

Appendix A: Table of Historic England’s comments on the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan January 2026

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
59	Figure 9	Comment	The symbol for Grange Farm is shown in different locations on the online version and a PDF version of this diagram.
76	Figure 13	Object	The figure is potentially misleading. The CSET proposals are still at Inquiry, it is not a committed scheme but a proposed scheme. We recommend that you amend status of CSET to proposed, not committed.
88	Policy S/DE	Support	We welcome the reference to heritage in criterion 1b.
91	Policy S/GB: The Cambridge Green Belt	Support	We welcome the 3 key purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt being set out in the Policy. We welcome the reference to a compact city and historic core.
92	2.142	Object	Does designated sites include designated heritage assets? If so, this should be made explicit with the addition of the word heritage. We recommend that you add reference to designated heritage sites.
99	3.1.2	Support	HE welcomes the ambition to ‘enable Cambridge to accommodate growth of the highest quality whilst protecting and enhancing the historic environment and the key public spaces which are an important part of what makes the city so special to local people’.
102	Policy S/NEC	Object	<p>We broadly welcome the allocation of this strategic brownfield site. It offers an exciting opportunity for regeneration in a highly accessible, sustainable location. It will be important that the policy ensures the protection and enhancement of the historic environment including the conservation areas, river corridor and wider city scape.</p> <p>We appreciate there are still some uncertainties about the site and the funding for the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant. However, we acknowledge the approach being taken to retaining the draft allocation whilst not relying on the housing numbers to meet the need.</p> <p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there are several Conservation Areas nearby including Riverside and Stourbridge Common, Fen Ditton, Baits Bite Lock and Horningsea as well as their associated listed buildings. The River Cam, the meadows and its setting are an important part of the wider setting of the City.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to harm the significance of these assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We recognise that an the HIA for North-East Cambridge has been prepared. However, this does not appear to have been included as part of the evidence base for this Plan. It is important to include this as part of the evidence base.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Furthermore, it is important to incorporate the recommendations of the HIA into the Policy. This includes recommendations such as increased landscaping along the eastern boundary. The HIA should also be referenced in the policy.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 7c.</p> <p>There is currently no reference to nearby conservation areas and the River. This should be included in the policy.</p> <p>There should also be a new criterion requiring careful consideration of impacts on the Conservation Areas and River as well as views into the City and an appropriate urban edge.</p> <p>We continue to have concerns about potential increases in heights in North-East Cambridge in both the existing Science Park and also the land to the east of Milton Road. We remain concerned about impacts on views from Ditton Meadows and the Conservation Areas as well as wider views approaching the City from the north-east and east. Heights must be carefully managed through appropriate criteria in the policy.</p>
110	Figure 17	Object	There are 4 heritage assets shown on this figure. These are not designated heritage assets. Are they non-designated heritage assets? Review and amend accordingly.
111	Paragraph 3.1.6 and 3.1.24	Object	Paragraphs 3.1.6 and 3.1.24 seem to be the same. Delete duplicate paragraph
119	S/C/SMS Garages between 20 St Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the site lies adjacent to the boundary of the Mill Road Conservation Area and close to the grade II Listed Church of St Matthew.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to harm the significance of these assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. While some of the recommendations of the HIA are included in the policy wording, reference should also be made to contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology criterion.</p>
121	S/C/HTR 137 – 143 Histon Road	Object	Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area lies adjacent to the site.

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Development of the site has the potential to impact upon the Conservation Area and its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>While some of the recommendations of the HIA are included in the policy wording, reference should also be made to contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology criterion.</p>
122	S/C/HGH Henry Giles House	Object	<p>The site lies within the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area, adjacent to the Central Conservation Area and fronting the river, the of the river opposite Jesus Green.</p> <p>Although we have no objection to the principle of redevelopment on this site, this is a sensitive location with the potential to impact on the historic environment.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>While some of the recommendations of the HIA are included in the policy wording, reference should also be made to contextually appropriate materials, local context heights and also the addition of an archaeology criterion.</p>
124	S/C/HRC: Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane	Support	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. No comments.</p>
125	S/C/PDC: Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road	Support	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies very close to the Trumpington Conservation Area. Any development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of the conservation Area through development within its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We question paragraph 1.10 of the HIA – the site is not far removed from Cambridge but lies within the city limits. Maybe more accurate to say removed from the historic core.</p> <p>Criterion 1 reflects the recommendations of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome paragraphs 3,1,54 and 3.1.55.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
127	S/C/PPS: Police Station, Parkside	Object	<p>The site is located within the Kite Conservation Area and close to other Conservation Areas (Central and Mill Road) as well as numerous listed buildings and Emmanuel College Registered Park and Garden. The site overlooks Parkers Piece.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion a, b and c which relate to the historic environment.</p> <p>The HIA recommends development is limited to around 4 residential storeys. This should be included in the policy.</p> <p>Should criterion 3 refer to any other strategic viewpoints?</p>
128	S/C/NCA: North Cambridge Academy, 108, Arbury Road	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>The HIA recommends that height is limited to 3-4 storeys. This should be specified in criterion g to add greater clarity regarding height.</p>
130	S/C/ER: 1-99 Ekin Road and 1-8 Ekin Walk	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>The HIA recommends that height is limited to 3-4 storeys. This should be specified in criterion g to add greater clarity regarding height.</p>
131	S/C/DR: 2-28 Davy Road and Garage Blocks	Support	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby. We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion c.</p>
132	S/C/HPC: 1-78 Hanover Court, 1-49 Princess Court and Garage at Newtown Garages		<p>The site is located within the New Town and Glisson Conservation Area and close to a number of listed buildings including the grade I The Church of Our Lady of the Assumption and the English Martyrs and Grade II* Wanstead House and numerous GII listings.</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome the criterion which reflect the HIA.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
134	S/C/GER: Former Garage Block, East Road	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies close to the Mill Road Conservation Area and St Matthews Church (GII listed).</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>The HIA recommends that height is limited to 3 storeys. This should be specified in criterion e to add greater clarity regarding height.</p>
135	1– 33 Stanton House, Christchurch Street, Cambridge	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the Kite Conservation Area and Christ Church (grade II).</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>Criterion 1a is quite vague in relation to building heights. Given the heritage sensitivity of the site, greater clarity is needed regarding building heights. The HIA recommends that 'Development at a scale similar to the local prevailing building height and existing buildings on site should be appropriate. Site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings'. This should be included in the policy.</p>
137	S/C/SCL: Land South of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome reference to St Andrews church. Part of the HIA refers to viewpoint 7 and part refers to viewpoint 10. The policy itself criterion 1b refers to Viewpoint F. Please check and clarify which viewpoint it is.</p>
139	S/C/BRN: Land at Barnwell Road and Newmarket Road	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Part of the HIA refers to viewpoint 11. The policy itself refers to Viewpoint M. Please check and clarify which it is. Is it one in the same?</p> <p>What height is considered suitable for this site?</p>
140	S/C/TRP: Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area.</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area through development within its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criteria 1b and 1c.</p>
142	S/C/OPK: Parcel Com4, Orchard Park	Support	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site or nearby.</p> <p>No comments.</p>
143	S/C/BFS: Brookfields	Support	<p>Part of this site lies within the Mill Road Conservation Area.</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1a, 1b and 1c.</p>
145	S/C/CJ: Cambridge Junction and Cambridge Leisure, Hills Road	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies close to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area.</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area through development within its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criteria m, n and p.</p> <p>The HIA recommends that height is limited to roughly 6 storeys. This should be specified in criterion n to add greater clarity regarding height.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			We welcome the inclusion of a Spatial Framework at Figure 37.
