty Consultancy	W A Fairhurst & Partners Ltd
Strawsons Devt t/a Omnivale	The Stukeleys Parish Council	Wadsworth Scott and Burgess
Strawsons Holdings Ltd	The Theatres Trust	Wagstaffe & Ablett
Strutt and Parker	The Wintingham Park Consortium	Warboys Parish Council
Surface Planning	Three	Warboys Sports Ground Trust
Sursham Tompkins And Partners	Tilbrook Parish Council	Warboys, Somersham & Pidley IDB
Sustrans	TNEI Services Ltd	Waresley Park Garden Centre
Swan Hill Homes Ltd	Toseland Parish Council	Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council
Swavesey District Bridleways Association	Town Planning and Development Consultants	
	Town Planning Services	

Water Newton Parish Meeting

Wharf Land Investments

Whittlesey IDB

Whittome Farms

Wild Property Consultancy Ltd

Wildlife Trust BCNP

William Davis

William Gosney Ltd

Wind Energy Direct Ltd

Wind Prospect Group Limited

Winwick Parish Meeting

Wistow Parish Council

Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc

Woodhurst Parish Council

Woodland Trust

Woods Hardwick Planning Ltd

Woodwalton Parish Council

Woolf Bond Planning LLP

Worley Parsons

Wrenbridge Ltd

Wyboston Lakes Ltd

WYG Environment Planning Transport Ltd

Wynnstay Properties

Wythe Holland Partnership LLP

Wyton on the Hill Parish Council

Yaxley Amenity Centre

Yaxley Parish Council

Yelling Parish Council

York Green Renewables

Annex B - Record of Issues Raised and Action Taken (organised by 'Representation from' column)

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
British Horse Society (Cambs) by Lynda Warth	17	L&TSPD:70	Object	First of all and very importantly I wish to object to your definition of Public Rights of Way: 'The network of footpaths on which access on foot is legally protected and bridleways to which access on foot, cycle and horseback is legally protected.' That is not the correct definition of Public Rights of Way. Provision for carriage drivers is important as many carriage drivers are disabled and rely on their horses and carriages to enable them to access the countryside. Footpath: a public right of way with recorded rights for walkers. Bridleway: a public right of way with recorded rights for walkers, horse riders and cyclists. Restricted Byway: A public right of way with recorded rights to walk, ride a horse or bicycle and use a horse drawn carriage. Byway open to all traffic (BOAT): a public right of way with recorded rights for all users.	A full review of the Glossary will be undertaken to add or amend definitions where they are appropriate to the SPD.	Definition of public right of way amended.
British Horse Society (Cambs) by Lynda Warth		L&TSPD:71	Have observations	This consultation includes a great deal of informative and detailed information. However, many of the points which are pertinent to horse riders can be applied throughout the document.	Comment acknowledged. The revised SPD makes several references to the importance of public rights of way with several development proposals should boxes including reference to their protection and enhancement where possible.	Comment noted, no change required.
British Horse Society (Cambs) by Lynda Warth		L&TSPD:72	Have observations	Every opportunity should be taken to improve and enhance the PROW network to the highest possible status to make it available to as many different users as possible within the limitations of the land available. The post pandemic world has highlighted the need for more easily accessible linked up countryside access. Climate change has highlighted the need to protect and enhance the existing green corridors of the PROW network and avoid man made hard surfaces.	Comment acknowledged. The revised SPD makes several references to the importance of public rights of way with several development proposals should boxes including reference to their protection and enhancement where possible.	Comment noted, no change required.
British Horse Society (Cambs) by Lynda Warth		L&TSPD:73	Have observations	One this that does appear to be missing from the historical surveys - which appear comprehensive - is to search the local archives to support the restoration of PROW to enhance and restore the local landscape. This should be on a par with preserving vernacular buildings or building new to be sympathetic to the old. I have included in one of my comments, the crucial time restriction in place on the recording of rights of way based on historic evidence. After 1st January 2026, this will no longer be permitted on the basis of historic evidence alone. It is therefore imperative that this research is carried out swiftly and the DMMO applications submitted well within the time frame. The British Horse Society may be able to help with this work for bridleway status and above.	Comment acknowledged; this work is outside of the scope of the revised SPD.	Comment noted and information circulated to HDC conservation team and Cambridgeshire County Council to action.
British Horse Society (Cambs) by Lynda Warth		L&TSPD:74	Have observations	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan defines Active Travel as walking, cycling and horse riding. Any new provision should be available to all three non motorised user groups. This is important even in urban and semi urban areas where it has been recognised by the proposed changes to the Highway Code that horse riders should not be left stranded between cyclists on their inside and vehicles on their outside. Safe provision needs to be made for all vulnerable road users.	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth		L&TSPD:75	Have observations	Change of use of farm buildings and land from agriculture to livery yards is a useful opportunity for landowners to diversify their business. Such schemes often retain traditional buildings and old grassland which we know is an important source of carbon sequestration and certain species of wildlife as well as enabling continuation of existing landscapes.	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	3.47	L&TSPD:61	Have observations	"development proposals should Protect the character of historic lanes with hedge-banks..." - "this could apply to the rights of way network (bridleways, restricted byways, byways) if you extend it to interconnections between settlements. Hugely important to protect and enhance rural, non metalled bridleways. Would be good to see more reference to the PROW network as it is an important part of the landscape.	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	3.64	L&TSPD:62	Have observations	The Ouse Valley has potential to become a very important corridor for recreational activities including horse riding. Please remember to include this activity throughout the Plan as equestrianism is important for the local rural economy offering diversification opportunities and rural employment as well as health and well being, especially for women. Suggested changes Inclusion of the importance of horse riding and appropriate access throughout the plan.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to reflect this.	Within the Key Characteristics box for the Great Ouse Valley landscape character area, horse riding has been added to the list of recreational activities commonly undertaken within the area.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	3.78	L&TSPD:63	Have observations	Careful consideration of the landscape impacts of the conversion of agricultural land to recreational or other non-agricultural uses *Preservation of medieval and other ancient features remaining within the landscape and enhanced interpretation and public access where appropriate..." There is an opportunity here to actively seek out ancient PROW and restore them through bridleways/ tithe and enclosures records.	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	3.87	L&TSPD:64	Support	'Preserve both designated and undesignated historic assets with improved public access and interpretation where appropriate.' This Plan needs to be mindful of the 2026 cut off date for the recording of ancient highways based on historic evidence. Evidence needs to be researched quickly. The British Horse Society has the know how and experience to help with the submission of DMMO's based on historic evidence and would be very willing to help with any bridleway or higher status applications. This applies to the whole area under consideration in this plan but careful attention needs to be paid to the cut off date 1st January 2026.	Comment acknowledged; this work is outside of the scope of the revised SPD.	Comment noted and information circulated to HDC conservation team and Cambridgeshire County Council to action.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	3.91	L&TSPD:65	Have observations	Recreation is a key activity, with facilities for sailing, fishing, walking and cycling..." It is also an important recreational area for horse riding and the proper access needs to be created to allow for this important leisure pursuit which not only supports the local economy but provides important health and well being especially for women who make up the vast majority of horse riders. Natural paths with soft surfaces which blend into the landscape should be enhanced and protected.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Within the Key Characteristics box for the Great Ouse Valley landscape character area, horse riding has been added to the list of recreational activities commonly undertaken within the area.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	3.98	L&TSPD:66	Support	"Effective management of existing footpaths, cycleways and bridleways in the vicinity of Grafham Water and establishment of appropriate additional routes to support active recreation and further link Grafham Water with the surrounding area..." The British Horse Society fully supports these aims and would be pleased to work with the Plan to deliver additional facilities. Carriage drivers should not be forgotten in these proposals.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Within the last bullet point of the Looking Forward section of the Grafham Water landscape character area, additional wording to

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				<p>The creation of restricted byways would include this group who are very poorly served for access. It should be remembered that for a good number of disabled horse riders and carriage drivers, horses are their only option to freely access the countryside. Hugely important for health and well being both mentally and physically.</p> <p>Suggested changes Include restricted byways and byways in PROW to cater for carriage drivers.</p>		set out examples of active recreation have been added.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	3.123	L&TSPD:67	Support	The British Horse Society supports the proposals for increased access in the Nene Valley for all non motorised users / active travellers i.e. pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and carriage drivers. Public funds should be spent to benefit the maximum number of users. Equestrians have virtually no negative impact on wildlife.	Comment acknowledged.	Support noted.
British Horse Society (Cams) by Lynda Warth	5.143	L&TSPD:68	Have observations	"Enhance and support initiatives for rights of way throughout the village to key services and to the wider countryside..." Bridleway / restricted byway provision is high on a wish list particularly links to Hinchbrook Country park and the Ouse Valley Way. Post Covid lifestyles require the provision of more inclusive rights of way provision for both physical and mental health well being. This comment applies throughout this consultation and should be underpin this Plan and the Hunts Local Plan.	Comment acknowledged. The revised SPD makes several references to the importance of public rights of way with several development proposals should boxes including reference to their protection and enhancement where possible.	Comment noted, no change made.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.6	L&TSPD:89	Have observations	<p>The A1 is not the western edge of the village. Perry Road, Taylors Lane and Hardwick Lane are all to the west of the A1 and form part of the village.</p> <p>Suggested changes Amend to delete the statement that the A1 is the western edge of the village.</p>	Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be added to the introductory text of Buckden's character assessment.	Amended paragraph 9.6 to reflect the comment submitted.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.10	L&TSPD:90	Have observations	<p>The village has one pub. It also has two hotel/restaurants.</p> <p>Suggested changes delete "pubs" and insert "a pub and two hotels with restaurant"</p>	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended paragraph 9.10 in line with the comment submitted.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.12	L&TSPD:91	Have observations	<p>There are numerous trees protected by TPOs in Little Park and the grounds of The Towers</p> <p>Suggested changes After St Mary's Church add "and in Little Park and the grounds of The Towers"</p>	Comment acknowledged, the majority of trees within the grounds of the Towers and within Little Park are protected by being located within the Conservation Area rather than a specific TPO.	Amended paragraph 9.12 to more accurately reflect the protection of trees within the grounds of St Mary's Church and Buckden Towers.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.15	L&TSPD:92	Have observations	<p>the spelling "Ivebury" is wrong.</p> <p>Suggested changes Substitute "Ivelbury" for "Ivebury".</p>	The Council will undertake a full spelling and typographical check before finalising the SPD.	Amended paragraph 9.15 Ivebury to Ivelbury.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.18	L&TSPD:93	Have observations	<p>The properties in Taylors Lane are not in the same style as those in St Hugh's Road. They do not have hedges or boundary walls. They are terraced and small.</p> <p>Suggested changes Delete the third sentence</p>	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended paragraph 9.18 by removing reference that these properties are of the same style as those along St Hugh's Road.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.19	L&TSPD:94	Have observations	<p>The words "and are contrast the overall ..." do not make sense.</p> <p>Suggested changes amend to read "and contrast with the overall....."</p>	A full spelling and typographical review will be undertaken before finalising the SPD.	Amended paragraph 9.19 as per comment

