

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Policy Team
South Cambridge District Council
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

By email: localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org

Date: 29 January 2026

Our ref: 68589/14/JF/AG/40691320v1

Dear Sir / Madam

Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Consultation

Representations on behalf of Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited

We write on behalf of our client, Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited ('Juniper'), the owners of Bourn Airfield. This letter draws together the representations that have been submitted digitally in response to the above consultation. The representations have been prepared by Lichfields, in conjunction with SLR Consulting on transport matters.

Executive summary

Juniper supports the overall ambitions of the draft plan including its growth strategy and the inclusion of Bourn Airfield as a site allocation. Policy S/BA should support the delivery of a new community at Bourn Airfield and maintain flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances over the construction period.

Juniper requests the following amendments to Policy S/BA to ensure it is sound or to aid clarity:

- 1 Remove the Strategic Enhancement Area ('SEA') and add this land back into the allocation boundary;
- 2 Remove reference to the Spatial Framework Diagram ('SFD');
- 3 Provide clarification that equivalent mass transit might be provided instead of a segregated bus link to reflect the terms of the existing planning permission;
- 4 Amend the reference in paragraph 19 c) from Queens Road to Grange Road and remove reference to the A1303;
- 5 Add Bourn Quarter back into the allocation boundary; and
- 6 Remove the policy requirement for provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

We also provide a number of comments on transport matters and related policies and request the following:

- 1 Add reference in Policy S/CB to funding towards the Cambourne to Cambridge bus link (“CtoC”);
- 2 Provide further clarity in Policy S/CBN regarding the provision of the East-West Rail and CtoC schemes;
- 3 Provide further clarification on the vehicle trip budget referenced in Policy S/CBN;
- 4 Provide clarification on the timescales for CtoC identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan; and
- 5 Engage with Juniper on future progress of the integration of CtoC with the Spatial Framework growth ambitions.

Our full review of the draft plan and our detailed comments are set out below.

About Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited

Juniper is a joint venture partnership between Homes England, Greycoat Real Estate, and Oaktree Capital, and is the master developer of Bourn Airfield. Outline planning permission for the development of Bourn Airfield was granted by South Cambridgeshire District Council on 30 July 2024 (reference S/3440/18/OL) (‘the outline permission’).

The Bourn Airfield development will provide 3,500 new homes and employment, retail, leisure, education, and community facilities, as well as a significant network of green and blue infrastructure.

Construction works have recently commenced on site with the Western Access, which forms the main access point for the new community, now underway. Alongside this, a rolling programme of site-wide archaeological investigations is being undertaken by Oxford Archaeology.

In the spring, a new community hub will open to the public, providing a focal point for engagement with the local community and stakeholders on the ongoing planning and delivery of the new development. A reserved matters application for the first parcel of 500 new homes will be submitted in the summer, with the first homes expected to be delivered in spring 2027.

Vision for Greater Cambridge

Juniper supports the vision for Greater Cambridge and the seven strategic priorities that flow from it. We consider clarity would be improved if the order in which the priorities are presented is changed, and the inter-relationships are explained.

For example, if climate change is intended to be an overarching priority, it should be followed by creating great places within which new homes and employment opportunities are provided. The remaining strategic priorities will then collectively contribute to transitioning to net zero carbon and sustaining the unique character and identities of the Greater Cambridge area.

Policy S/DS: Development strategy

Juniper supports the stated order of preference for delivering homes and jobs and the carrying forward of the Bourn Airfield allocation into this plan.

The draft plan states that the development strategy aims to direct development to where active and public transport is the natural choice, where green infrastructure can be delivered alongside new development, and where jobs, services and facilities can be located near to where people live.

Juniper supports this approach, and the focus of growth in South Cambridgeshire to the west of Cambridge, beyond the Green Belt. The allocation of Cambourne North anchored around a new town centre at the East West Rail station will strengthen the A428 Madingley Road corridor as a key axis. Bourn Airfield will play an important complementary role in this strategy. Its scale and location will help to promote a coherent and sustainable growth corridor, in line with the strategic transport objectives of the draft plan.

The text in no.2 (v) which briefly describes the carried forward allocation for Bourn Airfield could also usefully refer to its close proximity and relationship with an expanded Cambourne.

Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy

The supporting text for Policy S/SH and the Settlement Hierarchy Study Update 2025 identify Bourn Airfield as a Rural Centre. However, given its early stage of development, the documents state that Bourn Airfield will only be added to the settlement hierarchy during a future plan review. Based on the definition provided in the supporting text and the allocation of other settlements in the hierarchy, the designation of Bourn Airfield as a Rural Centre would be appropriate.