149	S/C/CLT: Clifton Road Area	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. The site is also close to the GII listed Railway Station.</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion g.</p> <p>The HIA recommends that height is limited to 1-2 storeys. This should be specified the policy criteria to add greater clarity regarding height.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of a Spatial Framework at Figure 39.</p> <p>We welcome reference to the Holford Plan in the supporting text.</p>
153	S/C/SRW: Station Road West	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies adjacent to the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. The site is also close to the GII listed Railway Station.</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact upon the significance of these heritage assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1a, 1b and 1c.</p> <p>The HIA refers to several viewpoints. The policy only refers to Viewpoint E. We recommend including the following wording:</p> <p>‘...should not negatively impact Strategic Viewpoints <u>particularly Viewpoint E Limekiln Road...</u>’</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
154	S/C/BJH: Betjeman House, Hills Road	Support	<p>This site is located in the Glisson Road and New Town Conservation Area, lies adjacent to the grade II* Botanic Gardens, a registered park and garden and close to the grade II listed War Memorial and milestone.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d.</p> <p>We appreciate the site is under construction but welcome the reference to the scenario should the permission not be completed.</p> <p>We welcome the reference to the retention of the Flying Pig House.</p>
155	S/C/OPM: Old Press/Mill Lane	Object	<p>There are a number of designated heritage assets within the site boundary including part of the Central Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings including Cambridge University Centre, The Mill Public House, The Mill The Mill Bridge and Paved Surround, Mill Haven - West House and Mill Haven - East House, Cambridge University Press (Pitt Press), Telephone Kiosks, 1 Mill Lane, House Adjoining Number 74 on The North, 74 Trumpington Street, 8-11 Little St Marys Lane, Number 1 Little St Marys Lane including gas lamp and Emmanuel Church all listed at grade II. The site is adjacent to other listed buildings including Little St Mary's Church (grade II*), Pembroke College and Pembroke College Chapel both listed at grade I, St Botolph's Church also listed at grade I as well as numerous grade II listed buildings. This is a highly sensitive location in terms of heritage.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a Heritage Impact Assessment for this site. An HIA should be completed for this site.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1.103 states that there are no grade I, GII* or GII buildings within the site. However, there are a number of GII listed buildings within the site and there are highly graded assets nearby. Paragraph 3.1.103 therefore needs to be amended to correctly recognise the presence of designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Amend criterion a as the Pitt building is within the site. Also, there are other highly graded nearby assets (Pembroke, Little St Marys and St Botolph's) that need to be listed.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
158	S/C/NMD: New Museums, Downing Street	Object	<p>There are a number of designated heritage assets within the site boundary including part of the Central Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings including the Cavendish Laboratory of Experimental Physics, Mond Laboratory, The Arts School, The Laboratory of Physical Chemistry, and the Zoological Laboratory all listed at grade II. The site is also surrounded by numerous listed buildings including Corpus Christ (grade I), Pembroke (grade II* and grade II) and St Benet's Church (grade I)</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings. This is a highly sensitive location in terms of heritage.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a Heritage Impact Assessment for this site. An HIA should be completed. The recommendations of the HIA should be included in the policy wording.</p> <p>Include St Benet's Church in criterion 1b.</p>
161	Policy S/PA/CC: Cambridge City Centre	Support	We welcome criterion 1c and 1d.
164	Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change	Support	We welcome criterion 4b.
166	S/AMC/AS: Abbey Stadium	Object	<p>The site is located adjacent to the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area, as well as a number of grade II listed buildings and close to the Grade I Leper Chapel.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p> <p>Criterion j should refer to a heritage impact assessment (not historic). It should also refer to the grade I listed Leper Chapel.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
168	S/AMC/BC: Beehive Centre	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies immediately adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 4 but recommend the addition of the word 'height'.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p> <p>We appreciate that the site has been granted planning permission by the SoS. However, the policy needs to be robust, should the permission not be implemented and alternative proposals come forward for the site.</p>
170	S/AMC/EB: East Barnwell		There are no designated heritage assets within the area or nearby. No comments.
172	S/AMC/DBG: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area	Object	<p>The site contains several designated heritage assets including the Arts Theatre Workshop and Store listed at Grade II* and 17 Fitzroy Street and 38 Newmarket Road both listed at grade II listed. Part of the Kite Conservation Area is included in the Policy Area. There are also numerous listed buildings nearby.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1b , 7b and 8.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			The Policy should make more reference the role of heritage in the re-vitalisation of retail areas. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit Historic England for further suggestions
176	S/AMC/SCL: South of Coldham's Lane	Object	<p>Mill Road Conservation Area slightly overlaps this policy area along Burnside.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of this asset including through development within its setting.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p> <p>Criterion c refers to building heights of no taller than 6 storeys. In the absence of a Heritage Impact Assessment this is inappropriate and should be deleted. This needs to be explored through an HIA and masterplanning. Delete reference to 6 storeys.</p>
179	Policy S/PRIA: Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA) in Cambridge	Object	<p>We welcome the general aims of this policy.</p> <p>Historic England focuses on using the power of heritage to secure vibrant and sustainable futures for places with historic character so that generations to come can continue to enjoy them. Our High Streets Heritage Action Zones have maintained, restored and brought buildings back into use for local communities and businesses. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit Historic England for further suggestions and case studies.</p> <p>We recommend that this policy should include provision for the re-instatement of historic shop fronts.</p>
180	S/PRIA/CRP Cambridge Retail Park	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there are two listed buildings on the other side of Newmarket Road – 247 Newmarket Road and Cambridge Gas Company War Memorial, both listed at grade II.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p>
182	S/PRIA/EG: Eastern Gate	Object	<p>Part of this site lies within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area. There are also several grade II listed buildings including the Church of St Andrew the Less, 247 Newmarket Road and Cambridge Gas Company War Memorial. There are numerous listed buildings nearby.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 2c and paragraph 3.1.162.</p>
185	S/PRIA/HRRS: Hills Road and Regent Street Corridor	Object	<p>The Policy Area lies within New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and the Central Conservation Area. There are numerous listed buildings along Regent Street and Hills Road, including the grade I listed Downing College and Church of Our Lady of the Assumption and the English Martyrs, the grade II* Wanstead House and grade II listed St Pauls Church and there are numerous grade II listings. The Botanic Gardens is a grade II* Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			The Policy should make more reference the role of heritage in the re-vitalisation of retail areas. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit Historic England for further suggestions
187	S/PRIA/MC: Mitcham's Corner	Object	<p>The Policy Area lies within Castle and Victora Road, De Freville and the Central Conservation Area.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p>
