Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Consultation - Response Form

Please submit your comments (known as representations) by **5pm** on **Friday 25 September 2026**.

Data Protection and Freedom of Information

We will treat your data in accordance with our Privacy Notice. All personal information that you provide will be used solely in relation to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

Please note that each representation and the name of the person or organisation who made the representation, and the name and organisation of the agent (where used), will be published on our website - representations cannot be treated as confidential.

Additionally, respondent details and representation(s) will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the examination.

By submitting this response form you are agreeing to these conditions.

About this Response Form

This response form has two parts:

- Part A – Your details. We cannot formally register your comments without your details.
- Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make. If you need more space to provide your answers, please expand the boxes or continue on an attached separate sheet.

We strongly encourage the submission of representations via our consultation platform at https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/proposed-submission-greater-cambridge-local-plan If you are unable to submit your representation using our online system, this response form is available to downloaded to complete electronically from www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/local-plan.

Your completed response form should be:

- emailed to localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org, or
- posted to: Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Policy Team, South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6EA

If you are having difficulty submitting your comments, please contact localplan@greatercambridgeplanning.org or call 01954 713694.

Part A: Your Details

Information required	Personal details *	Agent's details (if applicable)
Name	Sara Collings, clerk	Lisa Foster & Susy Gandy
Organisation (where relevant)	Teversham Parish Council	Richard Buxton Solicitors
Job Title (where relevant)	Clerk to Teversham Parish Council	Solicitors
Address, including Post Code	[redacted]	Dale's Brewery Gwydir Street Cambridge CB1 2LJ
Telephone	[redacted]	[redacted]
Email address	clerk@tevershamparishcouncil.gov.uk	[redacted]

* If you have appointed an agent to represent you, you only need to complete the Name and Organisation (if applicable) under Personal Details, but you do need to complete the full details of the agent. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

Part B: Your Representation

Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation.

Section 1: Which document, and section of that document, does your representation relate to?

Document	**Policy / Paragraph / Site / Map** (please identify)
Proposed Submission Greater Cambridge Local Plan	Policy GP/ST (supports) Policy S/CE (objects) Policy H/AH (supports) Policy H/AH.1 (objects) Policy BG/GI (supports green policy in so far as retains the green corridor in allocation S/CE, but objects because excludes the country park, which conflicts with the overall green policy direction)
Proposed Submission Policies Map	Policy S/CE (Cambridge Airport and Teversham environs)

Sustainability Appraisal	
Habitats Regulations Assessment	

Section 2: Do you consider that the Greater Cambridge Local Plan is sound and legally compliant?

Test	**Yes / No**
Legally compliant	No comment
Sound	See attached letter

Section 3: Your representation

Please set out and explain your comments. Please be as precise as possible, and please do not just refer to an attached supporting document(s). For your representation (comments) to be considered, your representation must be set out here. Wherever possible, set out precisely any changes you think should be made to the plan and its policies.

Proposed Submission Greater Cambridge Local Plan
Reg 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
Submission on behalf of Teversham Parish Council

1 We are instructed by Teversham Parish Council (TPC) in relation to their Reg 19 formal consultation response to the Proposed Submission Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP).

2 Whilst the GCLP will be evaluated against the four soundness principles and the 2024 NPPF, any development applications will have to meet the policy requirements in the new NPPF which will have primacy.[1] The key policy for TPC is of course allocation Policy S/CE (Cambridge Airport and Teversham environs), and their overriding concern is to ensure that allocation policy more clearly articulates certain design and transport principles to be applied in that location and as they relate to Teversham; as well as reinstating the long-promised country park to provide proper green infrastructure linkage.

Comments on the GCLP

Density & height

3 TPC supports the restriction in policy GP/ST on tall buildings to protect the skyline.

4 The GCLP identifies that the area around TPC is flattish that "*makes the area sensitive to buildings and other structures that rise above the treeline*". TPC supports the broad restricting to three-storey buildings but would like to see this policy clearly applied to the S/CE allocation policy. Particular sensitivity in design and massing should be shown at the edges of new

[1] National Planning Policy Framework 17 August 2026

developments that are closest to villages; many of which (as with Teversham Conservation Area) have an historic core whose settings must be respected in design of new development.