When referring to Bourn Airfield, in terms of its position in the settlement hierarchy, it would also be appropriate to note its proximity to Cambourne, reflecting the close relationship of the two communities. The preamble to Policy S/SH could usefully set out how new and emerging settlements will be addressed during a future review.

Policy S/BA: Bourn Airfield New Village

Bourn Airfield New Village, as it is referred to in the draft plan, is allocated under Policy S/BA. Outline permission is granted for development of the site, with implementation now underway. On this basis, policy for this site must be entirely consistent with the outline permission and support its implementation so that new homes can be delivered as soon as possible. It is not the purpose of policies in this plan to “guide the remaining development” for which planning permission has already been granted and is in the process of being implemented, and this should be deleted from the pre-amble or clarified.

Major schemes, such as Bourn Airfield, are implemented on a phased basis over many years. As the text states in the pre-amble, policy in this plan would be relevant to the consideration of any new planning applications that may come forward in the future. In this respect, policy must provide for some flexibility to enable the delivery of development on the site to evolve to respond to changes in circumstances that may be encountered over the lifetime of the development of the site, should new planning applications be required.

We have reviewed Policy S/BA in detail and highlight key points to be addressed below.

Vision, identity and uses

Juniper supports the overall vision, identity and uses as expressed. We suggest that further attention should be given to the relationship between this policy and the outline permission and the generally prescriptive nature of this policy, given that permission has already been granted. We also raise a number of points relating to the proposed Bourn Airfield SEA (S/SEA/BN), which we comment on below.

The plan sets out what the development of Bourn Airfield must do (particularly nos. 8 – 27) in policy terms, even though this will be governed by the planning permission which has already been granted. There is, therefore, no requirement that development must meet these requirements. Even though most of the numbered points are consistent with the planning permission, the text is confusing for users of the plan, referring to new applications and reserved matters submissions, seemingly interchangeably.

Greater clarity is required, particularly regarding the relationship between the development being implemented in accordance with an existing planning permission and policy which would apply to any new applications.

Strategic Enhancement Area ('SEA')

Policy S/BA proposes to introduce an SEA around the southern and eastern edge of the site and exclude this area from the allocation. This area is included in the allocation in the adopted plan, but outside the area marked as a 'Major Development Site'.

The Bourn Airfield proposal has been designed as a whole, with areas outside the Major Development Site area forming an integral part of the overall masterplan, providing the green infrastructure and open space for the new village. This remains the case and, therefore, these areas should remain in the allocation until the scheme is completed or well-advanced in its implementation.

It would be premature to de-allocate a part of the site that is integral to the design of the whole scheme, which is just commencing implementation. The policy wording states that the SEA will ensure sufficient separation from neighbouring settlements and maintain a soft green landscape to protect the development's rural setting. It is not necessary to do this, as the design of the masterplan already achieves these aims. These areas are secured by the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan approved under the outline permission. Also, part k. of the uses listed in draft Policy S/BA references the provision of ecological areas, woodlands, and orchards as a requirement for the allocation.

Figure 87 (Spatial Framework for Policy S/BA: Bourn Airfield New Village – digital version) shows the SEA as an area, whereas Figure 77 (Map of proposed development for New Settlements – digital version) refers to it as a policy. There is no justification of the designation of this area as a SEA or for a policy. The SEA should be removed, and these areas should remain in the Bourn Airfield site allocation to allow a fully comprehensive and integrated approach to development of the site during the plan period, in line with the existing planning permission.

Spatial Framework Diagram ('SFD') for Policy S/BA: Bourn Airfield

Paragraph 10 of Policy S/BA requires the built area of the Bourn Airfield settlement to be built in accordance with the policy's SFD, even though the parameters for the development of the site are set out in the planning permission documentation and secured by condition – with which the SFD is inconsistent.

It is not necessary to include the SFD. However, if it remains in some form, the layout should reflect the outline permission and include the necessary flexibility to facilitate detailed design. The SFD includes the locations of land uses and access points as approved under the outline, but it shows the main vehicle access to the east in the incorrect location and is missing a primary school site in the north-east area. The allocated site should include the totality of the permitted Bourn Airfield site and not just the Major Development Site area, as set out above.

The direct reference to the SFD in the policy could hinder the ability to accommodate design and layout changes that often arise through the detailed design process and which would improve the development. It is important for the delivery of a scheme of this scale, which is implemented over several phases, that there is sufficient flexibility for such changes to come forward in future.

The reference to the SFD should be removed from the policy, to allow for flexibility consistent with the approved parameter plans and any subsequent variations. Notwithstanding the above, the location of the vehicle access to the east should be amended and the missing primary school added to ensure consistency with the outline planning permission.