189	S/PRIA/MR: Mill Road	Object	<p>Parts of the Policy Area lies within the Mill Road, Newtown and Glisson Road and Kite Conservation Areas. It includes part of the Mill Road Cemetery – a grade II Registered Park and Garden as well as the Cambridge City Branch Library and Gas Lamp both listed at grade II.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We understand that there is no HIA for this as it is a Policy Area.</p> <p>The Policy currently makes little reference to the historic environment. Amend policy wording to include more reference to the historic environment. This should include nearby heritage assets and any requirements for heritage (either mitigation or enhancements) in the policy.</p> <p>The Policy should make more reference the role of heritage in the re-vitalisation of retail areas. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit Historic England for further suggestions</p>
191	S/PRIA/OPML: Old Press/Mill Lane	Object	There are a number of designated heritage assets within the site boundary including part of the Central Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings including Cambridge University Centre, The Mill Public House, The Mill The Mill Bridge and Paved Surround, Mill Haven - West House and Mill Haven - East House, Cambridge University Press (Pitt Press), Telephone Kiosks, 1 Mill Lane, House Adjoining Number 74 on The North, 74 Trumpington Street, 8-11 Little St Marys Lane, Number 1 Little St Marys Lane including gas lamp and

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Emmanuel Church all listed at grade II. The site is adjacent to other listed buildings including Little St Mary's Church (grade II*), Pembroke College and Pembroke College Chapel both listed at grade I, St Botolph's Church also listed at grade I as well as numerous grade II listed buildings. This is a highly sensitive location in terms of heritage.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a Heritage Impact Assessment for this site. An HIA should be completed. The recommendations of the HIA should be included in the policy wording.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1 a and 1 c, but these should be expanded to better reference the historic environment.</p>
200	Policy S/CE: Cambridge East	Object	<p>The site includes the grade II listed Marshalls Airport Control and Office buildings. The Teversham Conservation Area and its associated listed buildings including the grade II* Church of All Saints. The Moated Site at Manor Farm to the east of the site is a scheduled monument, with the Manor Farmhouse itself being listed at grade II. There are several grade II listed buildings to the south on the edge of Cherry Hinton and St Andrews Church Cherry Hinton is listed at Grade I.</p> <p>Development within this area therefore has the potential to affect the significance of these assets including through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. Section 5.5 helpfully summarises the key heritage sensitivity and Section 6 makes a number of recommendations.</p> <p>Whilst we broadly welcome criterion 5 – 7, these do not sufficiently reflect the recommendations of the HIA.</p> <p>The HIA recommendations include some strategic landscaping and areas of open space at the north-eastern edge of the site as well as a heritage setting for the airport buildings. These must be included within the policy and the Spatial framework (figure 61). We recommend that you Amend policy and figure 61 to incorporate the HIA recommendations in relation to strategic landscaping, open space to northeast of site and heritage setting for airport buildings.</p> <p>Criterion 10 should also refer to the strategic views and Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			Figure 61 Amend scheduled Ancient Monument to Scheduled Monument (NPPF Preferred terminology) Amend throughout the Plan.
211	Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets however there is a scheduled monument known site revealed by aerial photography west of White Hill Farm. There is also a grade II listed monument at Nine Wells with inscriptions including Thomas Hobson, of Hobsons Conduit.</p> <p>There are also important views of the edge of the city from the higher land to the south and in particular from heritage assets including the scheduled monuments of Little Trees Hill (on Magog Down) and Wandlebury.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome 14c, 16c.and 16d and 28.</p> <p>14c should also specifically mention the scheduled monument west of White Hill Farm as well as the listed monument at Nine Wells.</p> <p>The policy should include the need for a Conservation Management Plan of the heritage assets in the Landscape Enhancement Area including their ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>Criterion 16 should be amended to reference the need to scale down heights towards the edge of the development as recommended in the HIA.</p> <p>However, we have some serious on-going concerns about heights and the softening of the edge of the City as well as landscape enhancements in the wider area.</p> <p>Landscape Enhancement Areas have been part of the previous Local Plan and yet there has been little change to the wider setting of the city in this broad area. It is imperative that future development of the Addenbrookes site is linked to positive offside mitigation to help enhance the setting of the City and indeed views from heritage assets along the southern hills. This aspect of the Plan, and the link between development and mitigation must be strengthened to ensure that it is implement. This issue applies not only in relation to Addenbrookes but to other Landscape Enhancement Areas in the Plan.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
224	Policy S/NWC: Eddington, Cambridge	Object	<p>Whilst the site does not include any designated heritage assets the site lies adjacent to Conduit Head Road and Storey's Way Conservation Areas and their associated listed buildings. Girton College listed at Grade II* and lodge (grade II lie to the north of the site. The American Military Cemetery, a grade I Registered Park and Garden lies at an elevated position of the west of the site, commanding long ranging views across the site. This contains the grade II* listed memorial and is also adjacent to the grade II * Madingley Mill. There are a number of designated heritage assets in the village of Madingley, including Madingley Conservation Area, Madingley Hall (grade I),and its grade II Registered Park and Garden, the grade II* church of Mary Magdalene as well as numerous grade II listed buildings.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>5a What about views from Madingley Cemetery and Madingley Hall/RPG? We recommend that you add these views to criterion 5a.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 5b although in criterion iii 'Farrow' should read 'Furrow'.</p> <p>Criterion 6b: The HIA is clear than the site is not considered appropriate for tall landmark buildings. Therefore criterion 6 b should be deleted.</p> <p>The HIA references the need for reduced scale of development as well as landscape buffers and screening in the south-eastern area of the site. This should be included in the policy.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 6c.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.27 - The heights in this paragraph are not supported by the evidence in the HIA. The HIA says nothing about 5 storeys at the edge of the site, nor does it allow for testing for taller buildings elsewhere in the site. Indeed, it specifies lower heights in the south-eastern part of the site. Amend paragraph to more accurately reflect the HIA.</p> <p>See our recent response to 25/03746/OUT in which we set out our detailed concerns regarding height.</p>
232	Policy S/WC: West Cambridge	Object	<p>The grade II* listed Schlumberger Gould research Centre is located within the West Cambridge site. There are two Conservation Areas, West Cambridge and Conduit Head Road adjacent to the site (and their associated listed buildings).</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We broadly welcome criterion 9 Criterion 9b should be extended to include the setting of the listed buildings.</p> <p>3.2.48 The Schlumberger Building is grade II*. The text needs to be amended (currently says grade II). Reference should also be made to the listed buildings in the adjoining conservation areas.</p>
239	Policy S/HHR: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road	Object	<p>The site adjoins the Howes Place Conservation Area (designated 2024).</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect the Conservation Area and its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. However, the new Conservation Area does not appear to have been considered in the HIA. The HIA should be updated to include the new Conservation Area.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 4 and 5. We advise that you add reference in policy to the Howes Place Conservation Area</p>
244	Policy S/EOC: Other site allocations on the edge of Cambridge	Object	<p>Criterion 1 is unclear as to which sites it is referring to. We recommend that Criterion 1 should list the four sites.</p>
246	S/EOC/NWO: Land north of Worts' Causeway	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site. The grade II listed Milestone lies just to the east of the site.</p> <p>The milestone will need to be protected during the construction works.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1a.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			The policy should also refer to the Building of Local Interest, Netherhall Farm (though we appreciate it is mentioned in the supporting text at paragraph 3.2.70). The policy/supporting text should also refer to the need to protect the milestone.
248	S/EOC/SWO: Land south of Worts' Causeway	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site. The grade II listed Milestone lies just to the east of the site.</p> <p>The milestone will need to be protected during the construction works.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1a. The policy/supporting text should also refer to the need to protect the milestone.</p>
250	S/EOC/BS: Bell School, Babraham Road	Support	There are no designated heritage assets within the site and none nearby. No comments
251	S/EOC/FRE: Fulbourn Road East	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site. The Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area lies to the northeast of the site.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect the Conservation Area and its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome reference to the Conservation Area in criterion a.</p> <p>Criterion b is too vague. The policy should set out how much of the site can be developed.</p> <p>Criterion c – does not properly reflect the HIA. The HIA refers to the prevailing building height to the north and west. To the north, development is 2 storey residential. Amend the policy to be clearer on heights.</p> <p>We welcome criterion e which reflects the recommendations of the HIAS.</p>
260	Policy S/CBN: Cambourne North	Object	There are two listed buildings within the site area – New Inn Farmhouse and Barns to the north of New Inn Farmhouse. There are a number of other designated heritage assets near the site including a grade II listed

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>milepost. To the north of the site lie the Elsworth and Knapwell Conservation Areas and their associated listed buildings including the grade II* All Saints Church. Childerley hall and Chapel (both grade II* listed and various grade II listed buildings lie within the grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Childerley Hall. The scheduled monument, Overhall Moated site, also lies to the north.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the Strategic Cambourne HIA and the site specific HIA.</p> <p>However, not all of the recommendations for the HIA have been fully reflected in the draft policy wording. Please check and ensure that these are included.</p> <p>We broadly welcome criterion 11 but recommend some re-ordering of the bullet points. In particular, Historic Landscape Characterisation and Archaeological assessment need to be undertaken first to inform the preparation of the comprehensive landscape strategy. Therefore, we would recommend that you move criterion 11c to 11a.</p> <p>In 11 c we would suggest referring to a ‘...<u>more detailed</u> Heritage Impact Assessment...’ given that an HIA has already been undertaken. We recommend the wording could be amended to read: Historic Landscape Characterisation and Landscape Character Assessment, <u>more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment</u>, and Archaeological Assessment must be undertaken to understand the impacts of development on landscape character, long range and local views and heritage assets and their setting, identifying appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. The Council’s HIA and the results of these further assessments must inform the masterplanning for the site.</p> <p>In 11c i we recommend inserting the following ‘...that respond to topography, <u>historic landscape characterisation</u> and archaeological constraints.</p> <p>In 11 c iii We recommend that the policy could allow for the conversion/restoration of the farmhouse and barns and finding a suitable use together with a conservation management plan for the assets going forward. This criterion should also state that development should be excluded from a buffer area immediately surrounding these assets as shown in the framework plan. .</p> <p>11d We recommend further discussions concerning the timing of desk based archaeological assessment.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Areas of known archaeological sensitivity should be highlighted in the policy and shown on figure 78.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 15.</p> <p>Figure 78 should show the heritage buffer identified in the HIA around New Inn Farmhouse and Barns. It should also show the areas identified for strengthened landscaping in the HIA.</p> <p>Figure 78 – we are concerned that the eastern most area shown as a Local Centre might be in the area of archaeological sensitivity.</p> <p>Figure 78 should show the areas of archaeological sensitivity identified in the HIA.</p> <p>Figure 78 We are concerned at the proposed location of employment development in close proximity to the listed New Inn farmhouse. The likely scale of the employment development may not provide a suitable setting for the listed buildings.</p> <p>The supporting text is fairly light on heritage (for example in comparison to the natural environment.). We suggest that the imbalance should be addressed.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.3.25 The phrase 'to the south is potentially ambiguous – it could mean to the south of Childerley Hall whereas we think you mean within the southern portion of the site.</p>
279	Policy S/CB: Cambourne	Object	<p>Great Common Farmhouse listed at grade II lies within the site boundary,</p> <p>There are a number of Conservation Areas to the south of Cambourne including Caldecote, Bourn Village and Hall, Bourn Caxton End and Caxton. All of these contain numerous listed buildings including the grade I listed church of St Helen and St Mary, Bourn, Manor Farmhouse (grade II*), Bourn Hall grade II*, Bourn Mill (grade I), Church of St Michael and All Angels Caxton Hall, Crown House and the Church of St Andrew, all listed at grade II* as well as numerous grade II listed buildings are located to the south.</p> <p>There are other listed buildings to the west and the east of Cambourne.</p> <p>There are a number of scheduled monuments in the area including Moulton Hills Roman Barrows, a ringwork and bailey castle and 17th century formal garden remains at Bourn Hall, Caxton moats – medieval moated site and another at Pastures Farm.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Finally, there are two further registered parks and gardens in the area at Bourn Hall (grade II) and Longstowe Hall (grade II*).</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>There does not appear to be an HIA for this allocation.</p> <p>It is important that the policy identifies on-site and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. Amend policy accordingly.</p>
291	Policy S/GF: Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary there are a number of designated heritage assets nearby including 8 Cambridge Road and Worsted Lodge Farmhouse, both listed at grade II, Great and Little Abington Conservation Area and the associated listed buildings including the grade II * St Marys Church and numerous grade II listed buildings. To the north of the site lies Worstead Street (Via Devana), a Roman Road. To the west north-west of the site lies an ice-house. Within the site there are a number of barrows which are potentially of schedulable quality.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA for the site. The HIA notes that there will be a high risk of residual harm to heritage given the scale and nature of the proposals. Therefore, it is essential that every opportunity is taken to mitigate impacts and also maximise enhancements for heritage.</p> <p>Criterion 6 change 'historic assets' to 'heritage assets' and 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' to 'Scheduled Monument'. Amend 'Abington Conservation Area' to 'Great and Little Abington Conservation Area'.</p> <p>7h We have some concerns about the location of particularly B8 uses on this site given the potential scale of the development.</p> <p>Context 2 The buffers should be shown on the spatial framework. b i Delete Ancient bii Good to mention GII listed Worsted Lodge but other nearby listed buildings should also be mentioned e.g. 8 Cambridge Road Needs to reference nearby Great and Little Abington Conservation Area and associated listed buildings.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>B iii barrows, not burrows – for interest: Historic England – Prehistoric Barrows and Burial Mounds – Introductions to Heritage Assets</p> <p>b iv Grange Farm</p> <p>c Add the following ‘ This should include the enhancement and extension of the existing treeline along the southern edge of the landscape buffer.</p> <p>d we would suggest referring to a ‘...<u>more detailed</u> Heritage Impact Assessment...’ given that an HIA has already been undertaken. Do you mean Historic Landscape Characterisation? Again, as with North Cambourne the purpose should be to inform the masterplanning. Therefore we recommend re-ordering of the bullet points. We recommend the wording could be amended to read: ‘Historic Landscape Characterisation and Landscape Character Assessment, more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment, and Archaeological Assessment must be undertaken to understand the impacts of development on landscape character, long range and local views and heritage assets and their setting, identifying appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. The Council’s HIA and the results of these further assessments must inform the masterplanning for the site.’</p> <p>Also include reference to ‘improve understanding and legibility of Worstead Street Scheduled Monument and links to other Roman networks through interpretation and public art’ (as recommended in the HIA).</p> <p>11 c should mention scheduled monument designation of Roman Road</p> <p>11 g should also mention that ‘the open character of the landscape buffer should be maintained’ (as recommended in the HIA).</p> <p>23 Lifespan – needs to include reference to the need for a Conservation Management Plan for the heritage assets.</p> <p>Figure 82 Spatial Framework We welcome the identification of green space, landscape features around heritage assets.</p> <p>The Town Centre is shown quite high up the hill. Given that the heights of buildings are likely to be taller at the town centre, there is the potential for the built form to be visible above the ridge. We therefore recommend that the Centre is moved lower down the slope.</p> <p>Delete Ancient.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			Paragraph 3.3.66 Long term Conservation Management Plan also needed for Roman Road and other heritage assets. This should also be included in the Policy.
301	Policy S/NST: Northstowe New Town	Object	<p>Parts of the Longstanton Conservation Area lie within the site. There are also 8 grade II listed pillboxes within the site. There are a number of other designated heritage assets nearby including Oakington and Westwick Conservation Areas and their associated listed buildings including the grade I All Saints Church, St Andrews Church and St Michaels Church, both listed at grade II* and several grade II listed buildings.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>There does not appear to be an HIA for this allocation.</p> <p>It is important that the policy identifies on-site, and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. Amend policy accordingly.</p> <p>We welcome reference to Longstanton Conservation Area in 11d.</p> <p>Reference should be made to Oakington Conservation Area in 11e.</p> <p>We welcome reference to All Saints Church in 11f. Reference should also be made to St Andrews Church and St Michaels Church, both listed at grade II*</p> <p>Reference should also be made to the grade II listed pill boxes on site.</p> <p>32 Is there a Conservation Management Plan for the site? If so, this should be referenced. If not, we recommend that this should be included as a policy requirement.</p>
310	Policy S/WNT: Land north of Waterbeach	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the new settlement allocation itself there are a number of highly grade assets to the north of the site in the Strategic Enhancement Policy rea. Denny Abey (scheduled monument, and 2 grade I listed buildings and 2 grade II listed building (barn and gate piers). To the south of the site is Waterbeach Conservation Area and its associated listed buildings. There are some listed milestones along the A10.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>There does not appear to be an HIA for this allocation.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>It is important that the policy identifies on-site, and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. Amend policy accordingly.</p> <p>3 This Strategic Enhancement Area should refer to Denny Abbey (Scheduled Monument and grade I listed buildings).</p> <p>6 We broadly welcome criterion 6. 6a should also mention the scheduled monument status of Denny Abbey and listed buildings.</p> <p>We welcome reference to many of the non-designated heritage assets including Soldiers Hill and the Causeway.</p> <p>Figure 86 This should also identify heritage assets (much as the other Spatial Frameworks do).</p> <p>3.3.92 - 93 We welcome these paragraphs.</p>
323	Policy S/BA: Bourn Airfield New Village	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site but there are some grade II barns to the north of the Grange I the Strategic Enhancement Area to the south of the site allocation. Great Common Farmhouse (also grade II listed) lies to the west of the site. Bourn Village and Hall Conservation Area lies to the south of the site.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>There does not appear to be an HIA for this allocation.</p> <p>It is important that the policy identifies on-site and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation and enhancement measures required to address any impact. Amend policy accordingly.</p> <p>We welcome reference to the grade II listed barns at criterion 9.</p> <p>We recommend that Criterion 9 should also reference Great Common Farmhouse (also grade II listed).</p> <p>Figure 88 This should also identify nearby heritage assets (much as the other Spatial Frameworks do)</p>
334	Policy S/WGC: Wellcome Genome Campus, Hinxtton	Object	<p>The site includes the Grade II* Hinxtton Hall, game larder, stables and North Lodge all listed at grade II as well as Hinxtton Conservation Area. St Johns Church, the Old Manor House and The Oak House all listed at grade II* as well as numerous GII listed lie within the wider Conservation Area. To the north of the site lies Hinxtton Grange and Stables, both listed at grade II.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of an HIA for this site.</p> <p>We welcome the criterion 10 and 11. Criterion 10a should be amended as Hinnton Hall lies within the site not to the north of the site (that is Hinnton Grange). Similarly, parts of the Conservation Area lie within the site. Therefore, the wording needs to be amended to more accurately reflect on site and nearby heritage assets.</p> <p>We welcome the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment. We would suggest referring to a '<u>...more detailed</u> Heritage Impact Assessment...' given that an HIA has already been undertaken.</p> <p>We welcome paragraphs 3.4.17 and 3.4.18.</p>
347	Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus	Object	<p>The site includes the grade I listed Church of St Peters and grade II listed Babraham Hall as well as part of Babraham Conservation Area. There are a number of other listed buildings nearby in the village of Babraham.</p> <p>In addition, there is a series of scheduled monuments on the higher land to the north and north west of the site including a long barrow, bowl barrow at Copley Hill, Wormwood Hill Tumulus, Causewayed enclosure and bowl barrow at Little Tree Hill and Wandlebury Camp a multivallate hillfort, earlier univallate hillfort, Iron Age cemetery and 17th century formal garden remains.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of an HIA for this site.</p> <p>The Policy states that Babraham Hall is grade II*. However, our records show this is listed at grade II. Please check and amend if necessary.</p> <p>We broadly welcome criterion 4 – 9 and 11.</p> <p>Criterion 4 Add reference to the Babraham Conservation Area which covers part of the site. We welcome the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment. We would suggest referring to a '<u>...more detailed</u> Heritage Impact Assessment...' given that an HIA has already been undertaken.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Add in the need to retain The Lodge, as recommended in the HIA.</p> <p>Criterion 8 Replace 'or' with 'and' to read 'Retain or <u>and</u>, where possible, supplement...</p>
359	Policy S/RSC/MF: Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets on this site and whilst the Duxford Conservation Area lies to the south-east of the site it is separated from the site by development and a playing field.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome the references to heritage assets and building heights in the policy.</p>
360	Policy S/RSC/BR: Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. However, Sawston Hall a grade II Registered Park and Garden, lies to the south-west of the site.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through development within its setting.</p> <p>There does not appear to be an HIA for this site. However, we appreciate that this site is largely built out.</p> <p>The policy should reference Sawston Hall RPG and the need for landscaping along the southern part of the site.</p>
361	Policy S/RSC/FSS: Former Spicers Site, Sawston Business Park, Sawston	Object	<p>The site contains part of the scheduled monument. The scheduled monument known as 'Borough Hill' is a large multivallate (multi- ditched) iron age fort. This is an exceptional pre-historic site, of which there are less than a handful of surviving examples around the country. It is also on our heritage at risk register. We have previously raised concerns about the impact of the development on the significance of the designated asset.</p> <p>Our primary concern is the impact of the development upon the significance of the scheduled monument through a development within it setting. The closeness, scale and massing of the new development will significantly increase the quantum of the development in the area immediately adjacent to the monument. The setting of the monument will be irrevocably changed, and the significance of the asset will therefore be eroded and diminished. This development would therefore result in harm to this significance.</p> <p>We recognise that the Spicers site is a brownfield site and that some form of redevelopment of this site would be acceptable in principle. However, development will need to be very sensitive to the monument adhering to the recommendations of the HIA.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>Two of the recommendations from the HIA are not reflected in the policy. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Archaeological investigation should be undertaken in areas previously not subject to archaeological works. 2. Development should be limited to the area previously subject to development to avoid impacts on potentially significant archaeology associated with the monument. <p>These recommendations should be included in the policy.</p> <p>It is sometimes beneficial to consider including the monument within the site boundary in order that appropriate mitigation and enhancements for the monument can be secured. We would suggest that this is an instance where such an approach could be useful. At the present time, only part of the monument is included within the site boundary. It is our view therefore that the whole of the scheduled monument should be included in the site allocation area.</p>
363	Policy S/RSC/CC: Comfort Café, Fourwentways Little Abington	Support	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on site, there is a grade II listed building, the Temple café and restaurant, to the south of the site.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through development within its setting.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1a,1b 1e and 1f.</p>
366	Policy S/SCP: Policy Areas in the Rural Southern Cluster	Support	<p>We note that the policy for the Babraham Strategic Enhancement Area is within the main policy for Babraham Research Campus, criterion 15.</p>
367	Policy S/PA/LN: South of A1307, Linton	Support	<p>We broadly support this policy area.</p>
368	Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major	Support	<p>We welcome the reference to heritage in criterion 1d.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
	Change in the Rural Southern Cluster		
369	Policy S/AMC/WHD: Whittlesford Parkway Station Policy Area, Whittlesford Bridge	Object	<p>The Chapel of Hospital of St John the Baptist is a scheduled monument and listed at grade II*. The Red lion Hotel is listed at grade II.</p> <p>Whilst we welcome the reference to the assets on criterion 2, the policy should mention the type and grade of the assets. The policy should include a requirement for a heritage impact assessment.</p>
378	Policy S/SHF: Land north of A1307, Bar Hill (Slate Hall Farm)	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the grade II milestone is located nearby. The grade II * All Saints Church at Lolworth and the Grange (grade II) lie to the west of the site on slightly elevated ground. Whitehall Farmhouse lies to the north east of the site at the edge of Oakington.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. However, the HIA does not consider Lolworth Church, the Grange and Whitehall Farmhouse. Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding this.</p> <p>The policy should also refer to these other heritage assets.</p> <p>The Plan should be clear as to whether Slate Hall Farm is a NDHA or not.</p> <p>We welcome the emphasis on landscape context.</p> <p>Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding the potential impact on the historic environment of this employment allocation. The HIA should be reviewed prior to Regulation 19 to consider these other assets. This should also include further evidence in relation to heights and mass informed by some visualisations. We need to be able to establish whether there is likely to be an impact on these assets and, if so, what mitigation may be needed.</p>
386	Policy S/RR/ML: The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn	Object	<p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			We welcome criterion 1b. The HIA refers to building heights of 2 storeys or less. This should be included within the policy.
387	Policy S/RRA/H: Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote	Support	We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We welcome criterion 1d.
389	Policy S/RRA/SCS: Land to the south of Cambridge Services, A14	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are a number of assets nearby, St Peters Church Boxworth and all Saints Church, Lolworth, both listed at grade II* as well as a number of other listed buildings.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>The HIA refers to the importance of managing heights in relation to heritage impacts. Employment uses have the potential for greater impact due to scale and massing. To that end the need for detailed heritage impact assessment should be included in criterion 1 c. References should also be made to nearby heritage assets in the policy.</p> <p>Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding the potential impact on the historic environment of this employment allocation. The HIA should be reviewed prior to Regulation 19 to consider this issue in more detail. This should also include further evidence in relation to heights and mass informed by some visualisations. We need to be able to explore further whether there is likely to be an impact on these assets and, if so, what mitigation may be needed.</p>
391	Policy S/RRA/BBP: Land at Buckingway Business Park, Swavesey	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there is a grade II listed barn for the north-east of the site. There is also a cluster of listed buildings at Lolworth, including the grade II* All Saints Church.</p> <p>Any development of this site therefore has the potential to these heritage assets through development within their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA. We note that the HIA has given some consideration to heritage assets at Lolworth.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>We welcome criterion d and the reference to Lolworth church. Employment uses have the potential for greater impact due to scale and massing. The need for a detailed heritage impact assessment should be included in criterion 1 d.</p> <p>We welcome criterion f though it would be further improved by clarifying when the assessment will be required.</p> <p>Given the likely scale of the employment development, we have some concerns regarding the potential impact on the historic environment of this employment allocation. The HIA should be reviewed prior to Regulation 19 to consider this issue in more detail. This should also include further evidence in relation to heights and mass informed by some visualisations. We need to be able to explore further whether there is likely to be an impact on these assets and, if so, what mitigation may be needed.</p>
392	Policy S/RRR/SNR: Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton	Support	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the grade II* Registered Park and Garden, Childerley Hall lies to the north of the site. There are a number of listed buildings within the designed landscape.</p> <p>Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the designated heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>However, there is considerable vegetation and distance between the site and the proposed allocation.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1e.</p>
394	Policy S/RRR/OHD: Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the Cottenham Conservation area is next to the south-western corner of the site. The grade I listed Church of All Saints is very nearby, as are two grade II listed buildings.</p> <p>Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>However, not all of the recommendations of the HIA are fully reflected within the policy. In particular, the following recommendations are absent:</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting of development to avoid obstructing or interfering with views of the church tower from Twenty Pence Road • Restricting building heights to limit visual intrusion into the conservation area and in views of the conservation area e.g., 1-2 storeys <p>These should be included within the policy.</p>
395	Policy S/RRA/NW: Norman Way, Over	Support	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on the site, the scheduled monument and grade II listed Over Mill lies to the south-west of the site.</p> <p>Whilst the principle of development of this site has already been established and there is a buffer of planting between the site and the assets, any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1 a, 1b and 1d.</p>
396	Policy S/RRA/CRH: Land adjacent to Cambridge Road (A10) and Mill Lane, Hauxton	Object	<p>This part of the site lies very close to the cluster of grade II listed buildings at Hauxton Mill. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>There are opportunities for design to enhance the setting of the heritage assets. The HIA recommends an area of landscaped open space in the northern part of the site. This is shown in diagrammatic form in the HIA. This diagram should be included in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The HIA also recommends no more than 2 storeys (residential). This should be included in the policy.</p>
398	Policy S/RRA/CH: Land at Compass House, Chivers Way, Histon and Impington	Object	<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, Histon Conservation Area lies to the north of the site. The grade II listed 82-92 Station Road also lies to the north of the site. The Mill Cottage Grade II and Impington Mill grade II* lie to the south of the site.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			Criterion b should also refer to the Impington Windmill (grade II* and Mill Cottage (Grade II). The plan should be clear about the status of the potential NDHA.
400	Policy S/RRA/CR: Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn	Support	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within and site. The Melbourn Conservation Area and associated listed buildings lies further to the south-west of the site.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1c and 1d.</p>
401	Policy S/RRA/FID: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals	Object	<p>This site lies within Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. The eastern part of the site lies opposite the scheduled monument Settlement site by Caudle Corner Farm. The site lies close to the Fulbourn Conservation Area and its listed buildings, and the grade II listed windmill sits on elevated land to the south of the site.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the preparation of the HIA.</p> <p>We welcome criterion 1c although we recommend that the scheduled monument is also specifically referenced in this clause. We welcome criterion 1f.</p>
404	Policy S/AMC/IWM: Imperial War Museum, Duxford	Object	<p>There are multiple designated assets on this site including Duxford Airfield Conservation Area, five grade II* listed buildings and over 20 grade II listed buildings. The Conservation Area is on the Heritage at Risk Register. Often the best use for an asset is its original use. However, this clearly has implications for development in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Development in this policy area has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>We welcome the reference to the need for a site wide masterplan for the site as well as references to the historic nature of the airfield and heritage assets. Criterion 2 should specifically mention the Conservation Area and listed buildings.</p> <p>The policy should state that the masterplan should be informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>The potential uses for the land in the west end of the site should be set out in the policy and/or supporting text.</p> <p>Historic England is keen to support the ongoing use of the site as a museum which is an important visitor attraction, educational, commercial and aviation facility.</p>
405	Policy S/AMC/PH: Papworth Hospital	Object	<p>We recommend add the words Papworth Everard to the Policy title to avoid any confusion with the New Papworth Hospital at CBC.</p> <p>This site includes the part of the Papworth Everard Conservation Area and lies adjacent to and in the setting of the grade II* listed Papworth Hall, scheduled monument moated site and close to the grade II listed Lodge.</p> <p>Development in this policy area has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>The policy should require the preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment for the Site. The HIA should be used to inform a masterplan for the site.</p> <p>The policy should specifically reference the fact that the hall is Grade II*, the scheduled moated site and the grade II Listed Lodge.</p>
407	Policy S/AMC/FD: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate	Object	<p>The Fen Drayton Conservation area and associated listed buildings lies to the east of the site.</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>There is currently no reference to these heritage assets in the policy.</p> <p>Reference should be made in the policy and supporting text to nearby heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset). The policy should include some reference to the need to consider views into and out of the Conservation Area. Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording.</p>
409	Policy S/AMC/HIS: Mixed Use Development in Histon &	Object	<p>There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary but the Histon and Impington Conservation Area and associated listed buildings lies to the north of the site as well as other listed buildings to the south (Impington Windmill grade II* and Mill House grade II).</p> <p>Any development of the site has the potential to impact these designated heritage assets and their settings.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
	Impington Station Area		<p>There is currently no reference to these heritage assets in the policy. Reference should be made in the policy and supporting text to nearby heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).</p> <p>The policy should include some reference to the need to consider views into and out of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording.</p>
410	Policy S/AMC/GT: Optimisation of Gypsy and Traveller sites	Object	<p>The Chesterton Fen Road site is located across the river from the Fen Ditton and Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. This policy should therefore reference the nearby Conservation Area and the need to conserve and where appropriate enhance the Conservation Area and its setting.</p>
440	Policy CC/RE: Renewable Energy Projects and Infrastructure	Object	<p>Historic England is supportive of renewable energy development and supports the inclusion of a policy for renewable energy.</p> <p>Our advice note Commercial Renewable Energy Development Historic Environment Advice Note 15 provides further advice on Local Plans and renewable energy including site selection and development of policies and maps in plans.</p> <p>We note that you have commissioned a Landscape Assessment – Part 2 Renewable Energy Development Assessment as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. We note that this evidence has been used for the development of maps for solar and wind turbines which have then been used on the policies map.</p> <p>The assessment is mainly landscape focussed and does not appear to give detailed consideration to the historic environment (though there are some mentions of heritage e.g. church spires but more in relation to the wider landscape).</p> <p>Recognising the challenges in preparing a detailed and thorough assessment of heritage at a strategic scale, we consider that the mapping represents a helpful starting point, although there are some limitations. However, given the limitations of the mapping it is very important that the plan includes suitable strong caveats to help</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>explain these limitations and also to set out what further heritage assessment will be needed at planning application stage.</p> <p>This needs to be set out in robust policy criteria and in supporting text which is also reflected in the key to the policies map. We welcome references to heritage in the policy. However, we suggest a number of changes to wording to ensure that the policy and supporting text and policies map key is clearer and more robust.</p> <p>1e we welcome the reference to the historic environment and the setting of heritage assets. The Policy should also include reference to the need for detailed heritage impact assessment.</p> <p>Parts of the policy refer to a zooming study – whilst others refer to zoning – we assume the latter?</p> <p>Paragraph 4.51 After (LVIA) add '<u>...and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)</u>'</p> <p>Paragraph 4.56 We welcome the reference to heritage in this paragraph. The following wording must also be added: <u>When identifying and considering impacts on heritage assets and / or their settings special regard will be had to the desirability of protecting and enhancing the significance of such assets. A detailed heritage impact assessment will be required during the planning application process for each site to consider all designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings. Applications should include visualisations showing the relationship to heritage assets and settings. Viewpoints should be agreed in consultation with interested parties.</u></p> <p>Reference to the need for further site-specific assessment of proposals should be included on the key for the proposals map.</p>
534	Policy GP/HD: Housing Density	Object	<p>We welcome the reference to a context led approach and also the reference to heritage assets.</p> <p>Reference should also be made to gentle densification.</p>
536	Policy GP/ST:Skyline and tall buildings	Object	<p>Historic England is keen to support growth in appropriate locations whilst protecting and enhancing what is important in relation to the skyline of the City and surrounding area. Cambridge is set within a low-lying landscape. Much of the city is hidden within a well treed skyline, punctuated by a few landmark buildings. Many (particularly in the historic core) are also highly graded heritage assets and well-known features on the skyline. Maintaining the settings of these heritage assets, including how they sit within the skyline, particularly from key views in and out of the City, will be important.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Within the wider area, we are seeking to ensure that the rural character of the area is maintained and that even within the new settlements, buildings do not over-dominate the wider landscape and have a negative impact on the historic environment. The relatively flat nature of the area means that impacts can be felt over considerable distances.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of a policy for tall buildings and the skyline. We welcome the detailed evidence base that has been prepared in the form of the Skyline and Tall Buildings Baseline, Strategy and Guidance.</p> <p>Policy and Supporting Text We note that the policy wording itself is very similar to the previous Local Plan, albeit with greater emphasis on design quality and the addition of a further criterion relation to suicide prevention.</p> <p>We welcome the reference to the historic environment in criterion b.</p> <p>There are however some minor changes to wording that would be helpful.</p> <p>Appendix H/I Sometimes this is referred to as Appendix H and sometimes I.</p> <p>Appendix H Para 2.1 add reference to historic environment ‘..important views, <u>historic environment</u>, the wider townscape...’</p> <p>Section 5 seeks to define what is meant by tall buildings in the Cambridge context. This is a more nuanced definition than the former local plan, not least given that the policy now covers the rural area of South Cambridgeshire as well. We continue to have some concerns about the context heights identified and also the threshold heights.</p> <p>In relation to context heights, it is important that the average context heights are sense checked and that they are nuanced enough to pick out for example areas which may be considerably lower than the surround context height.</p> <p>Furthermore, just because an existing context height is a particular height, does not automatically mean that future development of a similar height or just a storey more may be acceptable, nor does it remove the need for assessment against the tall buildings policy.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>These caveats should be set out clearly within the policy/supporting text/Appendix.</p> <p>7.3 Figure 8 showing the key viewpoints should also be included in the Appendix.</p> <p>8.1 It would be helpful if the views were given distinct numbering. At the moment there are several views identified as a.</p> <p>We welcome the reference to dynamic views.</p> <p>12.6 After heritage assets this should include <u>heritage assets (listed building, scheduled monument, conservation area, registered historic park and garden and non-designated heritage assets, including but not limited to buildings of local interest)</u></p> <p>This section should also refer to the Cambridge Historic Core Appraisal and Conservation Area Appraisals.</p> <p>Process and Technical Requirements Heritage Impact Assessment Criterion 1 needs to be reworded to read: Any application that results in potential harm to the significance of heritage assets, including the contribution made by its setting (<u>listed building, scheduled monument, conservation area, registered historic park and garden and non-designated heritage assets, including but not limited to buildings of local interest</u>) needs to be accompanied by a separate heritage impact assessment.</p> <p>Criterion 2 We welcome the reference our advice note 3. We recommend including the hyperlink The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic England This criterion should also include reference to Tall Buildings: Historic England Advice Note 4</p> <p>We welcome the reference to digital assessment techniques.</p> <p>Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy – See also our comments in our letter. We welcome the detailed work that has been undertaken to prepare an evidence base in the form of the Skyline and Tall Buildings Baseline, Strategy and Guidance (although the detail is, at times, hard to follow – we recommend an executive summary is prepared to draw out the main points).</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>We remain concerned that the approach using context height and thresholds may lead to an ever-increasing roof height and flattening of the skyline to the upper limit, thus harming the overall gentle, treed skyline that currently exists within the city.</p> <p>Similarly, we are concerned that a blanket threshold of 3 storeys for rural villages is inappropriate. Whilst there may be scope for buildings of greater height at village centres, this may not be appropriate at the village edges or in areas with for example heritage sensitivities.</p> <p>Finally, we note that the tall buildings strategy identifies areas of search for taller buildings and for clusters of tall buildings. We have some reservations about the strategy in this area and some of the assumptions made. We would be keen to discuss this matter further with you and also to ensure that the appropriate height parameters are in place for specific site allocations.</p> <p>There also need to be strong clear caveats (in the Plan policy, supporting text, appendix and strategy) stating the need for proposals to be considered on a case-by-case basis. There must also be a clearer statement in both the Local Plan and also the Tall Buildings Strategy that the heights explored within the evidence base would need to be tested on a case-by-case for site-specific proposals and that the STBS is only one of a number of factors to be considered in determining the most suitable design and heights for a particular site.</p> <p>We want to be able to support you in delivering much needed housing and growth in the city. In order to do so it would be helpful to discuss the evidence base. We would therefore welcome discussion with GCSP prior to regulation 19 to better understand the Strategy, how it was developed and its conclusions. This will help to clarify the extent of our concerns and to explore with you how they might be addressed.</p>
546	Policy GP/HE Historic Environment	Object	<p>Historic England welcomes this policy.</p> <p>We welcome the positive strategy for the historic environment as set out here and elsewhere in the Plan.</p> <p>We welcome the requirement for Heritage Impact Assessments. Although these are often known as Heritage Statements at Application stage.</p> <p>We recommend adding more about the importance of heritage in place-making, quality of life and well-being as well as being a key economic driver as well as the importance of protecting and enhancing heritage because of this.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			We recommend adding text that that recognises the growing pressures on heritage of a rapidly growing population. We recommend including in the strategy something about seeking to enhance existing provision and create greater access to other heritage assets to spread the impact on heritage destinations. This might include specific encouragement of other heritage/nature base areas to open up to visitors.
548	Strategy Diagram	Object	Non-designated heritage assets (rather than non-designed)
550	Policy GP/HA: Designated heritage assets	Object	<p>Criterion 1 sets an inappropriate tone. The clear overriding message should be that harm should be avoided in the first instance. We recommend that you amend criterion 1 to make it clear that harm should be avoided in the first instance.</p> <p>Criterion 4 We welcome the reference to heritage at risk.</p> <p>In relation to Heritage at Risk (HAR), does the Plan include any site allocations containing HAR or near to HAR? If so, the associated policies should reference their HAR status and encourage positive solutions/identify opportunities for their conservation and enhancement. We recommend that you check the HAR register and amend any site allocations accordingly.</p> <p>Criterion 5 should be deleted. By definition, within the NPPF, enabling development is development that is not otherwise in accordance with adopted policy. We are therefore of the view that a policy on enabling development is not a necessary component of a local plan document and so should be deleted. A local plan should adequately set out a positive strategy for the historic environment without the need to include such a policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.62 could be much clearer in relation to the definition of designated heritage assets. Put simply, designated heritage assets are Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monument. We advise that you should amend the paragraph accordingly.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.70 – 7.72 We recommend that these paragraphs should be removed for the reasons set out above.</p>
554	Policy GP/ND: Non-designated heritage assets	Object	<p>We welcome the inclusion of a policy on non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.76 We recommend including a link to the criteria Criteria - Cambridgeshire's Local Heritage List in paragraph</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			<p>Paragraph 7.76 The final bullet point – it should be noted that not all entries on the HER are Non-designated heritage assets. A planning judgement (by a ‘plan-making body’) is needed to determine whether or not something is a non-designated heritage asset. Inclusion on the HER alone is not sufficient. Please refer to this in this paragraph.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.78 We welcome the inclusion of links through to the Cambridgeshire Local Heritage List Portal.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.79 This paragraph should make it clear that other ways that non-designated heritage assets may be identified are through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plans • Neighbourhood Plans • Conservation area appraisals and reviews • Decision-making on planning applications
556	Policy GP/CC	Object	<p>We welcome reference to heritage assets in this policy.</p> <p>We recommend that the policy should highlight the need to take a whole building approach.</p> <p>We welcome the various hyperlinks to publications. We also recommend including the following link: Energy Efficiency and Retrofit in Historic Buildings Historic England</p>
559	Policy GP/AR: Archaeology	Object	<p>The policy should reference the importance of archaeological assessment informing planning proposals including masterplans.</p> <p>The policy should provide clearer guidance on the appropriate timing of archaeological assessment.</p>
561	Policy GP/SF: Shopfronts	Object	<p>We welcome the reference to historic shopfronts in this policy. The policy could go further and encourage the restoration and reinstatement of historic shopfronts. This is both in terms of the positive contribution historic shopfronts make to the character of an area, but also the economic benefit of providing traditional and bespoke shopping units to shop owners.</p> <p>Our recent High Street Heritage Action Zones across the country are unlocking the potential of high streets, fuelling economic, social and cultural recovery and breathe new life into it for future generations.</p>

Page	Section	Support/ Object/ Comment	Comments
			The Policy should make more reference the role of heritage in the re-vitalisation of retail areas. See our Heritage Led Regeneration Toolkit Historic England for further suggestions
655	Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Show people sites	Support	We welcome criterion 1g.
695	Policy I/DT: Digital and Telecommunicatio ns infrastructure	Support	We welcome criterion 1c.