5 NPPF 2026 DP3 sets out key principles for well-designed places, stating that

> *"Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets*."[2]

6 Policy S/CE discusses preserving the "rural setting" of Teversham Conservation Area and some design principles, at para 13:

> *"Through the masterplan for the site, agree appropriate variation in building form, scale, height, massing, and density to shape a distinctive city district by:*
>
> *a. Providing taller buildings in appropriate locations to mark key spaces, enhance wayfinding and complement the Cambridge skyline;*
> *b. Utilising innovative approaches to development typologies to define character areas;*
> *c. Responding to key views and approaches to the site"*

7 However, TPC would prefer a clearer articulation of the national policy principle and absolute clarity within the allocation policy that this should be interpreted as lower density and height at development edges, with the maximum 3-storey height as the stated default, unless lower heights deemed suitable from applying the para 13 principles.

Affordable Housing

8 TPC supports the GCLP requirement for minimum proportions of affordable housing in Policy H/AH along with the requirement to align with "identified local need"[3], but would like to see a higher minimum for social rented as opposed to discounted purchase schemes.

9 Policy H/AH.1 requires all major development to provide at least 40% affordable housing with Table 6 setting out the tenure mix as 65% affordable rented, 10% social rented and 25% shared ownership. However, although this is the default position there may be different provision within a particular allocation. S/CE is silent on the required % and TPC would like to see this clearly articulated as a minimum provision. Given the airport had for many years (until 2006) been within green belt, 50% as a minimum affordable housing element (set out for green belt locations in H/AH.2) is an appropriate starting point for S/CE.

Green infrastructure & recreation

10 TPC supports draft policy BG/GI: "*To support successful delivery of green infrastructure, the policy will require proposals to demonstrate that green infrastructure has been planned: As an integral part of the development, so that it informs the overall development design. This should include identifying, retaining and enhancing existing natural features of value*." This is continued in Policy S/CE: "*Open to a greater width at the Teversham end, maintaining a clear gap between Cambridge and Teversham, protecting the village's identity and character, heritage assets and rural outlook and setting by providing an informal countryside character*."

[2] DP3.1

[3] Annex B glossary

11 Since the redevelopment of the airport was first mooted, certain principles were set down that were immutable. For example, whilst the airport area was removed from the Green Belt (2006) the green corridor linking Teversham with Coldhams Common was retained and TPC supports its retention at its fullest extent in the GCLP.

12 However, from the earliest plans a country park to the north of Teversham was also set out. This can be seen in the 2008 Cambridge East Area Action Plan (see Fig 1).




Fig 1: CEAAP 2008

13 Careful thought went into the evolution of the country park policy[4]:

> "*As a new urban quarter with a considerable population living at high densities, it will be important that residents have the opportunity to connect with the surrounding countryside. One advantage of Cambridge East being developed in a compact form will be that the countryside will be relatively close to the whole development and should be reachable on foot and certainly by bicycle. However, the intensively farmed nature of the countryside on the eastern side of Cambridge means that the opportunities for informal recreation are currently limited.*
>
> *As a major new community, it will be important to ensure that the substantial population of Cambridge East has good access to the countryside. A new country park is proposed east of Airport Way and north of Teversham, where people can also find the facilities which would enable them to experience informal countryside leisure activities, with provision of publicly accessible wildlife areas and habitats, and areas solely for nature conservation. Such facilities could include a visitors' centre, areas for picnicking, barbeques, kick about areas, kite flying and so on, as well as supporting facilities such as car and cycle parking, toilets, etc.*
>
> *A country park in this location will be well related to the main body of the urban extension."*

14 It was retained in the 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (see Fig 2).

[4] Cambridge East Action Plan Adopted February 2008
Policy CE/21 Countryside Recreation D10.22-24




Fig 2: South Cambs LP 2018

It is, however, entirely missing from the GCLP (see Fig 3).




Fig 3: GCLP Figure 53: Indicative Spatial Framework for S/CE: Cambridge East.

15 The GCLP gives no explanation for its removal, nor has it been replaced with an alternative land use on policy maps. This omission does not fulfil the requirement to be "positive" in terms of land use enshrined in the four soundness principles.

16 Nor is this consistent with the GCLP elsewhere which requires the green corridor to "*Connect to strategic green infrastructure beyond the site*." Or "*ensuring that proposed green infrastructure is appropriate to its local contexts*", According to Figure 53 (our figure 3) there will be no green infrastructure to connect to save an aspirational linkage to the Wicken Fen Vision well north of the A14 trunk road and entirely separated from Teversham. TPC cannot comprehend how this complies with GCLP policy principles elsewhere in the consultation draft it also contradicts the design principles of

> *"Establishing an integrated framework of open spaces, green corridors, and green infrastructure across the new city district"*[5]*. The language used deliberately emphasises connectivity and adjacency including to "enable a seamless strategic green connection…"*[6]

TPC fails to see how this can be satisfied if the country park is **not** provided.

[5] S/CE para 16(a)
[6] S/CE para 16(c)ii

17 The removal of the country park and tenuous (if any) link to Wicken Fen Vision are also contrary to national policy with its extensive support for green recreation:

> NPPF 2024: *"Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change."*[7]
>
> NPPF 2026: "*To create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect relevant aspects of the following principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location….Nature: incorporate and/or connect to a network of high quality, accessible, multifunctional green infrastructure to provide opportunities for recreation and healthy living, strengthen habitats, improve climate change resilience and improve air and water quality*."[8]

18 TPC strongly considers the country park should be reinstated.

Transport infrastructure

19 Whilst TPC supports the GCLP's transport policies in broad terms, they note the absence of articulated proposals for village bus links, and lack of public transport strategy to villages particularly Teversham. The principle is established as a foundation:

> NPPF 2026 states good design should "*provide transport infrastructure and choices which support the design vision for the site, provide good connections to the wider settlement (or those nearby), and prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport*"[9]
>
> GCLP allocation policy S/CE 12(b) states the Master Plan should ensure it "*Provides appropriate connections between neighbourhoods, public spaces, cultural and educational facilities, promoting active travel and public transport use".*

20 However, whilst para 17 talks about *"integration of bus routes to connect with hubs", "promoting low car ownership"* and providing a *"high-quality public transport route through the site"* with a *"package of bus service enhancements"* TPC is concerned that the focus is solely on connectivity of new development with key hubs, when additionally improvements and provision should be articulated to connect existing villages with each other and these hubs. TPC would like to see this point clarified as a requirement within S/CE.

Conclusion

21 TPC wishes to emphasise the need for clear requirements in relation to:

- social rent with the affordable housing mix;
- retention of the green corridor and retention of the country park plan;
- proper integrated bus package that also benefits and accounts for the needs of existing villages, including Teversham; and
- density and height maxima to protect the setting of existing villages, including Teversham Conservation Area.

[7] NPPF 2024 para 98
[8] NPPF 2026 DP3.2(c)
[9] NPPF 2026 DP3.1.d

Please provide a 100 word summary of your representation.

TPC wishes to emphasise the need for clear requirements throughout the local plan but in particular in relation to draft allocation Policy S/CE:

- social rent with the affordable housing mix;
- retention of the green corridor and retention of the country park plan;
- proper integrated bus package that also benefits and accounts for the needs of existing villages, including Teversham; and
- density and height maxima to protect the setting of existing villages, including Teversham Conservation Area.

Section 4: Supporting Documents

If you are submitting any supporting documents with your representation, such as maps or further evidence documents, please provide a list.

Please see our letter dated 24 September 2026. We have attempted to incorporate its contents into Section 3; however, for the avoidance of doubt, we attach the letter separately for ease of reference.

Section 5: Proposed Modifications

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Greater Cambridge Local Plan legally compliant and sound.

You will need to say why each modification will make the Greater Cambridge Local Plan legally compliant or sound. Please put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or paragraph, being as precise as possible.

Please see attached letter dated 24 September 2026.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to justify your representation and any proposed modification(s), as there will not be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations other than at the invitation of the Inspector during the Examination process.

Section 6: Participation at the Examination

If you are proposing a modification to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearings?

Examination	**Yes / No**
Participate at the hearing sessions	To be confirmed

If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Please note: the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in Examination hearing sessions. You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

Section 7: Being Kept Informed

Would you like to be kept informed of the progress of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan through to adoption?

Notifications	**Yes / No**
Informed of submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for independent Examination	Yes
Informed of the publication of the Inspector's recommendations following the Examination of the Local Plan	Yes
Informed of adoption of the Local Plan	Yes