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.21	L&TSPD:95	Object	<p>Outline planning permission has now been granted for up to 270 dwellings which should form part of the Silver Street character area. The statement that development proposals are limited is out of date and wrong. The box setting out development proposals should be expanded as below.</p> <p>Suggested changes 1. Amend the statement to include the new development within the character area and apply the "Development proposals" box to it. 2. Add to the box: Protect the views of the Church and The Towers from the north. Include some Arts and Crafts style dwellings and emulate the diversity of architectural styles on Silver Street Create a sense of place by grouping dwellings around green areas, reflecting the style of Lincoln Close Create attractive features with opportunities for tree planting Be low to medium density with spacious layouts and wide roads. Comply with the design and layout requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	The character area boundary does not include site allocation BU1 (East of Silver Street). The Council notes that outline planning permission has now been granted for this site. It is anticipated that this development would merit being identified as its own character area once development is well underway. In any future review of the SPD, this will be reconsidered.	Noted, as outlined in the Council's assessment, no changes will be made to this area at this time.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.27	L&TSPD:96	Have observations	<p>Hunts End relates much more to the historic centre than to Vineyard Way. In fact the first sentence states Hunts End is located opposite the historic centre. The words "and is located....." do not make sense. The Valley lake is not mentioned</p> <p>Suggested changes Delete the first sentence. Add mention of the Valley Lake to the last sentence</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged:</p> <p>The location of Hunts End within Character Area 4 (Vineyard Way/Park Way) is consistent with the character area drawn for the Buckden Design Guidelines (May 2019). Their location was not changed in this SPD to ensure consistency between the two documents.</p> <p>Additional clarity will be made to the paragraph to reflect the comment regarding Hunts End and Valley Lake.</p>	<p>No changes made to the location of Hunts End at this time.</p> <p>Removed reference to Hunts End being opposite the historic centre.</p> <p>Valley Lake reference added to paragraphs 9.27 and 9.35.</p>
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.30	L&TSPD:97	Have observations	<p>There is also a group of bungalows in Hunts End Court</p> <p>Suggested changes Add reference to the bungalows as well as the flats.</p>	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Added reference to paragraph 9.30 to reflect bungalows in Hunts End Court.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.32	L&TSPD:98	Have observations	<p>Lucks lane is located partly in and partly to the south of the historic centre. In addition to the doctors' surgery and cemetery there is the Scout Hut.</p> <p>Suggested changes Amend to change in accordance with the comments above.</p>	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended paragraph 9.32 in line with the comment submitted.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.33	L&TSPD:99	Have observations	<p>"form" should read "from". (twice)"Weir Close is omitted.</p> <p>Suggested changes Change "form" twice. Add Weir Close after Cranfield Way.</p>	A full spelling and typographical review will be undertaken before finalising the SPD.	Amended paragraph 9.33 as per comment submitted.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.36	L&TSPD:100	Have observations	<p>"and marks" should read "which marks"</p> <p>Suggested changes as above</p>	A full spelling and typographical review will be undertaken before finalising the SPD.	Amended paragraph 9.36 as per comment submitted.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.38	L&TSPD:101	Have observations	"greatest concentration" - greater than what? Suggested changes Change "the greatest" to "a great" or "a large".	The statement states that the major development along Lucks Lane of 180 homes (the largest 21 st century development within the village to date) will 'provide the greatest concentration of design principles and trends of 21st century building'. The sentence is intended to acknowledge that some other 21 st century design has taken place within the village but not to this scale before.	Comment noted, no change required.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.39	L&TSPD:102	Have observations	There are three attenuation ponds not "several". Suggested changes Amend to read "three attenuation ponds"	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended paragraph 9.39 in line with the comment submitted.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.43	L&TSPD:103	Have observations	Amend last sentence as below. Suggested changes "early 18th century, constructed of Flemish....."	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended paragraph 9.43 as per the comment submitted.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.45	L&TSPD:104	Have observations	"symmetrical chimney stacks pointed front set..." does not read right. Amend to read as intended. Suggested changes Amend as suggested above.	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended paragraph 9.45 to aid its interpretation.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.46	L&TSPD:105	Have observations	There are opportunities for infill between Stirtloe Lane and Long Hall Road. Suggested changes Expand the box to include more detailed requirements for such infill in terms of style, density etc and to comply with the Neighbourhood Plan.	The Buckden Neighbourhood Development Plan is part of the Development Plan for Huntingdonshire. Therefore, any proposal within Buckden will apply the neighbourhood plan policies to it as well as guidance within this SPD (guidance which supports the implementation of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036). As such, it is unnecessary to duplicate requirements already set out within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Comment noted, no action undertaken, see Council's assessment for further details.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.47	L&TSPD:106	Have observations	The word "the" has been omitted in the third sentence. Suggested changes to read "services within the main village."	A full spelling and typographical review will be undertaken before finalising the SPD.	Amended paragraph 9.47 as per comment submitted.
Buckden Parish Council by John Thelwall	9.51	L&TSPD:107	Have observations	Fifth sentence "rights" should not be plural. Suggested changes Delete the "s" from "rights".	A full spelling and typographical review will be undertaken before finalising the SPD.	Amended paragraph 9.51 as per comment submitted.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Central Bedfordshire Council		L&TSPD:134	Support	Thank you for consulting Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) on the above document. Please accept this letter as our formal response. CBC welcomes the opportunity to respond to the proposals and we have provided some high-level comments below which we hope you will find helpful. We look forward to continued engagement between our two authorities moving forward. The Council considers the document to be a comprehensive aid in guiding the preparation and consideration of planning applications to enhance the quality of new development in Huntingdonshire. The SPD will help developers in their submission of planning applications by providing guidance on landscape and townscape issues to be considered as part of any development proposals and will help to guide the location and integration of new development within the varied existing landscape and townscapes of Huntingdonshire. CBC recognises that the SPD will also support the preparation of neighbourhood plans through the provision of detailed information on landscape and townscape characteristics. Overall, the Council supports the comprehensive approach you have taken to this SPD and the level of detail is commendable. We particularly support the reference to substantial landscape buffers around major developments on the edges of towns at para 3.78 which states "key issues for the South East Claylands landscape character includes; provision of substantial landscape buffers to accompany major developments on the edges of towns to ensure successful integration into the landscape setting." The Council considers this approach is particularly essential for any major development that may happen in close proximity to the border with Central Bedfordshire to reduce visual impacts on the rural landscape and surrounding communities. I hope you find these comments on the proposed SPG useful. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions.	Comment acknowledged.	Support noted.
CPRE by Gareth Ridewood	3.81	L&TSPD:32	Have observations	Leighton should be Leighton Bromswold Suggested changes Leighton should be Leighton Bromswold	A full spelling and typographical review will be undertaken before finalising the SPD.	Amended table below paragraph 3.81 to say Leighton Bromswold.
CPRE by Gareth Ridewood		L&TSPD:77	Have observations	CPRE Cambridgeshire and Peterborough generally supports the proposed Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Supplementary Planning Document: Consultation Draft 2021. CPRE welcomes the recognition of the importance of conservation and enhancement of the landscape's distinctive qualities within Huntingdonshire, along with townscape character. The historic landscape character areas of Huntingdonshire are important to it's sense of place and distinctiveness which are valued by many of its residents and visitors. It is important that landscape character is protected from intrusive development, including views into and out of historic settlements. CPRE supports comments from Historic England in ensuring there is stronger focus on promoting a sense of place and local distinctiveness within the document wording. We support the following comment 'A number of the development proposals text boxes include a criterion for 'Protect and conserve the historic buildings...'. We suggest that this wording should be revised to read 'Conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the heritage assets... including any contribution made to significance by their settings' which would be more in line with the wording in the NPPF and PPG. Similar wording could also be used at paragraph 2.21. Suggested changes We support the following comment 'A number of the development proposals text boxes	Amendments to 'development proposals should' boxes which refer to 'protect and conserve' will be amended in line with the proposed wording to enable consistency in application between the SPD and national policy and guidance on heritage matters. This proposed wording has also been proposed by Historic England.	Amended several 'development proposal should' boxes to address comment raised.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				include a criterion for 'Protect and conserve the historic buildings...'. We suggest that this wording should be revised to read 'Conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the heritage assets... including any contribution made to significance by their settings' which would be more in line with the wording in the NPPF and PPG. Similar wording could also be used at paragraph 2.21.		
CPRE by Gareth Ridewood	1.6	L&TSPD:78	Have observations	Interactive Map does not work with Mac computers. Suggested changes Need to re-test map tools using Mac's and Smart Phones etc to ensure it is accessible on all devices.	Comment acknowledged, testing will be undertaken to review whether the map is compatible with Mac computer and smartphones.	Have tested the interactive map on smartphones and a Mac computer, both worked. No change required. It is suggested that when viewing the map on Mac computers to open it via Chrome rather than Safari.
CPRE by Gareth Ridewood	3.7	L&TSPD:79	Support	Huntingdonshire's agricultural land and soil health is vital to the local rural and farming community. Suggested changes Add carbon storage... Agricultural land is a valuable asset in itself as it contributes to the local and national economy and assists with food security and a vital store of carbon for climate resilience.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to this paragraph.	Amended paragraph 3.7 to add in that agricultural land is a store of carbon in line with the comment submitted.
CPRE by Gareth Ridewood	3.6	L&TSPD:80	Support	agree but need to mention soil health. Suggested changes Modern management techniques are seeking to redress some of these impacts through reintroducing landscape features such as hedgerows, woodlands and wetlands to boost biodiversity and nature soil friendly farming measures to protect health.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to this paragraph.	Amended paragraph 3.6 to include improve soil health.
CPRE by Gareth Ridewood	3.14	L&TSPD:81	Support	Support Suggested changes Many locally and nationally important habitats and species are found in the district including meadows, hedgerows, ponds, grazing marsh, woodland, veteran and heritage trees , orchards, parkland, fen, wetlands, reedbeds and lakes. Need to also mention Elms... Today there are over a thousand living mature elms around Abbots Ripton and surrounding villages. Also the importance of trees to townscapes...add... Mature trees play an important role in the character of historic townscape areas, including Conservation Areas, and complement the built environment.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to this paragraph.	Amended paragraph 2.14 to add elm into list of matures trees. Also added a sentence at the end of the paragraph incorporating the importance of mature trees to townscape areas in line with comment submitted.
Godmanchester Town Council by Vicky Pryce	2.26	L&TSPD:49	Object	Key Features Within the draft document on page 187 a table of key features within the town are listed. Although we agree with all the features currently included, we would like to see the Town Hall added within the landmarks section. This building is a prominent part of Godmanchester's skyline when looking from the recreation ground toward the town and is one of the grade II listed buildings that comprise our central focal point within the town.	Comment acknowledged.	Town Hall added to Key Features table following paragraph 5.201.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Godmanchester Town Council by Vicky Pryce	5.199	L&TSPD:50	Have observations	<p>Conservation Areas</p> <p>Godmanchester has two conservation areas within the town which are not referenced or noted within this document; these areas need to be mentioned within the Townscape Character section - 5.199, 5.200, 5.2001 and reiterated within each character area; Godmanchester Character Area 1, 2 & 4. The development proposals for these areas should be in align with the GNP and Conservation Area Character Statements. Several policies from the GNP need highlighting for potential developments and extensions to be sympathetic to the surrounding historical building in terms of scale, amenity and design along with reinforcing the grain, density and architectural distinctiveness of the local character (GMC 10-12). In addition, any developments in the Areas 1-4 should not cause a loss of parking or clutter the street scene for example public artwork GMC 14 & 15.</p>	<p>Need to add reference to conservation areas is acknowledged.</p> <p>As part of the statutory Development Plan Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan takes precedence over this SPD where any inconsistency arises in guidance provided. References to Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan policies are therefore unnecessary and have not been added to avoid the potential for future confusion when the Neighbourhood Plan is updated.</p> <p>Control of many of the elements that add to clutter in the street scene such as highway signage are outside the scope of this SPD.</p>	<p>Reference to two Conservation Areas having been designated has been added to paragraph 5.199 and to character areas 1, 2 and 4.</p> <p>References to public art have been amended.</p>
Godmanchester Town Council by Vicky Pryce		L&TSPD:51	Have observations	<p>Response to Huntingdon Landscape and Townscape Supplementary Planning Document: Consultation Draft 2021 Godmanchester Town Council Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Whilst we agree that this document will provide details for towns and villages to create their own Neighbourhood Plan, its purpose should also take into account the planning policies contained within existing plans therefore highlighting the importance and value of Neighbourhood Plans. (page 1 - Introduction) We feel that this draft document does not fully align itself with the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan (GPR).</p> <p>Key Features</p> <p>Within the draft document on page 187 a table of key features within the town are listed. Although we agree with all the features currently included, we would like to see the Town Hall added within the landmarks section. This building is a prominent part of Godmanchester's skyline when looking from the recreation ground toward the town and is one of the grade II listed buildings that comprise our central focal point within the town.</p> <p>Conservation Areas</p> <p>Godmanchester has two conservation areas within the town which are not referenced or noted within this document; these areas need to be mentioned within the Townscape Character section - 5.199, 5.200, 5.2001 and reiterated within each character area; Godmanchester Character Area 1, 2 & 4. The development proposals for these areas should be in align with the GNP and Conservation Area Character Statements. Several policies from the GNP need highlighting for potential developments and extensions to be sympathetic to the surrounding historical building in terms of scale, amenity and design along with reinforcing the grain, density and architectural distinctiveness of the local character (GMC 10-12). In addition, any developments in the Areas 1-4 should not cause a loss of parking or clutter the street scene for example public artwork GMC 14 & 15.</p>	<p>As part of the statutory Development Plan Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan takes precedence over this SPD where any inconsistency arises in guidance provided. References to Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan policies are therefore unnecessary and have not been added to avoid future confusion when the Neighbourhood Plan is updated.</p> <p>The SPD places substantial emphasis on the historic character of Godmanchester and its prevalence of listed buildings which is in broad alignment with the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Town Hall added to Key Features table following paragraph 5.201.</p> <p>Reference to two Conservation Areas having been designated has been added to paragraph 5.199 and to character areas 1, 2 and 4.</p> <p>Reference to public art has been removed from character areas 2 and 3 and the text for areas 1-4 amended to state: 'Seek to incorporate interpretation boards to share the historical significance of the area' to allow for expansion of the historic interpretation boards erected at various historic sites around Godmanchester a few years ago.</p> <p>Typographical error</p>

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				<p>football club that are part of the Romans' Edge Development. The boundary line for Character Area 5: London Road and Crowhill also needs to be extended to cover the Clyde Farm Development, Ream Close.</p> <p>Art Work The promotion of 'Public Art' work has been included within most areas within the town. However, it may not be welcome in the historic core of Godmanchester., Character Areas 1-4 and any planning applications would be resisted in line with GMC15 of the GNP. As a town we would embrace art work in new development areas such as Clyde Farm or Romans' Edge. As stated in GMC15 we would welcome signage that interprets and promotes the historic character of the town. Moorings Within Area 10, we would welcome developments to include public moorings to enable visitors to access our town and provide portage to encourage water-based activities (GMC5)</p> <p>Pedestrian and Cycle Route As a council, we endorse any development that promotes pedestrian and cycle routes which provide access to the historic core of the town as well as providing safe passage to cross the A1198.</p> <p>(GMC23 & 25) Spelling Error On pg 195 there is a typing error within bullet point 5 - 'tot' not 'to'. Citations: Godmanchester Town Neighbourhood Plan Polices (15th February 2018)</p> <p>GMC5 -: Making the most of our waterside assets Development proposals that promote the use of the river for quiet and low-impact leisure, wildlife and tourist's pursuits, with low risk to wildlife and habitats, will be supported. Proposals to protect, restore, replace and enhance public moorings and create new public mooring space to encourage safe access and use will be prioritised over private access and use. Proposals that will create activity on the river will be expected to demonstrate that such uses do not have a detrimental impact on the tranquil environment through the creation of excessive noise or pollution.</p> <p>GMC10 – : Promoting Godmanchester's history and heritage. Development proposals that seek to promote and share the history and heritage of Godmanchester through the development of the visitor economy and of tourist facilities will be supported, Proposals need to be: of an appropriate scale for their location; be sympathetic to their location; have low-impact and enhance their environment. Development proposals to provide a permanent home to the Museum within the historic core will be supported.</p> <p>GMC11 - : Ensuring development maintains and enhances the character of the Town and reflects its heritage and history Development proposals within the historic core are expected to demonstrate that they are sympathetic to the surrounding buildings (including listed building), in terms of scale, design and amenity. Development proposals should reinforce the local character including the grain, scale, density and architectural distinctiveness.</p>		<p>corrected.</p> <p>A requirement for short-stay moorings to be provided at the Tyrell's Marina redevelopment site has been added.</p> <p>Reference to provision of car parking and reducing the impact on the street scene of on-street parking has been added to areas 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>For more detailed amendments to the Godmanchester chapter please see the responses made to comments submitted by Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy.</p>

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				<p>GMC12 - : Protecting and celebrating our heritage In order to protect and celebrate Godmanchester's heritage, development proposals that seek to alter or extend listed or historic buildings and structures should retain any key features that show their past use.</p> <p>GMC14 - : For new residential development, plans should not exacerbate any pressure 'on-street' parking and should provide numbers of off-street parking spaces appropriate to the site's location and the character of the proposal. The number of spaces should reflect the mix, size and type of housing. Parking spaces can take the form of spaces or garaging/car port facilities, but must be permanently available for parking use and must meet the minimum standards for size as set out by the Local Planning Authority. Development that results in the loss of existing off or on-street parking will be resisted unless it can satisfactorily be demonstrated that the amount of overall provision is adequate. Proposals for new commercial development (A, B, or D-use class) must demonstrate that they can provide adequate off-road parking for their workforce, customers and deliveries and will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties or existing businesses. Proposals for new commercial activity that include for the provision of a Travel Plan will be supported, particularly where use of public and community transport is included. Proposals that result in the loss of public car-parking facilities in the historic core will be resisted. Such proposals will only be acceptable if parking provision is made elsewhere within the historic core that is at least of an equivalent size, quality and accessibility as the existing facility.</p> <p>GMC15 - : Improving and enhancing the Town through street furniture lights and signage that reflect the Towns character. The provision of street furniture, hard landscaping, lighting and signage will be expected to minimise the visual clutter in the Historic Core and to enhance its historic character. Where new provision is made, it should be in keeping with its surroundings, have regard to energy conservation and public safety and be sympathetic to the historic character of the Town. Signage which seeks to interpret and promote the Town's heritage and history will be supported.</p> <p>GMC23 -: Improving cycling in Godmanchester Development proposals that contribute to improvement of the network of cycle routes in the Town, or access to them, will be strongly supported. This includes the provision of safe crossing of roads for cyclists. Development proposals to provide covered public cycle parking will be supported.</p> <p>GMC25 -: Making it easier to get about on foot in Godmanchester To ensure that residents can walk safely to the historic core, public transport facilities, schools and other important facilities service Godmanchester town, all new developments should ensure safe pedestrian access to link up with existing footways that, in turn, directly serve the Walkway Routes. Development will not have an unacceptable impact on Walkway Routes, and provide a strategy to mitigate the impact of additional traffic movements on the safety and flow of pedestrian access. Proposals to enhance the identified Walkways will be strongly supported. Where possible, footpaths should be clearly delineated to separate them from roads and cycle paths. They should be constructed from hard-wearing materials and designed to be easy to maintain over time.</p>		

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				Suggested changes Please see details above.		
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell		L&TSPD:111	Have observations	Various references to the Great Ouse Valley and its context in the Huntingdonshire landscape are made in paras 3:1 to 3:17. However in the paragraphs 3:57 to 3:68, which are specific to the Great Ouse Valley, the references and evaluation become more generalised and less focussed. This seems contrary. The identification of the characteristics of the Great Ouse Valley in paras 3:57 to 3:68 is weak and, in places, poorly informed. This results in the analysis of those characteristics of the Great Ouse Valley, and hence their value to Huntingdonshire, being insufficient and inadequate.	Comment acknowledged; the original Landscape and Townscape SPD was undertaken by qualified landscape professionals; this update has been undertaken by Planning Policy Officers at HDC to reflect the key changes to the landscape and adding additional detail where appropriate. Additional detail will also be added to the SPD in line with responses received on the draft SPD.	Comment noted.
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	3.57	L&TSPD:108	Have observations	It should be noted that as the river is the River Great Ouse - distinct from the River Ouse in Yorkshire and Sussex - the abbreviation of its valley to 'Ouse Valley', although perhaps quicker and more convenient, is incorrect and allows for confusion. The full, correct name of 'Great Ouse Valley' should therefore be used. It would be appropriate here to include reference to the scale of the river as c143 miles in total making it the fifth longest in the UK. Suggested changes The full, correct name of 'Great Ouse Valley' should be used.	Comment acknowledged, references to the Ouse Valley will be amended to Great Ouse Valley. Additional detail relating to the scale of the river will be added.	Amendments made throughout the SPD correcting the reference from Ouse Valley to Great Ouse Valley and Rive Ouse to Rive Great Ouse. Interactive map also updated to reflect this. Additional detail added to paragraph 3.58 incorporating the scale of the River.
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	Figure 3.1	L&TSPD:109	Have observations	Defining the area and drawing a boundary. It would be helpful to have explanation as to how the boundaries of the Ouse Valley' have been drawn for this document in Fig 3:1. Do they indicate the extent of the flood plain and/or contour lines? In some areas - most notably south of Hemingford Grey - the boundary extends further than might be expected - i.e. south of the new A14. The defined area of the Great Ouse Valley should include those areas of directly adjacent higher land which have an integral and essential relationship with the valley - e.g. Houghton Hill, Hinchbrook, some parts of Paxton Hill and Eaton Ford.	The SPD supports policies within the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, whilst we recognise the concern regarding the Great Ouse Valley boundary and the implications of the new A14 on it, HDC cannot change the boundaries of designations that support strategic policies. This could, however, be an aspect to review in detail when preparing the next local plan. The original boundaries drawn by qualified landscape architects, this update to the SPD has been undertaken by Planning Policy Officers at HDC. The boundaries have	Noted, no change at this time but see Council's assessment for details.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
					therefore remained unchanged for consistency of application of the original methodology.	
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	3.62	L&TSPD:136	Have observations	Key characteristics This paragraph does not sufficiently identify and assess the quality of the main features of the natural and built heritage of the Great Ouse Valley. It should be far more robust. The quality, quantity and concentration of the components of the area is the dominant and exceptional feature of the Great Ouse Valley in comparison to the rest of Huntingdonshire. This is an outstandingly rich area indeed. From Figure 3:3 it can be seen that there are more Cambridgeshire County Wildlife Sites of both land and river, and (with the exception of Grafham Water) more SSSI s, in the Great Ouse Valley than anywhere in Huntingdonshire. For the built heritage, the Great Ouse Valley contains the largest number and greatest concentration of Listed buildings in Huntingdonshire. (As such these buildings are not just 'attractive' but have been nationally assessed for quality). There are also more Conservation Areas, many of which link or are in close proximity, in the Great Ouse Valley than anywhere else in Huntingdonshire. Many of the buildings that relate to the river are superb and distinct to the area - ranging from medieval bridges (and St Ives with one of only four bridge chapels in the UK), to causeways, mills, churches alongside the river, the Quay side at St Ives.	Comment acknowledged; the original Landscape and Townscape SPD was undertaken by qualified landscape professionals; this update has been undertaken by Planning Policy Officers at HDC reflecting the key changes to the landscape and adding additional detail where appropriate. Additional detail will also be added to the SPD in line with responses received on the draft SPD.	Comment noted.
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	3.58	L&TSPD:112	Have observations	Although 'the fertile alluvial soils of the valley floor have strongly influenced the establishment of extensive hay meadows and grazing land along the river valley', the fundamental and determining reason such areas are pasture is because they are subject to regular floods and a high water-table which render them unsuitable to arable farming. It would be appropriate here to describe the essential role of the flood-plain meadows for flood storage and flow attenuation. The flood-plain meadows of Huntingdonshire serve a wide region, due to the large catchment area of the Great Ouse. The storage of flood waters on the meadows protects considerable areas of built areas from flooding.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Amended paragraph 3.58 to add additional detail regarding the role of flood-plain meadows in the storage of flood water.
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	3.59	L&TSPD:113	Have observations	59 The term 'transport corridor' does little to explain the significance of the River Great Ouse in Huntingdonshire as a highway, over millennia, for people as well as for cargoes. Within Huntingdonshire the Great Ouse was a link to the vast network of waterways of the Fens, the major route to the east coast for national and international travel, and a route inland to Bedford and beyond. As such, it was a national commercial route until the Industrial Age, and continued as an important regional route until the advent of rail.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Amended paragraph 3.63 to add additional detail regarding the importance of the Great Ouse transport corridor.
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell		L&TSPD:114	Have observations	There is no mention of archaeology in the Great Ouse Valley, where contrary to the assertion in 3:8, there is the sequence of Neolithic and Bronze Age ceremonial sites along the river; most notable is the Neolithic complex at Godmanchester whose sophistication outranked that of Stonehenge. The siting of these ceremonial areas - whose construction and attendance involved large numbers of people - is understood to relate directly to the river. It is likely that all settlements along the river began beside fords, as evidenced by the later names of many villages - Hemingford, Hartford, Offord etc. Where bridges replaced fords, the towns of St Ives, Huntingdon and St Neots, expanded as transport hubs (serving river, road and, later, rail) and became the most important market and commercial centres of Huntingdonshire. The industrial heritage of	Comment acknowledged, paragraph 3.8 refers to Scheduled Monuments, of which there several across the Great Ouse Valley. Recognising that there may be sites of archaeological value that are not scheduled, reference to the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record has been added to the SPD as paragraph 2.20 where such information can be shared	Comment noted, additional paragraph 2.20 added.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				the river is far older than the 18C. Watermills along the river are recorded in the Domesday survey. And although there is no specific archaeological evidence to confirm Roman watermills it is very probable that these existed. From the 12C there were numerous watermills, many in close proximity, from St Ives to Eaton Socon. In the 19C large steam mills were built at St Ives, Godmanchester, Offord and Great Paxton.	and stored.	
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	3.60	L&TSPD:115	Have observations	The large scale of gravel extraction - almost entirely post-1940, and still in operation - deserves mention because of the resulting vast areas of water which have transformed the nature of the Great Ouse Valley.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Paragraph 3.60 amended to reflect this comment.
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	3.61	L&TSPD:116	Have observations	Because many parishes of Huntingdonshire have boundaries with the Great Ouse Valley, or have significant parts of the Valley within their parishes, accordingly, it should be noted that the Great Ouse Valley has a direct influence on a large part of the landscape of Huntingdonshire.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Paragraph 3.61 amended to reflect this comment.
Great Ouse Valley Trust by Graham Campbell	3.68	L&TSPD:117	Have observations	The phrase - used in several parts of this paragraph 'Protection and enhancement' is welcomed. It shows an understanding of the need for greater management for the Great Ouse Valley. The hitherto intermittent and insufficient recognition of the value of the landscape of the Great Ouse Valley, has been disappointing. The margins of the Great Ouse Valley have areas that are vulnerable to erosion by development, as well as more central areas that are currently degraded and need active enhancement. But, when the statements in 3:68 for the Great Ouse Valley are compared to those in 3:123 for the Nene Valley, there is a notable difference in emphasis and detail. The proposals for the Great Ouse Valley need to be strengthened. They should be more specific - particularly in relation to nature conservation, restoration and promotion. The terminology should be as robust: the Nene Valley paragraph is considerably more positive and directional with phrases such as: 'enrich the area: reinforcing its special qualities and acknowledging its distinct local character: improve: promote opportunities for... initiatives: maximise ecological value: minimise ... impact on the tranquil landscape character: ensure: encourage public access.' The Great Ouse Valley Trust is encouraged by the recommendation: 'Protect and enhance the strategic green corridor formed by the river valley, particularly where it passes through settlements.' The landscape of the Great Ouse Valley plays a crucial role in the well-being of Huntingdonshire residents in being a vital resource of accessible green space in a County where such areas are nationally comparatively scarce. Equally, the 'green corridor' is of high ecological value. Recognition of the Great Ouse Valley as a 'green corridor' will help ensure the integrity of landscape. It is vital to maintain cohesion. Any fracturing of the whole, or reduction of margins, will diminish the value overall. Moving forward: The Great Ouse Valley Trust welcome the inclusion of the Great Ouse Valley as one of the three Green Infrastructure Priority Areas in Huntingdonshire. The Great Ouse Valley Trust recommend that the draft Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Supplementary Planning Document, 2021, be amended and strengthened as proposed in this response. The Great Ouse Valley is an outstanding area of landscape, and it is essential that the Local Plan to 2036 has adequate provision to ensure the necessary conservation and enhancement for present and future generations.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Support noted. Additional 'development proposals should' criteria have been added to the Great Ouse Valley.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Hemingford Abbots Parish Council by Maxine Blewett		L&TSPD:142	Have observations	<p>Hemingford Abbots covers c 950 Ha and has a population of c 620 with c 250 houses. Thus there is a lot of landscape in the parish! The whole of the built area of Hemingford Abbots lies within the Great Ouse Valley. About two thirds of the countryside of the parish is within the Valley. (The exception is the southern third of the parish, which extends over the A1307 and new A14 where the land rises.) The built area of the village lies mostly along or close to the backwater of the river but, east of the Manor House, the remainder of the parish lies along the main channel of the river. The parish contains extensive areas of flood-plain meadow between the two channels of the river. These meadows, the whole of the built areas of the village, plus a large part of Godmanchester East Side Common which borders the western end of the village, are within the Hemingfords Conservation Area. Hemingford Park is an area of c 75 acres of parkland surrounding the Grade II* Hemingford Park House. A National Cycle Route runs through the village. There are many footpaths including the Ouse Valley Way and Pathfinder Long Distance Walks. Hemingford Abbots is part of the circular route to St Ives via Houghton and The Thicket. The village is much frequented by walkers, cyclists and horse riders who enjoy the riverside scenery, off-road countryside routes and pretty village. There are an increasing number of visitors -both local and from further afield - who recognise Hemingford Abbots and its neighbouring villages of Houghton and Hemingford Grey as a 'beauty spot'. The biennial Flower Festival in Hemingford Abbots attracts thousands of visitors who come to enjoy riverside gardens, the decorated church, teas and river trips. The river is much enjoyed by many people for fishing, canoeing, punting, paddle boarding, swimming, motor cruising. The two Hemingford villages hold an annual Regatta (in existence since 1901) where there is keen competition in rowing, punting and canoeing with upwards of 180 races held in one day. For all these reasons the special landscape setting of Hemingford Abbots is intrinsic to the nature and life of the village - not only for its residents but for many visitors. The high-quality landscape along and around the river makes the Great Ouse Valley a unique place. The variety of parts - meadows, lakes, river, woodland etc - are interlinked and shared, rather than being a sequence of places. For example, the setting of Hemingford Abbots benefits from the landscape of its neighbours - the Houghton meadows and their 'backdrop' of the woods of Houghton Hill, the open tracts of Godmanchester East Side common, and the river scenery of Hemingford Grey.</p>	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
Hemingford Abbots Parish Council by Maxine Blewett		L&TSPD:143	Have observations	<p>Key characteristics The natural and built heritage of the Great Ouse Valley make this an outstandingly abundant area indeed. For example, the flood-plain meadows of this lowland river valley are an increasingly rare national resource. In Hemingford Abbots these meadows continue to be managed traditionally with autumn grazing after the summer hay crop. This way of farming, that has existed for millennia, ensures that the meadows are a rich habitat with great biodiversity. The quality, quantity and concentration of the components of the area is the exceptional feature of the Great Ouse Valley in comparison to the rest of Huntingdonshire.</p>	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Hemingford Abbots Parish Council by Maxine Blewett	Figure 3.3	L&TSPD:144	Have observations	From Figure 3:3 it can be seen that there are more Cambridgeshire County Wildlife Sites of both land and river, and (with the exception of Grafham Water) more SSSI s in the Great Ouse Valley than anywhere in Huntingdonshire. For the built heritage, the Great Ouse Valley contains the largest number and greatest concentration of Listed buildings in Huntingdonshire. There are also more Conservation Areas, many of which link or are in close proximity, in the Great Ouse Valley than anywhere else in Huntingdonshire.	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
Hemingford Abbots Parish Council by Maxine Blewett	3.68	L&TSPD:145	Have observations	Ref: 3.68 Looking forward, and recommendations for Development proposals HAPC is encouraged by the recommendation: 'Protect and enhance the strategic green corridor formed by the river valley, particularly where it passes through settlements.' The landscape of the Great Ouse Valley plays a crucial role in the well-being of Huntingdonshire residents in being a vital resource of accessible green space in a County where such areas are nationally comparatively scarce. Equally, the 'green corridor' is of high ecological value. Recognition of the Great Ouse Valley as a 'green corridor' will help ensure the integrity of landscape. It is vital to maintain cohesion of this place. Protection is necessary - particularly of fragile areas. Any fracturing of the whole, or reduction of margins, will significantly diminish its value overall.	Comment acknowledged.	Support noted.
Hemingford Abbots Parish Council by Maxine Blewett		L&TSPD:146	Support	Moving forward: HAPC welcomes the inclusion of the Great Ouse Valley as one of the three Green Infrastructure Priority Areas in Huntingdonshire and one of the six priority habitats in the whole county of Cambridgeshire. HAPC considers it essential that the Landscape Character Area Assessment is sufficiently accurate in its description and analysis of the Great Ouse Valley. In this matter, HAPC supports the specific recommendations of the Great Ouse Valley Trust with regard to the draft Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Supplementary Planning Document, 2021. HAPC is a Partner Member of the Great Ouse Valley Trust. The Great Ouse Valley is an outstanding area of landscape and environment. It is essential that the HDC Local Plan to 2036 has sufficient provision to ensure the necessary conservation and enhancement of the landscape for the benefit of present and future generations.	Comment acknowledged.	Support noted.
Hilton Parish Council by Nicola Webster		L&TSPD:69	Have observations	As we are a small settlement not earmarked for development Hilton Parish Council has no comment on this consultation	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
Historic England		L&TSPD:53	Have observations	Overview - a robust approach We broadly welcome the draft Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). From our review of the document we consider that this is a robust document in terms of both Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) and Townscape Character Assessment (TCA). The SPD demonstrates that a general understanding and appreciation of the historic environment has informed the production of this draft LCA/TCA SPD. The background information and the LCA/TCA Assessments include mentions of not only designated and non-designated heritage assets but also their settings, and it would appear that these have informed the 'Looking Forward' sections and 'Development proposals should...' boxed text within each assessment. All told this should help in achieving the key aim of promoting sense of place and local distinctiveness. The document is helpfully illustrated with maps, diagrams, figures, photographs and aerial photography which all help to convey the key characteristics of each area.	Comment acknowledged.	Support noted.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Historic England		L&TSPD:54	Have observations	<p>Historic Landscape Characterisation</p> <p>Ideally, there would be a clearer link with historic landscape characterisation. While the document helpfully explores how the presence of heritage assets defines existing landscape character, it could be more explicit in how historic land use and land management patterns and the associated changes over time have helped to shape it. The use of Historic Landscape Characterisation would provide the opportunity and framework to more clearly explain the thought process. Our web pages provide further advice in relation to Historic Characterisation including Historic Landscape Characterisation. https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/ https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/historic-landscapecharacterisation/</p> <p>Suggested changes</p> <p>Ideally, there would be a clearer link with historic landscape characterisation. While the document helpfully explores how the presence of heritage assets defines existing landscape character, it could be more explicit in how historic land use and land management patterns and the associated changes over time have helped to shape it. The use of Historic Landscape Characterisation would provide the opportunity and framework to more clearly explain the thought process. Our web pages provide further advice in relation to Historic Characterisation including Historic Landscape Characterisation. https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/ https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/historic-landscapecharacterisation/</p>	This is outside of the scope of the revised SPD. However, it is recognised that this work may be of use, therefore historic landscape characterisation could be included within future landscape and conservation work.	Comment noted and information circulated to HDC conservation team and Cambridgeshire County Council to investigate.
Historic England		L&TSPD:55	Have observations	<p>Non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>The paragraphs related to heritage assets 2.18-2.24 would benefit from being accompanied by some additional paragraphs about non-designated heritage assets (NDHA). Indeed, the document makes quite a bit about the contribution to landscape character made by historic parks and gardens, and recommends to 'protect' (and in other places 'maintain' the 'historic role of the parkland landscape' and the 'parkland setting' for the grade II* registered park and garden at Elton Hall and non-registered parks and gardens at Kimbolton Castle, Stirtloe Park, and Somersham Palace; however, it misses out on other sites that we consider may be worthy of consideration as an NDHA by your authority-- e.g. Alconbury House, Diddington Hall, Hemingford Park, Houghton Hill House, Houghton Grange, Holme, Offord Cluney, Stukeley Park, and Priory (Hill) Park in St Neots...</p>	Comment acknowledged. This is outside of the scope of the revised SPD. The sites identified for potential inclusion on a local list will be passed onto HDC's Conservation team and Cambridgeshire County Council's public engagement officer who are collaborating on a local list methodology and list for Huntingdonshire.	Comment noted and information circulated to HDC conservation team and Cambridgeshire County Council to action.
Historic England		L&TSPD:56	Have observations	<p>Historic Environment Record</p> <p>Reference should also be made to the Historic Environment Record (HER). The importance and extent of below ground archaeology is often unknown, although information in the HER will indicate areas of known interest, or high potential where further assessment is required before decisions or allocations are made.</p> <p>Suggested changes</p> <p>Reference should also be made to the Historic Environment Record (HER).</p>	Comment acknowledged, a new paragraph detailing the role of the Historic Environment Record will be added to direct readers that resource.	Added a new paragraph (2.20) referencing the Historic Environment Record with a link to Cambridgeshire's HER.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Historic England		L&TSPD:57	Support	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>It is good to see consideration being given to the impacts of climate change within the document and helpful to see references to peat shrinkage and flooding. Additionally, woodland creation is only going to become more prevalent in the coming years in response to government initiatives to mitigate the impacts of climate change and address the biodiversity crisis. Understandably, woodland creation is mentioned among the 'Looking forward' sections in a number of LCA assessments, e.g. Grafham Water, Central Claylands, Southern Claylands. The document makes clear that such actions should be focussed on screening visually intrusive development and providing a greater sense of structure within the landscape, e.g. responding to landform and character, which is welcomed.</p>	Comment acknowledged.	Support noted.
Historic England		L&TSPD:58	Object	<p>Terminology</p> <p>Finally, there are at least two references to 'English Heritage' when it should be 'Historic England' - paragraphs 2.23 and 3.24. In addition, for consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we suggest that you refer to scheduled monuments, rather than scheduled ancient monuments (e.g. p71) and non-designated heritage assets rather than undesignated heritage assets (e.g. para 2.19, p90) throughout the report. Also, in figure 2.1 on page 6 and page 90 and throughout the report, we suggest using the term heritage assets rather than historic assets, again for consistency with the NPPF. Finally, in relation to designated heritage assets, rather than Historic Parks and Gardens we suggest you refer to them as Registered Parks and Gardens (e.g. p19). Please check the document for consistency in this regard.</p> <p>Suggested changes</p> <p>There are at least two references to 'English Heritage' when it should be 'Historic England' - paragraphs 2.23 and 3.24. In addition, for consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we suggest that you refer to scheduled monuments, rather than scheduled ancient monuments (e.g. p71) and non-designated heritage assets rather than undesignated heritage assets (e.g. para 2.19, p90) throughout the report. Also, in figure 2.1 on page 6 and page 90 and throughout the report, we suggest using the term heritage assets rather than historic assets, again for consistency with the NPPF. Finally, in relation to designated heritage assets, rather than Historic Parks and Gardens we suggest you refer to them as Registered Parks and Gardens (e.g. p19). Please check the document for consistency in this regard.</p>	A full review will be undertaken to ensure accurate, consistent and most up to date terminology is used throughout for consistency.	<p>Have amended references throughout the SPD from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage to Historic England • Scheduled Ancient Monument to Schedule Monument • Historic Parks and Gardens to Registered Parks and Gardens • Undesignated assets to non-designated • Historic assets to heritage assets
Historic England		L&TSPD:59	Have observations	<p>Development proposals criteria wording Although we have not reviewed all of the character areas and settlements in great detail, we have reviewed a selection and make the following comment. A number of the development proposals text boxes include a criterion for 'Protect and conserve the historic buildings...'. We suggest that this wording should be revised to read 'Conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the heritage assets...'including any contribution made to significance by their settings' which would be more in line with the wording in the NPPF and PPG. Similar wording could also be used at paragraph 2.21.</p> <p>Suggested changes</p> <p>A number of the development proposals text boxes include a criterion for 'Protect and conserve the historic buildings...'. We suggest that this wording should be revised to read</p>	Amendments to 'development proposals should' boxes which refer to 'protect and conserve' will be amended in line with the proposed wording to enable consistency in application between the SPD and national policy and guidance on heritage matters. This proposed wording has been proposed by CPRE.	Amended several 'development proposal should' boxes to address comment raised.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				'Conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of the heritage assets... including any contribution made to significance by their settings' which would be more in line with the wording in the NPPF and PPG. Similar wording could also be used at paragraph 2.21.		
Historic England	17	L&TSPD:60	Have observations	Glossary We suggest added Registered Park and Garden, Conservation Area and Scheduled Monument to the glossary. Suggested changes We suggest added Registered Park and Garden, Conservation Area and Scheduled Monument to the glossary.	A full review of the Glossary will be undertaken to add or amend definitions where they are appropriate to the SPD.	The definitions for Registered Park and Garden, Conservation Area and Scheduled Monument have been added to the glossary.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale		L&TSPD:120	Have observations	We would like to make a general point which is that the river Great Ouse has had, and continues to have a huge impact in shaping much of the landscape of the area and the settlement patterns we see today - particularly of our market towns. However, throughout the document whilst much is made of the land and buildings, very little defining reference is made to the actual river and to how we use and protect this feature of our district. Has thought been given to the inclusion of a 'Riverscape' definition which might address this issue and reflect its importance? Throughout the area, the river is classified as a County Wildlife Site. Amongst other things it has created many of the most valued and heavily protected environmental areas of the District; it serves as a boundary to help define a sense of place; it contributes to many special views and settings; it still provides a means of travel and access; as well as being the district's biggest attraction for tourism, recreation; and to sustaining many of our local economies.	Comment acknowledged; the River Great Ouse is mentioned throughout the document where it is appropriate to do so. It forms an important part of the Great Ouse Valley which is a designated Green Infrastructure Priority Area as well as including numerous nature designations and heritage assets. An additional 'riverscape' definition is unlikely to add further significance than these locally and nationally recognised designations.	Comment noted, no action made.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	1.18	L&TSPD:121	Have observations	Ref1.18 outlines some of the difficulties with the boundaries when they fall between character areas and states that consideration should be given to the characteristics of each relevant area. Whilst pointing towards local differences that skew an area into one or other character areas, we feel that there are localities which defy definition in this way and do not fit either. Take for example the area north of the Thicket path between Houghton & St.Ives. This is on the boundary of the Central Claylands and Great Ouse valley character areas. However the steep rising land from the valley floor and consequential escarpment that is created is unique within the District. As such there needs to be room within these definitions to recognise and more importantly be able to treat as exceptions to the general rule of thumb so that we avoid overlooking such unique and special areas of our landscape and giving them the relevant care and attention they deserve.	It is acknowledged that certain landscape and townscape features may be highly distinctive at a local scale and atypical of the character area within which they sit. Whilst they cannot be captured within the large scale of a district level assessment that identified key characteristics their importance at the local scale is recognised.	Paragraph 2.14 has been amended to acknowledge the importance of such distinctive features at the finer scale of locally prepared assessments.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	2.4	L&TSPD:122	Have observations	Ref 2.4 provides a list of issues which may be relevant to guide preparation of assessment of the landscape and/ or townscape impact of a proposed development. The factors of key importance for landscape exclude many things to do with the functional value of the landscape - such as how it contributes to health and wellbeing, recreation or the local economy through e.g. tourism. Fig 2.1 goes on to suggest that value is created through the built environment and fails to recognise sufficiently the link between landscape and cultural and social assets. Likewise greater thought and guidance needs to be given to the cumulative contribution or otherwise, development makes to the wider landscape. This would also recognise that as the spread or density of development increases how the cumulative impacts may become greater and therefore harder to	The interaction of local communities with the landscape is acknowledged. Figure 2.1 contains reference to cultural and social assets which is considered to cover the linkage adequately given the broad nature of the diagram. The cumulative impact of change is considered to be adequately covered	Paragraph 2.4 has been amended to include reference to consideration of how the landscape has shaped local communities and is used by them.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				manage.	in paragraphs 2.3 and 2.5.	
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	Figure 2.1	L&TSPD:123	Have observations	<p>Fig 2.1 goes on to suggest that value is created through the built environment and fails to recognise sufficiently the link between landscape and cultural and social assets. Likewise greater thought and guidance needs to be given to the cumulative contribution or otherwise, development makes to the wider landscape. This would also recognise that as the spread or density of development increases how the cumulative impacts may become greater and therefore harder to manage.</p> <p>Suggested changes Likewise greater thought and guidance needs to be given to the cumulative contribution or otherwise, development makes to the wider landscape. This would also recognise that as the spread or density of development increases how the cumulative impacts may become greater and therefore harder to manage.</p>	<p>Figure 2.1 is intended to provide broad representation of the evolution of townscape character from the natural landscape.</p> <p>The suggested changes regarding cumulative impact have been addressed above.</p>	The title of Figure 2.1 has been amended to better reflect its purpose as indicating the evolution of townscape from the natural landscape.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	2.15	L&TSPD:124	Have observations	<p>Ref 2.15 Poses questions which are designed to provide a starting point to help local residents undertake their own assessments informed by local knowledge of their town or village. This section does not prompt the question regarding the uniqueness of landscape/topographical features in relation to the wider character area.</p> <p>Suggested changes This section does not prompt the question regarding the uniqueness of landscape/topographical features in relation to the wider character area.</p>	These are suggested questions to consider when undertaking an assessment and not intended to be a definitive list but it is acknowledged that locally distinctive features would be of interest within an assessment carried out at a local level.	An additional question has been included to prompt consideration of whether there are distinctive features that contribute to the character of the local area.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	2.17	L&TSPD:125	Have observations	<p>Ref 2.17 Within Landscape we would add further examples such as providing public access, providing a gateway into another area of landscape or townscape, or preventing anti coalescence/green wedge between settlements and helping define a sense of place. Under the heading Views and vistas - we would add the question do these serve any other function such as proving a setting or backdrop for a building/structure or other landscape such as valley floor? We also question where are the Landscape / Townscape features within the list which recognise the recreational/tourism assets? Under Accessibility and permeability - we feel the some of the functions that are associated with certain routes is not explored/prompted sufficiently. For example the river provides access into and through areas of the district - boaters pass through or moor up to spend time and visit. It also provides housing (e.g. house boats) as well as business opportunities (e.g. marinas). Likewise, the Thicket path is an access point to Houghton as well as St.Ives but also recognised as a destination to simply visit in itself. How does the value of these access routes get recognised properly in this assessment list?</p> <p>Suggested changes Ref 2.17 Within Landscape we would add further examples such as providing public access, providing a gateway into another area of landscape or townscape, or preventing anti coalescence/green wedge between settlements and helping define a sense of place. Under the heading Views and vistas - we would add the question do these serve any other function such as proving a setting or backdrop for a building/structure or other landscape such as valley floor? We also question where are the Landscape / Townscape features within the list which recognise the recreational/tourism assets? Under</p>	<p>As mentioned above the questions are not intended to be a definitive list but are simply prompts to help local residents get started on an assessment.</p> <p>The Accessibility and permeability section provides prompts relating to physical access which could relate to river access where relevant.</p>	Additional questions have been incorporated to prompt consideration of whether the area attracts visitors as well as local residents and whether any views provide a valuable setting to existing buildings or landscape features.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				Accessibility and permeability - we feel the some of the functions that are associated with certain routes is not explored/prompted sufficiently. For example the river provides access into and through areas of the district - boaters pass through or moor up to spend time and visit. It also provides housing (e.g. house boats) as well as business opportunities (e.g. marinas). Likewise, the Thicket path is an access point to Houghton as well as St.Ives but also recognised as a destination to simply visit in itself. How does the value of these access routes get recognised properly in this assessment list?		
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	3.48	L&TSPD:126	Have observations	Ref 3.48 Central Claylands - add the fact that ancient woodland also exists in the south of the character area - namely Thicket wood which seems to be overlooked and therefore undervalued in some documentation. Suggested changes Ref 3.48 Central Claylands - add the fact that ancient woodland also exists in the south of the character area - namely Thicket wood which seems to be overlooked and therefore undervalued in some documentation.	Comment acknowledged; the area has not been formally identified as ancient woodland according to Natural England's data set which has been used within the interactive map that accompanies the SPD.	Comment noted, no action made.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	3.56	L&TSPD:127	Have observations	Ref 3.56 Add to the key issues list - Maintain a sense of place and avoid both actual and perceived coalescence of settlements. Development proposals should: Protect long distance views into and from the Great Ouse character area - particularly where this is a conservation area. Suggested changes Ref 3.56 Add to the key issues list Maintain a sense of place and avoid both actual and perceived coalescence of settlements. Development proposals should: Protect long distance views into and from the Great Ouse character area - particularly where this is a conservation area.	The issues raised are considered to apply to all landscape character areas.	Additional text incorporated after paragraph 3.11 highlighting the importance of these factors across all landscape character areas.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	3.60	L&TSPD:128	Have observations	Ref 3.60 The significance of the river and setting for recreation and tourism and all that this brings needs to be captured properly. At the time of writing, Tripadvisor list locations associated with the river setting and providing access to it - namely Houghton Mill as the no.1 attraction within Huntingdonshire and 13th in the whole of Cambridgeshire. Suggested changes Ref 3.60 The significance of the river and setting for recreation and tourism and all that this brings needs to be captured properly.	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the paragraph.	Amended paragraph 3.60 to include tourism and reflect that the activities within the Great Ouse Valley extend beyond the urban parks found on the edge of larger settlements.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	7.5	L&TSPD:129	Have observations	Ref 7.5 make reference to the Thicket wood being ancient woodland including an area of woodland carr where it meets the valley floor as well as adjoining a SSSI site to the southwest of Houghton Grange and the County Wildlife Site. This section also needs to reference the fact that most of the area is located within the parish of Houghton & Wyton and as both settlements have expanded over time now represents the remaining land area between St.Ives and the village of Houghton. Consequently as well as forming a mature landscape setting for the town and village it also serves as an important anti coalescence gap. Finally for this section it should include reference to the fact that the steep escarpment and plateau form an important backdrop and setting to Houghton Grange, to the heritage asset of the valley floor and the river as a County Wildlife Site, as well as to views upstream from the scheduled monument of the Old Town Bridge and bridgefoot. This view is highly regarded as one of the most important views in	Paragraph 7.5 does not reference that the Thicket wood is ancient woodland. The chapter refers to St Ives Spatial Planning Area which includes some of Houghton & Wyton parish as per the definition on page 55 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036. The landscape and townscape character of Houghton Grange and Bridgefoot are explored in detail	Comment noted, no action made.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				<p>Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>Suggested changes This section also needs to reference the fact that most of the area is located within the parish of Houghton & Wyton and as both settlements have expanded over time now represents the remaining land area between St.Ives and the village of Houghton. Consequently as well as forming a mature landscape setting for the town and village it also serves as an important anti coalescence gap. Finally for this section it should include reference to the fact that the steep escarpment and plateau form an important backdrop and setting to Houghton Grange, to the heritage asset of the valley floor and the river as a County Wildlife Site, as well as to views upstream from the scheduled monument of the Old Town Bridge and bridgefoot. This view is highly regarded as one of the most important views in Cambridgeshire.</p>	within character areas 11 and 2 respectively within the St Ives SPA assessment.	
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	3.68	L&TSPD:130	Have observations	<p>Ref 3.68 Add to key issues: Recognising and protecting the landscape value from the impact of development Development proposals should: Minimise the impacts of development on wider landscape value</p> <p>Suggested changes Ref 3.68 Add to key issues: Recognising and protecting the landscape value from the impact of development Development proposals should: Minimise the impacts of development on wider landscape value</p>	This is considered relevant for all landscape character areas.	An additional bullet point has been added to the Site Specific Character Assessment guidance following paragraph 2.17.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	7.63	L&TSPD:131	Have observations	<p>7.63 Needs to state that the site is in the neighbouring parish of Houghton and Wyton and is located within its Conservation Area. We would like to see the following under Development proposals should: The Huntingdonshire Development Plan is very clear about maintaining separation and quotes from the Neighbourhood Plan HWNP 3 the following: Development proposals should respect the individual and distinct identities of the village of Houghton & Wyton and the town of St.Ives. Development will not be permitted if, individually or cumulatively, it would result in the loss of the visual and physical separation between these two settlements, or would lead to their coalescence. We would also add that developments should: Deliver 'Balanced' housing schemes with Economic, Social and Environmental benefits; having particular regard to the value of landscape and tourism/recreation. deliver more high quality, genuinely affordable homes for Local People; minimise environmental impacts on the local area; have an emphasis on quality - and low carbon/eco/environmental resilience; maintain availability of affordable housing in perpetuity maintain and preserve the anti coalescence area in perpetuity maximise open space, and provide public access; increase the bio diversity net gain potential and create continuous wildlife corridors; achieve long-term financial sustainability of housing and management of green spaces. improve flood prevention through careful planning, land use and mitigation.</p> <p>Suggested changes Needs to state that the site is in the neighbouring parish of Houghton and Wyton and is located within its Conservation Area. We would like to see the following under</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be added to reflect that this site is within Houghton & Wyton parish.</p> <p>Regarding additional development proposals should criteria, the Houghton & Wyton Neighbourhood Plan is part of the Development Plan for Huntingdonshire. Therefore, any proposal within Houghton & Wyton will apply the neighbourhood plan policies to it as well as guidance within this SPD (guidance which supports the implementation of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036). As such, it is unnecessary to duplicate requirements already set out within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Have added a sentence to paragraph 7.63 clarifying that the Houghton Grange site is located within the adjoining parish of Houghton & Wyton but forms part of the St Ives Spatial Planning Area. Removed last sentence of the paragraph as a result which had partially covered this originally.</p> <p>Regarding additional development proposals should criteria, no action taken.</p>

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				<p>Development proposals should: The Huntingdonshire Development Plan is very clear about maintaining separation and quotes from the Neighbourhood Plan HWNP 3 the following: Development proposals should respect the individual and distinct identities of the village of Houghton & Wyton and the town of St.Ives. Development will not be permitted if, individually or cumulatively, it would result in the loss of the visual and physical separation between these two settlements, or would lead to their coalescence. We would also add that developments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver 'Balanced' housing schemes with Economic, Social and Environmental benefits; having particular regard to the value of landscape and tourism/recreation. deliver more high quality, genuinely affordable homes for Local People; minimise environmental impacts on the local area; have an emphasis on quality - and low carbon/eco/environmental resilience; maintain availability of affordable housing in perpetuity maintain and preserve the anti coalescence area in perpetuity maximise open space, and provide public access; increase the bio diversity net gain potential and create continuous wildlife corridors; achieve long-term financial sustainability of housing and management of green spaces. improve flood prevention through careful planning, land use and mitigation. 		
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	7.8	L&TSPD:132	Have observations	<p>Ref 7.8 more needs to be made of the important primarily recreational and tourist route in and out of St.Ives using the Thicket footpath/ Ouse Valley way. The magnificence of this as a country lane is not to be underestimated and is often a destination for visitors itself to wander along rather than functioning as a route from a to b.</p> <p>Suggested changes Ref 7.8 more needs to be made of the important primarily recreational and tourist route in and out of St.Ives using the Thicket footpath/ Ouse Valley way. The magnificence of this as a country lane is not to be underestimated and is often a destination for visitors itself to wander along rather than functioning as a route from a to b.</p>	Comment acknowledged; additional detail will be added to the text of this character area to reflect this.	Additional sentence added to the end of paragraph 7.8 to reflect the use of Thicket and Ouse Valley Way a key recreational and tourist route in and out of St Ives.
Houghton & Wyton Parish Council by Lois Dale	7.65	L&TSPD:133	Have observations	<p>Ref 7.65 repeat Development proposals should respect the individual and distinct identities of the village of Houghton & Wyton and the town of St.Ives. Development will not be permitted if, individually or cumulatively, it would result in the loss of the visual and physical separation between these two settlements, or would lead to their coalescence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver 'Balanced' housing schemes with Economic, Social and Environmental benefits; having particular regard to the value of landscape and tourism/recreation. deliver more high quality, genuinely affordable homes for Local People; minimise environmental impacts on the local area; have an emphasis on quality - and low carbon/eco/environmental resilience; maintain availability of affordable housing in perpetuity maintain and preserve the anti coalescence area in perpetuity maximise open space, and provide public access; increase the bio diversity net gain potential and create continuous wildlife corridors; achieve long-term financial sustainability of housing and management of green spaces. improve flood prevention through careful planning, land use and mitigation. <p>Suggested changes</p>	Comment acknowledged, regarding additional development proposals should criteria, the Houghton & Wyton Neighbourhood Plan is part of the Development Plan for Huntingdonshire. Therefore, any proposal within Houghton & Wyton will apply the neighbourhood plan policies to it as well as guidance within this SPD (guidance which supports the implementation of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036). As such, it is unnecessary to duplicate requirements already set out within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Comment noted, no action taken.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				<p>Ref 7.65 repeat Development proposals should respect the individual and distinct identities of the village of Houghton & Wyton and the town of St.Ives. Development will not be permitted if, individually or cumulatively, it would result in the loss of the visual and physical separation between these two settlements, or would lead to their coalescence.</p> <p>Deliver 'Balanced' housing schemes with Economic, Social and Environmental benefits; having particular regard to the value of landscape and tourism/recreation. deliver more high quality, genuinely affordable homes for Local People; minimise environmental impacts on the local area; have an emphasis on quality - and low carbon/eco/environmental resilience; maintain availability of affordable housing in perpetuity maintain and preserve the anti coalescence area in perpetuity maximise open space, and provide public access; increase the bio diversity net gain potential and create continuous wildlife corridors; achieve long-term financial sustainability of housing and management of green spaces. improve flood prevention through careful planning, land use and mitigation.</p>		
Kings Ripton Parish Council by Philip Rayner		L&TSPD:135	Have observations	<p>Submitted document: Kings Ripton Parish Council response 20211213.pdf</p> <p>It has not been possible to put King's Ripton full response within this table due to formatting, however, to see a full copy of this with images and link, please see HDC's planning consultation portal.</p>	Comments acknowledged. The detail provided within the response regarding climate change is welcomed. The SPD has where it can incorporated climate change and climate resilience matters. The SPD can only provide additional guidance to the existing policies of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, it cannot introduce higher thresholds. Therefore, the detailed recommendations made within the paper, are out of the scope of this SPD at this time. Future climate change work will form part of the next local plan.	Comment noted, no changes made at this time, however, see Council's assessment for details.
Sawtry Parish Council by Diane Davis	12	L&TSPD:82	Have observations	<p>Sawtry's Neighbourhood Plan (NP), in preparation, will emphasise the rapid population growth in recent years and the predicted increase before 2026. The 2011 Census reported 6536 as Sawtry's population. Since then, a further 963 dwelling have been approved in substantial estates plus a significant number of individual homes. The projected population by 2026 is over 8700 whereas the County Council population and dwelling stock estimate is only 7250. In recognition of this rapid expansion, Sawtry's NP is likely to propose policies which extend community services and facilities while preserving the historic character and village setting. The policies in the draft version of the NP are already supported in both the 2019 Local Plan and the Draft Consultation 2021. However, the recent community consultation revealed further planning objectives, and this comment highlights four characters areas whose development proposals could be influenced by these objectives.</p>	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Sawtry Parish Council by Diane Davis	12.12	L&TSPD:83	Have observations	Character Area 1: High Street/Green End Road. The area surrounding the Green is the historic centre of the village, but which has lost many of the original shops and facilities over the past century. However, it now appears, after consultation with a key landowner, that there may be an opportunity at some point in the period up to 2036, to restore some of the traditional character enjoyed in years past. A significant area occupied by business premises could become free for the development of community facilities and shops. Indeed, such an aspiration would appear to be wholly compatible with the development proposals in the Consultation Draft 2021.	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
Sawtry Parish Council by Diane Davis	12.51	L&TSPD:84	Have observations	Character Areas 8 and 10: Gidding Road (Area 8) and Green End Road/Beaumaris Road (Area 10). Residents' feedback indicates support for a supermarket as a much needed extension of shopping facilities in a village of Sawtry's size. Although the village centre lacks a sufficient area to accommodate buildings and parking space, possible sites have been identified in the Gidding Road and Green End Road. It is understood that exploratory enquiries are in progress by at least one supermarket chain, and modification of the development proposals would be welcome to admit and support planning applications for such a facility.	Comment acknowledged, character area 8 includes a development proposals box for these areas includes bullets supportive of additional or enhanced services and community facilities; equally character area 10 includes a development proposal that new development responds positively to the specific opportunities within the area. It is therefore considered that these offer sufficient opportunity for any potential future proposal.	Comment noted, no change required.
Sawtry Parish Council by Diane Davis	12.62	L&TSPD:85	Have observations	Character Areas 8 and 10: Gidding Road (Area 8) and Green End Road/Beaumaris Road (Area 10). Residents' feedback indicates support for a supermarket as a much needed extension of shopping facilities in a village of Sawtry's size. Although the village centre lacks a sufficient area to accommodate buildings and parking space, possible sites have been identified in the Gidding Road and Green End Road. It is understood that exploratory enquiries are in progress by at least one supermarket chain, and modification of the development proposals would be welcome to admit and support planning applications for such a facility.	Comment acknowledged, character area 8 includes a development proposals box for these areas includes bullets supportive of additional or enhanced services and community facilities; equally character area 10 includes a development proposal that new development responds positively to the specific opportunities within the area. It is therefore considered that these offer sufficient opportunity for any potential future proposal.	Comment noted, no change required.
Sawtry Parish Council by Diane Davis	12.70	L&TSPD:86	Have observations	Character Area 12: Blackhorse Business Park. Paragraph 12.72 recognises the capacity for business expansion to the north of this area, and construction is in progress as shown in the attached image. The development proposals could be extended to encourage further growth in this latter site, perhaps in terms of recognition as an Established Employment Area to promote further employment and business activity. Secondly, as stated in paragraph 12.70, playing fields (Greenfields) are located to the east of Area 12, and proposals exist to extend the sports area through purchase of adjacent land. Support for such a proposal may already be available under Local Plan Policy 22.	The SPD supports policies within the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, whilst we recognise the point made regarding a potential new or amended boundary of an existing Established Employment Area (EEA), we cannot assess this and amend the list of EEAs at this time. This could, however, be an aspect to review in detail when preparing the next local	Noted, no change at this time but see Council's assessment for details.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action																																																															
					plan. Comment regarding paragraph 12.70 acknowledged.																																																																
Sawtry Parish Council by Diane Davis	12	L&TSPD:87	Have observations	<p>A list of typographical corrections:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location in Chapter 12</th> <th>Current version</th> <th>Suggested version</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P 403 caption</td> <td>St Judiths...whichpublic rights</td> <td>St Judith's...with public rights...</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P 404 caption</td> <td>Tinkers Lane and Tinkers Lane</td> <td>Fen Lane and Tinkers Lane</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.12</td> <td>Green End</td> <td>Green End Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.12 caption</td> <td>Parade shops on Greenway</td> <td>Parade of shops on Greenways</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.14 and caption</td> <td>Greystone (twice)</td> <td>Greystones</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.17 and 12.18</td> <td>Green End</td> <td>Green End Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>p 406</td> <td>know used...</td> <td>now used...</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.20</td> <td>Sawtry Junior and infant schools</td> <td>Sawtry Junior Academy and Infant school</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.21</td> <td>Green End</td> <td>Green End Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.30</td> <td>Newtown Road/ Tinkers Lane</td> <td>Newton Road/Tinkers Lane</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P 412 caption</td> <td>Newtown Road</td> <td>Newton Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.36</td> <td>Newtown Road</td> <td>Newton Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P 414 caption</td> <td>Maltings Lane</td> <td>The Maltings</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.40</td> <td>Green End</td> <td>Green End Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P 416 caption</td> <td>Rockingham Way with Green End</td> <td>Rockingham Road with Green End Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.46</td> <td>Middlemoor Road</td> <td>Middlefield Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.49</td> <td>Rockingham Way</td> <td>Rockingham Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P 418 caption</td> <td>Jackson Walk</td> <td>Jackson Avenue</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.54 caption</td> <td>Woolward</td> <td>Woollard</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P 420 caption</td> <td>St Judiths Lane streetscene</td> <td>St Judith's Lane street scene</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Location in Chapter 12	Current version	Suggested version	P 403 caption	St Judiths...whichpublic rights	St Judith's...with public rights...	P 404 caption	Tinkers Lane and Tinkers Lane	Fen Lane and Tinkers Lane	12.12	Green End	Green End Road	12.12 caption	Parade shops on Greenway	Parade of shops on Greenways	12.14 and caption	Greystone (twice)	Greystones	12.17 and 12.18	Green End	Green End Road	p 406	know used...	now used...	12.20	Sawtry Junior and infant schools	Sawtry Junior Academy and Infant school	12.21	Green End	Green End Road	12.30	Newtown Road/ Tinkers Lane	Newton Road/Tinkers Lane	P 412 caption	Newtown Road	Newton Road	12.36	Newtown Road	Newton Road	P 414 caption	Maltings Lane	The Maltings	12.40	Green End	Green End Road	P 416 caption	Rockingham Way with Green End	Rockingham Road with Green End Road	12.46	Middlemoor Road	Middlefield Road	12.49	Rockingham Way	Rockingham Road	P 418 caption	Jackson Walk	Jackson Avenue	12.54 caption	Woolward	Woollard	P 420 caption	St Judiths Lane streetscene	St Judith's Lane street scene	A full spelling and typographical review will be undertaken before finalising the SPD.	Have amended Chapter 12 Sawtry as per the list of typographical corrections submitted by Sawtry Parish Council.
Location in Chapter 12	Current version	Suggested version																																																																			
P 403 caption	St Judiths...whichpublic rights	St Judith's...with public rights...																																																																			
P 404 caption	Tinkers Lane and Tinkers Lane	Fen Lane and Tinkers Lane																																																																			
12.12	Green End	Green End Road																																																																			
12.12 caption	Parade shops on Greenway	Parade of shops on Greenways																																																																			
12.14 and caption	Greystone (twice)	Greystones																																																																			
12.17 and 12.18	Green End	Green End Road																																																																			
p 406	know used...	now used...																																																																			
12.20	Sawtry Junior and infant schools	Sawtry Junior Academy and Infant school																																																																			
12.21	Green End	Green End Road																																																																			
12.30	Newtown Road/ Tinkers Lane	Newton Road/Tinkers Lane																																																																			
P 412 caption	Newtown Road	Newton Road																																																																			
12.36	Newtown Road	Newton Road																																																																			
P 414 caption	Maltings Lane	The Maltings																																																																			
12.40	Green End	Green End Road																																																																			
P 416 caption	Rockingham Way with Green End	Rockingham Road with Green End Road																																																																			
12.46	Middlemoor Road	Middlefield Road																																																																			
12.49	Rockingham Way	Rockingham Road																																																																			
P 418 caption	Jackson Walk	Jackson Avenue																																																																			
12.54 caption	Woolward	Woollard																																																																			
P 420 caption	St Judiths Lane streetscene	St Judith's Lane street scene																																																																			

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action															
				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>12.58</td> <td>Rockingham Way</td> <td>Rockingham Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.59 and caption</td> <td>St Bosworth's (twice)</td> <td>St Bosworths</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P 422 heading</td> <td>Green End</td> <td>Green End Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.65</td> <td>Beaumaris Way</td> <td>Beaumaris Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12.67 and 12.68</td> <td>Co-Op</td> <td>Co-op</td> </tr> </table> <p>Suggested changes Typographical corrections.</p>	12.58	Rockingham Way	Rockingham Road	12.59 and caption	St Bosworth's (twice)	St Bosworths	P 422 heading	Green End	Green End Road	12.65	Beaumaris Way	Beaumaris Road	12.67 and 12.68	Co-Op	Co-op		
12.58	Rockingham Way	Rockingham Road																			
12.59 and caption	St Bosworth's (twice)	St Bosworths																			
P 422 heading	Green End	Green End Road																			
12.65	Beaumaris Way	Beaumaris Road																			
12.67 and 12.68	Co-Op	Co-op																			
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC		L&TSPD:4	Have observations	No reference to the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan: Whilst the new Landscape and Townscape Supplementary is helpful there are a number of issues for Godmanchester who already have an established Neighbourhood Plan. This document does not reference the Neighbourhood Plan nor does it fully align with its policies - I believe it should both legally and in principle as the Neighbourhood Plan was developed after a long consultation with residents about their needs and aspirations.	As part of the statutory Development Plan Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan takes precedence over this SPD where any inconsistency arises in guidance provided. References to Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan policies are therefore unnecessary and have not been added to avoid future confusion when the Neighbourhood Plan is updated	No change required.															
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	Figure 5.3	L&TSPD:5	Have observations	<p>No reference to the historic core and the policy intended to protect and enhance it: The Areas must align with the same terminology defined in the Neighbourhood - specially with reference to the Historic core - not only a defined concept but with a detailed boundary plan p70. More than one of your new areas cover the core which the planning inspector has already allowed. GMC11 should also be reflected in the areas covered by the core and specifically the reference to grain, scale and density - you do not go as far, and it could open the door to inappropriate over development including back land development (GMC13). Similarly, GMC10 referring to our heritage and history is not really picked up in your area statements as should be. GMC14 is very clear that loss of parking in the historic core will be resisted, and this should be strengthened in your area statements. GMC15 makes it clear that visual clutter is not welcome and its at odds with the areas statement that include reference to public art works. GMC5 specifically references the desire to restore, replace and enhance public mooring and there is no. This should be references in your area statements that adjoin the river areas: Areas: Bridge place, Post Street, Northern Godmanchester and West Street. Its unclear why you do not include Godmanchester Rover Football ground, the area behind it which is part of Roman's Edge (a recreations and play space) and the newly agreed outline development site at Clyde Farm. These naturally form part of the Roman's Edge Area. The Football Groups is a community asset and covered by Policy GMC9.</p> <p>Suggested changes Reference that would need amended: P217 the 'core' is replaced with 'the historic core' as we have a clear definition for this and maps that show is boundaries right down to garden level. P213 The map doesn't include the new Clyde Farm development already given consent. Doesn't include the recreation ground behind Rovers. P215 - must show</p>	<p>For clarity it is noted that page references cited are those from the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance and Growth) meeting of 6th October 2021.</p> <p>The Historic Core set out in Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan covers part of three of the areas defined in the original 2007 L&T SPD. Of these The Lanes remains the same in the updated SPD, the Historic Fringes has been extended slightly eastwards to include more of Cambridge Street and Cambridge Road and West Street has been extended northwards to include all land up to the riverbank. All form part of the historic centre of Godmanchester but have distinctive characteristics which are considered to merit sub-dividing into separate character areas. Thus the change suggested for page 213 (actually 185) is not considered appropriate as it would reduce the</p>	The word 'core' only appears once on the page identified as 217 (actually 189); to avoid confusion between terminology this has been rephrased to 'traditional heart' of Godmanchester. Paragraph 5.213 has been supplemented by the phrase 'and incorporation of wholly new development on backland plots is unlikely to be appropriate.'															

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				our 'historic core' map - doesn't include our policy of preserving off street parks and must! Does not also reject backland development and our NP does. P219 5.213 does not reference stopping back land development	level of local detail. Areas with planning permission that are not yet started are excluded from character areas. They will be added to existing areas or established as new ones next time the SPD is updated and the characteristics of the new development are known.	
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5	L&TSPD:6	Have observations	Reducing congestion and traffic on roads: The Neighbourhood Plan addresses this as it was consistently important to residents. Whilst A14 changes have helped, on street parking continues to be problematic and we would want to see that message more clearly in your area statements relating to historic core where it causes the greatest issues for road users including cyclists. Whilst the reference to the West Street junction is welcome, the reference to additional cycle and pedestrian routes along Post Street and the Causeway is a conundrum to which we have no answer - most of the homes have no offer street parking and there is insufficient carriageway / footpath to enable a marked cycle lane. GMC22 sets out that mitigations in the historic core are particularly important. Please note the Town Council are about to pay for a traffic review but a quantified consultant (and previously agree with County Council Highways) as piecemeal suggestions to reduce traffic issues (yellow lines, speeding measures) have created new unintended consequences and we need a holistic approach to the whole of the historic core that works harmoniously to resolve issues. Reference to other options in this document is, therefore, unhelpful.	The challenges of car parking and movement space for vehicles and people are acknowledged as frequently occurring constraints within historic settlements. Improvements to pedestrian and cycleways may be in the form of qualitative improvements rather than additional capacity and the text allows for this to provide scope for whatever the outcomes of Godmanchester's traffic review suggests.	Text added referring to Mill Yard car park in character area 1. Text referring to the challenges arising from on street parking has been added to character areas 1 and 3.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.215	L&TSPD:7	Have observations	Not is it clear how this area can include improved pedestrian and cycling - where would we fit it?	There is no reference to pedestrian and cycling improvements in paragraph 5.215. The nearest is in the Development proposals should section for Character Area 4 which seeks to 'Retain and improve the network of pedestrian links to the town centre'. Improvements may be instigated in terms of quality rather than additional routes and therefore not require additional land.	Comment noted, no change made.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.219	L&TSPD:8	Have observations	The comments about restricting parking are unhelpful.	The only comments regarding restricting parking are set out in the 'Development Proposals should' section on page 219 (191).	Comments removed.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.221	L&TSPD:9	Have observations	Off street parking.	Page 221 (193) states that Development Proposals should 'Ensure adequate provision of car parking to reduce the impact on the street scene of on-street parking'	Text amended to 'Ensure adequate provision of off-street car parking...'

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.227	L&TSPD:10	Have observations	Yes to off road parking and not the loss of off-road parking.	Page 227 (199) states that Development Proposals should 'Ensure adequate provision of car parking to reduce the impact on the street scene of on-street parking'	Text amended to 'Ensure adequate provision of off-street car parking...'
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.234	L&TSPD:11	Have observations	Nothing here about parking and it's a real issue.	Re-provision of public car parking referenced in paragraph 5.251.	Text added to the 'Development proposals should' box to require this re-provision of car parking within allocation HU14.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC		L&TSPD:12	Have observations	Importance of pedestrian and cycle routes: Some of this is already covered in point 3, however the references for the Romans Edge Area and the need for safe cycle crossings are odd given that we asked for these, and planners (District and Highways) refused the requests as unnecessary. Including them here is welcome although will cause some to comment that its too late as the development is almost complete and there are not further funding planning opportunities through which to make more changes.	The reference to seeking improved pedestrian and cycle links across the A1198 is in the context of any future development proposals in the area; funding is not a matter for consideration of this SPD.	Comment noted, no change made.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.232	L&TSPD:13	Have observations	Improved cycle and pedestrian routes - every time we ask, we get told they are not needed.	Comment noted.	Comment noted, no change made.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.234	L&TSPD:14	Have observations	We could do with a new cycle bridge to help the children reach their secondary school, as well as for adult travelers.	Comment noted but the work is outside the scope of this SPD.	Comment noted, no change made.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.243	L&TSPD:15	Have observations	Public Art should have been provided for the new Romans Edge development (it was enshrined in the design guide) but the was not delivered as it was not covered by S106 funding - the funds ran out before it could be provided! If it were to be included anywhere then it should be integral to some of the newer developments but given that we have a Town boundary this is now unlikely to be achieved - it should be removed from the historic areas and added to the Roman's Edge Area statement.	Provision of public art at Romans' Edge is outside the scope of this SPD. All references to public art have been amended.	All references to public art amended to say 'Seek to incorporate interpretation boards to share the historical significance of the area'. Additional text in the Romans' Edge character area supporting initiatives for the creation of public art.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.219	L&TSPD:16	Have observations	Public art	Comment noted.	Amendment made on page 219 (191) as above.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.221	L&TSPD:17	Have observations	Public art	Comment noted.	Amendment made on page 221 (193) as above.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.234	L&TSPD:18	Have observations	Public art	Comment noted.	Amendment made on page 235 (206) as above.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC		L&TSPD:19	Have observations	Alternative and renewable energy: The principle is most welcome but also problematic. Solar energy is incompatible with most listed building and the two conservation areas but is welcome where appropriate to the location. Additional wind turbines in the Claylands should also be resisted and the Local policy covering this was specifically adjusted to talk about the cumulative impact of wind turbines. A proliferation of turbines would have a detrimental impact on the Town's setting and potentially on resident's amenity (Yelling being a case in point). GMC 1 not only refers to the importance of the countryside setting (of which this landscape is referenced in HDC/s Landscape and Town Assessment 2007 and this draft in section South East Clayland) but also the need to retain high quality agricultural land (as defined by Defra) and this area also meets that criteria. Perhaps a better statement might be that low impact (Sympathetic to the setting and the impact it will make) would be appropriate.	The sensitivity of incorporating renewable energy generation equipment is acknowledged. A separate SPD provides guidance specifically on this issue.	Amendments made to references to renewable energy in character areas 5, 6, 7 and 8.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.225	L&TSPD:20	Have observations	Why renewable energy and active travel here but not in other parts of GMC?	Inconsistencies acknowledged; they have arisen from trying to ensure the same points were not repeated for all areas but included very local scale nuances.	Renewable energy and active travel split into separate criteria.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.227	L&TSPD:21	Have observations	Why renewable energy and active travel here but not in other parts of GMC?!!!	Inconsistencies acknowledged; they have arisen from trying to ensure the same points were not repeated for all areas but included very local scale nuances.	Renewable energy and active travel split into separate criteria.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.239	L&TSPD:22	Have observations	Can't have electric charging points - private land and road has private enforcement!	The area includes a fuel filling station which could offer EV charging points in the future and a distribution park which could include private EV points for business operations.	Comment noted, no change made.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.243	L&TSPD:23	Have observations	NO to renewable energy - we have marked the landscape as one not to be blighted by wind turbines.	Romans' Edge is a modern development with scope for renewable energy such as solar panels to be added to roofs or ground/ air source heat pumps to be installed in homes; there is no specific reference in the text to wind turbines. A separate SPD provides guidance specifically on this issue.	Text amended to require avoidance of detrimental impact on the adjoining landscape.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC		L&TSPD:24	Have observations	Conservation Areas: Godmanchester has two conservation areas and documentation which sets out how these should be protected and cared for. These are not mentioned in the relevant area statements covering Earning Street, Post Street and the Causeway and should be. Failing to reference (and enforce) them risks further erosion of these important townscapes and their heritage assets / setting.	Comment acknowledged.	Reference to the Conservation Areas has been added.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.202	L&TSPD:25	Have observations	It's a conservation area but doesn't mention it.	Comment acknowledged.	Reference to conservation area added

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.207	L&TSPD:26	Have observations	Doesn't reference the conservation area.	Comment acknowledged.	Reference to conservation area added
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.225	L&TSPD:27	Have observations	The Neighbourhood Plan works hard to protect the semi-rural feel of the Town and its green spaces (some of which are Local Green Spaced with a level of legal protection). Whilst tree planting is welcome it's important that the countryside feel is not lost to a urban style formal garden style. Please note Godmanchester In Bloom have spent many hours over many year working to keep the hedgerows and verges on Silver Street green, rural in character and looking natural. Protect verges and plant trees on whose land? This needs to be checked. Nothing about Silver Street being a rural countryside lane that needs protected - not aligned with our plan.	The National Model Design code advises that all new streets should include street trees to improve streets' popularity and walkability.	Reference added to the rural nature, boundary trees and hedgerows of Silver Street.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.243	L&TSPD:28	Have observations	Tree along Bearscroft t- the football club intend to remove these for road access.	This outside the scope of the SPD.	Comment noted, no change made.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.235	L&TSPD:29	Have observations	We don't want lots more street furniture.	Comment acknowledged.	Reference to street furniture removed.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.235	L&TSPD:30	Have observations	Urbanisation and lighting: This is partially covered in item to but appears again in reference to other areas. We fought hard to keep streetlamps and we thwarted, specifically in the Fox Grove area. A reference to keeping lighting it helpful but will not be welcome by those who believe the current lighting levels fall well outside of their comfort zone. Area 7 Low level lighting - but CCC took it out.	Comment acknowledged.	Reference to low level lighting removed.
Ward Councillor Sarah Conboy for HDC	5.249	L&TSPD:31	Have observations	Public Moorings and low impact leisure use of river: This was important in the Neighborhood Plan, but we have already lost the public moorings at the Marina to houseboats when HDC overruled the Neighbourhood Plan. It is vital that the Tyrells Marina development adds public mooring back into the local offer. Area 10 we asked for public moorings and these are not reference!	Acknowledged; planning permission has been approved in principle for redevelopment of Tyrell's Marina which includes provision of new short-stay moorings.	Reference to short-stay moorings added.
Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council by Eleanor Jack		L&TSPD:88	Have observations	We consider that the document has highly laudable aims and some excellent features, but we do have the following concerns. If this SPD is to become an effective planning guide for the future, it needs to describe our landscape accurately and highlight all the features which need to be protected. We realise that in a survey of this kind, some generalisations have to be made. However, once planning documents are approved, they tend to be set in stone, so it is important to address any discrepancies at this stage.	Comment acknowledged.	Comment noted, no change required.
Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council by Eleanor Jack	3.3	L&TSPD:110	Have observations	My concern is that my parish of Waresley-cum-Tetworth does not really fit into any of the landscape categories provided. We have been assigned to South East claylands but there is no mention of the Greensand Ridge which dominates a large part of the parish	See below comment for Council's assessment.	See below comment for action.
Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council by Eleanor Jack		L&TSPD:118	Have observations	I am concerned that our parish does not really fit into any of the categories used to define landscape character areas. Our parish of Waresley-cum-Tetworth is assigned to South East Claylands but in my view that does not really describe our landscape. Waresley and Tetworth lie along the Greensand Ridge, an escarpment which runs north from Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire and which terminates at Waresley. This gives the parish a distinctive character which needs to be recognised. Large country estates with extensive parkland grew up over time along this escarpment and the estates at	It is acknowledged that certain landscape and townscape features may be highly distinctive at a local scale and atypical of the character area within which they sit. Whilst they cannot be captured within the large scale of a district level assessment that	Paragraph 2.14 has been amended to acknowledge the importance of such distinctive features at the finer scale of locally prepared assessments.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				<p>Waresley and Tetworth have had a profound influence on the development of the landscape and of our village. Parts of this eighteenth century parkland survive and need to be protected from insensitive development. Likewise the many small plantations of trees surrounding these estates need to be preserved, as well as the larger ancient woodlands and SSSIs. The District Council used to have an "Area of Best Landscape" category which covered these examples. Has that been discontinued, and if not, why does it not figure on the interactive map?</p> <p>Suggested changes Recognition of the greater variation in our landscape rather than forcing us into rigid categories</p>	identified key characteristics their importance at the local scale is recognised.	
Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council by Eleanor Jack	Figure 3.2	L&TSPD:119	Have observations	<p>There are some worrying anomalies on this map and also on the interactive map affecting my parish of Waresley-cum-Tetworth. Some areas which are really farmland are coloured deep purple (ie non-agricultural). The areas affected are 1. The area South of Waresley Wood this is definitely farmland but has been misrepresented as non-agricultural. 2. There is a similar problem affecting a small area between Gamlingay Wood and the B1040 There is a large inverted triangle of white pointing down from Abbotsley to Waresley, which erroneously shows this area as 'urban' when it is open countryside. BCN Wildlife Trust sites are not shown either unless they are ancient woodland. Thus the interactive map does not show Sugley Wood, which is a Wildlife Trust site in Waresley, acquired in about 2000, which extends Gamlingay Wood to the East.</p> <p>Suggested changes If this document is to be a definitive guide, the map needs to be accurate</p>	It is recognised that there are some anomalies in the data for agricultural land classifications which are supplied to HDC by Natural England. The resolution at which the maps are prepared results in some misalignment of boundaries when the maps are zoomed into a very small area. The dark purple non-agricultural designations to the west and east of Waresley are intended to cover the woodland areas which are not deemed to be agricultural land. The white inverted triangle is actually a data gap in the mapping as urban areas are shown in grey. We do not have access to the BCN Wildlife Trust mapping to include these, only the county Wildlife Sites.	The symbology for the agricultural land class layer has been amended so that any data gaps are not confused with urban areas. Figure 3.2 amended as a result.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.1	L&TSPD:34	Have observations	<p>Yaxley is 5½ miles from the city centre</p> <p>Suggested changes Amend to 5½ miles from the city centre</p>	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended paragraph 15.1 as per comment.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	Figure 15.1	L&TSPD:35	Have observations	<p>Page 483 - Bottom left picture refers to Main Street, London Road and Broadway when the photograph is off two houses on Telford Drive, Ferndale</p>	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the picture's caption.	Amended caption to include Telford Drive, Ferndale.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.11	L&TSPD:36	Object	<p>Refers to places of worship, when there is no only one place of worship on Main street being the Methodist church. St Bartholomew's closed around 20 years ago and is now St B hall. The paragraph refers to a parish hall which doesn't really reflect the facilities at the Amenity Centre which includes workshop and the parish council offices as well as two public halls and there is no reference to the Infants School.</p> <p>Suggested changes Suggested alternative would be: The uses within the area include a place of worship, public houses, shops, opticians, an Amenity Centre housing the Parish Council offices,</p>	Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be added to the character area.	Amended paragraph 15.11 as per comment.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				workshop, chambers and two public halls one of which is home to a pre school, a fire and rescue station, Yaxley infants School, restaurants, a dentist, offices and residential properties.		
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.14	L&TSPD:37	Have observations	Please remove reference to the existing Parish Hall and St Bartholomew's and replace with ... including the Owen Pooley Hall and Council Chambers, the Methodist Church and St. Bs hall. Suggested changes Replace with ... including the Owen Pooley Hall and Council Chambers, the Methodist Church and St. Bs hall.	Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be added to the character area.	Amended paragraph 15.14 as per comment.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.15	L&TSPD:38	Have observations	No one on the Parish Council has heard of a building on Main Street being known as the Red Front House - does it mean the house overlooking the green?	Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be added to the character area.	Amended paragraph 5.15 to add clarity.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.19	L&TSPD:39	Object	Page 486 - The second to end point refers to the demolition of existing homes within the site area if access is particularly narrow. With Main Street being in a conservation area the Parish Council would wish to see the emphasis being on protect and conserve rather than demolition Suggested changes The Parish Council would wish to see the emphasis being on protect and conserve rather than demolition	Comment acknowledged. The bullet is clear that demolition may be undertaken where it is appropriate. This approach is consistent with Local Plan allocation YX1.	Comment noted, no change required.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.39	L&TSPD:40	Have observations	The Farmers is not a Public house it is the Farmers Carvery and Grill and there is no mention of Wiles Haulage company which is found on Broadway	Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be added to the character area.	Amended paragraph 15.39 as per comment.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.44	L&TSPD:41	Have observations	William De Yaxley is a junior school not primary. The third sentence reads as if the playing fields of William De Yaxley School adjoin the larger public recreational ground - they do not, they are totally separate and have a boundary of trees. The recreational ground is a large centrally located piece of open space with two adult football pitches and access from Lansdowne Road, Main Street from the south and Middletons Road from the west. It has a 3G pitch, an outdoor gym, toddler and junior play areas, a floodlit multi activity area, skate ramps, community orchard and a pavilion which is the home to the Yaxley Community Fridge. Lansdowne Road second line missing the first d and ditto for 15.45 Suggested changes Please remove all reference to synthetic turf pitches and childrens nursery as they no longer exist. Lansdowne Road second line missing the first d and ditto for 15.45	Comment acknowledged; additional information will be added to the character area.	Amended to reflect the provision and separation of the recreation field from the school. Amended school from primary to junior school. Corrected typographical errors within Lansdowne Road.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.46	L&TSPD:42	Have observations	Page 496 - Development proposals fourth point, re ensuring that there is adequate car parking provided with any extension to the health centre and shopping centre. There is no land to make this happen and the health centre has just been extended without any thought to adequate car parking as the health centre staff continue to park on neighbouring streets often obstructing driveways	Comment acknowledged, the presence of adequate car parking within this character area will be a material consideration to any future planning application.	Comment noted, see Council's assessment for further details.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.61	L&TSPD:43	Have observations	The paragraph suggests that there are no open green spaces on Ashridge Walk	Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be added to the character	Amended para 15.61 to add additional clarity.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
					area.	
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.64	L&TSPD:44	Have observations	There is no mention of the large area of green space and tree belt referred to as "Green Park" which is located off Seaton Close and Pooley Way its path connects this area with Allard Close	Comment acknowledged; additional information will be added to the character area.	Amended para 15.64 to reflect this.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.81	L&TSPD:45	Have observations	Refers to limited front space resulting in some on street parking but the majority of parking spaces are found in parking courts located behind the properties. Unfortunately there is a lot of on street parking now on the grassed area near the foxglove playarea, a lot of this is down to inadequate parking spaces per house and the fact that the vans can not go under the coach ways this then limits the opportunities for enhancement of amenity green space as the area is being used as a car park.	Comment acknowledged; additional information will be added to the character area.	Amended paragraph 15.81 to reflect comment by the Parish Council. For this character area, a development proposal has been added to assist in highlighting this issue and addressing it in future planning applications.
Yaxley Parish Council by Helen Taylor	15.89	L&TSPD:46	Support	Page 511 - Pleased that consider and mitigate any potential impacts on the B1091 and wider highways network have been included.	Comment acknowledged	Support noted.
Jeremy Sheppard	5.199	L&TSPD:76	Have observations	The historic environment of the town. Concerns about the damaging effects of speeding traffic and the difficulty of pedestrians being able to get around safely and appreciate what we have been very fortunate to inherit from previous generations, is emphasised in the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan which received 96% support in our referendum. Speeding traffic regularly throws up surface water, badly weathering the historic boundary and other walls which are referred to in the on line consultation. We were promised 25% of the Infrastructure Levy from the Romans' Edge Scheme if we voted in favour of the GNP, which would be spent on such improvements as traffic calming, pedestrian crossings and cycle routes. Over £1M has been allocated to Godmanchester to date, but nothing spent on these. Three years ago, West Street residents submitted an 86 signature petition for a pedestrian crossing which was rejected by the Town Council. This followed a 20mph petition, also rejected. In July 2020 there was £500,000 of un-allocated CIL available but the Town Councillors firmly rejected a resident's suggestion at their meeting that some of this should be used to provide speed tables on all main roads through the town, in the same way as now provided along the road through the Stukeleys. These are recommended by County Highways as the most effective way of reducing traffic speeds, because signs are frequently ignored. The Town Council are now organising another expensive residents' consultation on our problems, whilst ignoring the opportunities to address residents' previously stated concerns by making use of the Infrastructure Levy available for environmental improvements.	Comment acknowledged. Comment relates to issues that are outside of the scope of the revised SPD.	Comment noted, no change required.
Kelly Barnes	10	L&TSPD:2	Have observations	Throughout the document, and yet most notably for Fenstanton (as this is where I live), I question if some "musts" could replace some "shoulds"? Should suggests an expectation and prior understanding, must explains where there is little wriggle room and it has to be considered. Could this wording be reconsidered and/or a note be added that if any of the areas are not addressed in planning application there needs to be a strong explanation as to why it is not being done in keeping with surrounding areas, or will plant trees etc, and if any compromise being considered. It feels like this gives a bit of wriggle room to developers, those developing.	Comment acknowledged; the revised SPD supports the implementation of already adopted policies within the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 by providing additional guidance. It is acknowledged that not all development proposals will be applicable to every form of planning application/proposal, therefore some	Comment noted, see Council's assessment for further details.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
				Suggested changes As above - it is to do with the "shoulds" and if some / if not all need to be "musts" instead.	flexibility in the wording has been applied to enable the most appropriate criteria to apply.	
Nicholas Ward (Carter Jonas) on behalf of Plaza Land		L&TSPD:137	Have observations	We welcome the advice in paragraphs 2.16, 2.17 and following box regarding the landscape and townscape assessment of proposed development. We would however suggest that this section refers to the following guidance from the Landscape Institute. 1 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment 2013 (GLVIA3), Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management Assessment. 2 Townscape Character Assessment. Landscape Institute Technical Information Note 05/2017. We would also suggest that within the Historic, Cultural, and Social Assets Section, where designated or undesignated heritage assets exist, there is reference to the need for a Heritage Impact Assessment to be undertaken by a qualified professional. Further it would be helpful if reference was made to Heritage Assets rather than historic assets to avoid confusion with the language of other planning documents. We welcome the guidance specifically related to development proposals that has been added to the assessments for the landscape character areas. We note however that the draft Supplementary Planning Document does not include any assessment of the sensitivity or capacity of the landscape adjoining the urban areas to future urban expansion.	Comment acknowledged. Will amend references from historic assets to heritage assets. This point has also been raised by Historic England.	Support noted. Have amended references of historic assets to heritage assets throughout the SPD.
Nicholas Ward (Carter Jonas) on behalf of Plaza Land		L&TSPD:138	Have observations	We refer to the consultation currently being undertaken and are pleased to provide you with some observations and comments on behalf of our clients, Plaza Land Limited, who have an interest in land to the east of the A1198 and south of the A1307 at Godmanchester. It is noted that the consultation document updates the 2007 Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment Supplementary Planning Document. Whilst the townscape assessments have been expanded to include a wider range of settlements, the evidence base for the Landscape Character Assessment and Guidance relies upon the Landscape Character Assessment undertaken by LDA in 2001. By relying on this earlier evidence base, we consider the updates undertaken to produce the current document have not always fully recognised the changes that have taken place in the landscape over the last 20 years. For example, the impact on the landscape of the South-East Claylands of the new route of the A14 is not reflected in the key characteristics for this Landscape Character Area.	The SPD supports policies within the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, whilst we recognise the concern regarding the Great Ouse Valley boundary and the implications of the new A14 on it, HDC cannot change the boundaries of designations that support strategic policies. This could, however, be an aspect to review in detail when preparing the next local plan.	Reference to the impacts of the new A14 and the A428 on the South East Claylands landscape character area have been added.
Nicholas Ward (Carter Jonas) on behalf of Plaza Land	5.248	L&TSPD:139	Have observations	We think that the final paragraph in the assessment of Godmanchester Character Area 9: Romans' Edge (paragraph 5.248) is open to misinterpretation and does not read as intended. Currently it reads: 'This is a large urban extension to Godmanchester providing substantial further growth during its construction although with very limited opportunities for extensions and alterations beyond that' We have interpreted this as meaning that once the approved development has been fully constructed in Character Area 9 there will be few opportunities for any further development within the new neighbourhood apart from extensions and alterations to dwellings and other buildings. We consider that it would be clearer if the phrasing used was consistent with that used for other Areas (such as for Area 5: London Road and Crowhill) and read as follows: This is a large urban extension to Godmanchester providing substantial further growth to the town. Once the new neighbourhood is completed there will be very limited development opportunities within this area, primarily limited to extensions and alterations.	Comment acknowledged	Paragraph amended to remove use of the phrase 'beyond that' and improve consistency with other areas.

Representation from	Chapter or Para No.	Comment ID	Support/ Object/ Have Observations	Comment	Council's assessment	Action
Nicholas Ward (Carter Jonas) on behalf of Plaza Land	3.17	L&TSPD:140	Have observations	There is a reference Figure 3.4 as showing the location of Green Infrastructure Priority Areas (paragraph 3.17). However, there does not appear to be a Figure 3.4 in the document and the Green Infrastructure Priority Areas do not appear on the other figures.	Comment acknowledged; the correction will be made to the character area.	Amended caption to 3.3. to remove reference to Green Infrastructure Priority Areas. Added in map to create Figure 3.4 showing the Green Infrastructure Priority Areas and Great Fen project.
Nicholas Ward (Carter Jonas) on behalf of Plaza Land	4.13	L&TSPD:141	Have observations	The abbreviation KSC (4.13 and onwards) is not explained.	Comment acknowledged; additional clarity will be made to the character area.	Added in abbreviation to paragraph 4.2 for clarity