Public transport improvements

Paragraph 19 of Policy S/BA relates to required public transport improvements. Part a) states that improvements must include provision of a segregated bus link from Cambourne to Bourn Airfield new village across the Broadway and on through the development to the junction of the St Neots Road with Highfields Road and contribute under planning obligations towards the continued route to Cambridge.

Juniper supports this but clarification should be provided in the policy that this requirement should relate either to a segregated bus link or equivalent scheduled rapid mass transit passenger carrier service, as per the outline planning permission.

Paragraph 19 part c) states that public transport improvements must include provision of high-quality bus priority measures or a busway on or parallel to the A1303 between its junction with the A428 and Queens Road, Cambridge. The CtoC scheme is not proposed 'on or parallel to the A1303' and only extends as far as Grange Road. The policy should be amended to reflect these points.

Paragraphs 18-20 repeat the use of 'must', which is already used at the start of this section. This should be updated to correct the wording of the policy.

Bourn Quarter

Bourn Quarter has been removed from the Bourn Airfield allocation on the basis that, as it has already been redeveloped, it no longer needs to be included.

This is premature - it is not yet fully built-out nor is it integrated with the airfield site. Integration is important as it forms part of the employment provision for the new settlement. Bourn Quarter should be reincorporated into the allocation boundary, along with the land outside the Major Development Site area, to ensure a comprehensive approach across all areas and effective integration and connectivity between different uses. It should not be unpicked at this juncture.

Gypsy and traveller pitches

Policy S/BA states that Bourn Airfield will provide 12 permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches (within a site of approximately 1 hectare).

No such provision is secured under the outline planning permission, nor does the adopted plan identify specific sites in major developments. Instead, the adopted policy refers to a criteria-based approach to guide the identification of sites through the master planning process. This master planning process has already been completed for Bourn Airfield and, following that, no provision was secured within the outline planning permission.

The approach in the draft plan is unsound and should be remedied by provision in forthcoming strategic sites, such as Cambourne North where it can be secured. The reference to Gypsy and Traveller pitches is unsound and should, therefore, be removed from Policy S/BA.

Transport

SLR Consulting has carried out a detailed review of the supporting transport work and evidence base that has been published, in addition to transport matters in other site allocations. Our comments are set out below.

Policy S/CB (Cambourne West)

In the same manner as the Bourn outline planning permission, the section 106 agreement for Cambourne West secures funding towards CtoC. However, we note there is no reference to the requirement for a contribution within draft Policy S/CB (Cambourne West). This should be inserted to ensure consistency across the policies.

Policy S/CBN (Cambourne North)

Policy S/CBN relates to Cambourne North and whilst the delivery of East West Rail and CtoC is not an explicit requirement, it is clear throughout the policy and within the supporting information that the delivery and integration of these schemes is assumed in bringing forward development in this location. We suggest greater clarity should be provided in Policy S/CBN about the provision of these schemes, as part of Cambourne North.

Policy S/CBN - Strategic transport model

Policy S/CBN references the establishment of a trip budget to ensure that the development does not result in unmanageable congestion on the surrounding road network.

This vehicle trip budget appears to have been established using the County Council's strategic transport model (CSRM2); however, the derivation of this budget and how the additional trips can be accommodated on the highway network is not set out. Clarification should be provided as to whether this evidence base has already been prepared and is available to review or, if not, confirmation on when it will be produced.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Section 4.3 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan ('IDP') sets out the priority projects. CtoC is identified in Table 4-1 as a strategic transport measure. It is unclear in its wording whether it is anticipated it will be delivered by 2035. Clarification should be provided regarding the anticipated timescales within which CtoC will be delivered. This may become clearer prior to the Regulation 19 version of the plan being produced.

CtoC Busway Integration Report

This report forms part of the evidence base and sets out the potential role of CtoC in catalysing Cambourne's growth and establishes a vision for how a future busway extension should be integrated with the Spatial Framework growth ambitions.

Juniper welcomes the indicative proposals for integration and requests they are consulted when further progress is made in the future. Juniper would like the opportunity to work with the authorities to ensure smooth integration, including discussions around the frequency and capacity of CtoC buses and buses on the wider network, to support Bourn Airfield's future residents' access to bus services.

Conclusion

Juniper supports the draft plan's growth strategy and the proposed allocation of Bourn Airfield. As stated, it is important that Policy S/BA provides the necessary flexibility to support the delivery of new homes on the site in the future. Accordingly, Juniper has requested several amendments to Policy S/BA and also provided a number of comments on transport matters and related policies.

Juniper looks forward to the next version of the plan and the opportunity to discuss the matters outlined above with the Council between now and then. Please contact James Fennell or me with any questions about these representations.

Yours faithfully



Alice Green

Senior Planner

BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI