

Local Plan response 27th January 2026

[REDACTED]

Site information

URN 668 JDI 52694

Site I.D. 115883

HELAA 52694

Postcode CB22 4NB

Foster's Field, Hill Farm Road, Whittlesford, Cambridge

1. Suitable Site Area 1.6703 hectares
2. Ward Parish Whittlesford
3. Greenfield or Previously Developed? Greenfield
4. Category of Site Integrating homes and jobs - Southern cluster
5. Category of Settlement Within group village
6. Current use Arable Field Grade 3a and 3b
7. Proposed development Mixed use
8. Proposed employment floor space 1000 m²
9. Proposed residential capacity 25

10. Suitability

11. Adopted Development Plan Policies RAG 2025 Amber

12. Adopted Development Plan Policies Comment 2025 Development of the site has some potential policy constraints, but these could be overcome through the planning application process.

13. Flood Risk RAG Assessment 2025 Green

14. Flood Risk Officer 2025 Flood zone; wholly in flood zone 1. Surface water flooding none

15. Landscape RAG Assessment 2025

16. Landscape Comment 2025

17. Landscape Comment 2021 "However, local views are medium and filtered through existing vegetation through Ditton Lane. Firstly, there is no Ditton Lane in Whittlesford so we question the whole of this section especially the RAG assessment red.

Secondly "The proposed number of units is unachievable and would have an adverse impact on landscape". We disagree with this judgement and we know the proposed number of units is achievable. With sensitive landscaping the impact would be minimal.

18. Biodiversity and Geodiversity Firstly RAG Assessment 2025. The solid geology of Fosters field is entirely Holywell nodular chalk formation. There is no superficial deposits above.
19. Biodiversity and Geodiversity Officer Comments 2025. We note that the officer has not commented on this matter in 2025. We note that in 2021 the comments do not match the Fosters field site and the description of the site is factually wrong. This has been an intensive arable field since 1962. There are no statutory protected areas within a kilometre of Fosters field.
20. Biodiversity and Geodiversity Guideline Comments 2025. We think this should be green. There are no Biodiversity or Geodiversity issues.
21. Policy RAG Rating 2025 We note this has been left blank and we are assuming the RAG rating from 2021 which is green has been carried forward unchanged to 2025
22. Policy Officer Comment 2025
23. Historic Environment RAG Assessment 2025
24. Historic Environment Comments 2025. We agree with the comments made in 2021.
25. Archaeology RAG Assessment 2025 There are no designated archeological sites recorded within Fosters field.
26. Archaeology Officer Comments 2025 Fosters field is outside the village core.
27. Accessibility RAG Assessment 2025 Automated
28. Accessibility RAG Assessment 2025 Officer Verified
29. Accessibility Comment 2025 We agree with the comments from 2025 but would also add access to Fosters field via Wren Park is already established and access to Fosters field from Hill Farm Road can achieve the visibility splays demanded by county highways
30. Site Access RAG assessment 2025 We think this should read green
31. Site Access Officer Comment 2025 We agree with the 2021 comments.
32. Transport and Roads RAG Assessment 2025. We think this should be green. All the criteria necessary can be satisfied.
33. Transport and Roads Guideline Comments 2025. We agree with the 2021 comments.
34. Noise, Vibration, Odour, and Light Pollution RAG Assessment 2025
35. Noise, Vibration, Odour, and Light Pollution Guideline Comment 2025. We agree with the comments from 2021 but think the rating should be green
36. A.Q.M.A., (Air Quality Management Areas), RAG Assessment 2025
37. Air Quality Officer Comments 2025 We agree with green. There are no Air Quality comments made
38. Contaminated Land RAG Assessment 2025. We think this should be green, amber at worse
39. Contaminated Land Officer Comments 2025. There is no reason to assert there is any historic contamination
40. Overall Suitability Score. We disagree with the red rating and we think it should be amber/green
41. Further Constraints
42. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1. Zero
43. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2. You assert 29.67%. Our view is that it should be is Zero.
44. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3a. We think this should be 29.67%.
45. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3b. We think this should be 70.33%. We would remind you our family has been farming this field for decades.

46. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 4. Zero
47. Agricultural Land Classification Non-Agricultural. Zero
48. Agricultural Land Classification Urban. Zero
49. Source Protection Zone. 100. The entire site lies within the Blue zone.
50. Highways England Zones. A11 / M11
51. Is the site controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop. We agree with the comments. There has been multiple speculative developers interested in Fosters field.
52. Are there known legal or ownership impediments to develop. No. The entire site is freehold, [REDACTED] and is not subject to [REDACTED] issues.
53. Is there any planning permission to develop the site? No
54. When will the site be available for development? This site has been in the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Not in the Whittlesford Conservation Area or affected by any Statutory Protection.
55. Available RAG We think this should be green

56. Achievable.
57. Is there a reasonable prospect that the site will be developed? We agree with the comments made on this assessment
58. Achievable RAG. We agree with this assessment.

59. Capacity.
60. Prevailing Density (weighted) (dwellings per ha). We agree with 30
61. Residential capacity at prevailing density. We agree with 45
62. Estimated employment space 1000m²
63. Estimated start date. 0 – 5 years. We agree
64. Estimated annual build-out rate. We agree with 40 - 75
65. Development completion timescales (years). We agree with 0 – 5 years