

Consultee Ref.	Response to Open Question 1: What people liked about living in Heathfield
R1	Great community spirit
R2	I don't live in Heathfield
R3	Easy access to transport links
R4	CB22 postcode, Cambridge phone number, ease of access to M11
R6	The community feel, friendly neighbours, feel safe, good to bring up kids. Good transport routes
R7	Community and quietness.
R8	I don't live in Heathfield
R10	The community
R11	I don't live in Heathfield
R15	n/a as I live in Thriplow
R16	Rural life while having the security of living on a housing estate
R19	I don't live in Heathfield
R20	N/A
R22	Good community spirit
R24	I don't live in Heathfield
R26	I don't live in Heathfield. I live in Pepperslade. None of the Heathfield issues affect me.
R30	Don't love there
R32	I don't live in Heathfield!! Form completed identifying Thriplow Village, yet the form continues asking for feedback on Heathfield.
R33	I don't live in Heathfield, so no comment
R34	I do not live in Heathfield but near enough to be affected by any changes. It seems a pleasant community
R35	Where I live in Pepperslade it is quiet, because of low traffic density. Having access to the POS and footpaths to Thriplow is a great asset, which was particularly so during lockdown. All of the NP issues are focussed on Heathfield, but I agree with your observations.
R39	I don't live in Heathfield
R41	Relatively quiet, rural location.
R46	I like the peace and quiet.
R50	A close community without living on top of one another. Far enough from cities and town to give a rural feel but within easy commuter reach of Cambridge & London.
R51	Countryside and quiet
R52	Road links.

R53	Open spaces to walk in. Nice quiet area.
R54	Affordable 4-bedroom house
R55	The quietness, the access to fields for walking and abundance of dark sky.
R56	The community feel, coupled with easy access to the countryside
R58	Smaller community, lack of lighting, open green spaces
R59	Sence of community. Could
R60	Community spirit
R61	The Community
R62	The location. There is good access by car to the north, south, east and west.
R63	Community feel and great access to travel (M11, A505, A14, A1(M) and A10)
R64	Rural, remote, more affordable than other nearby villages
R65	It backs onto good dog walking land.
R66	The People. Close to M11. Play spaces for children. Country walks.
R67	Being in the countryside but close enough to main amenities I need and use. Smallness of a village rather than a large town. Less noise, less people, less trouble. This is why I don't want more being built around as it will not feel like the countryside anymore.
R68	Not much traffic, no lorries
R70	The beautiful countryside
R71	N/A
R72	The parks/open spaces/walks and it's a generally nice area to bring children up in with a nice community feel.
R73	we live in Thriplow village, but walk through Heathfield
R76	Great community but poor provision of amenities
R78	I don't live there
R79	I don't
R81	Friendly
R82	A very friendly community, feeling of safety, lots of open spaces.
R83	It's peaceful
R84	Quiet, seeing the aeroplanes, good neighbours.
R86	Easy access to the M11, pleasant rural walks
R88	Country walks. low prices compared to other areas.
R89	The quiet neighbourhood and easy access to walks across the fields.

R90	It is very safe area and I like it so much.
R92	The open spaces and walks through the fields, the access to local road networks (A505, M11, A11), the proximity to beautiful Thriplow, proximity to the IWM
R95	The open space that opens out to the fields
R96	I like being so close to the countryside, the peacefulness, low crime rate, and friendly neighbours. I moved here because I wanted to be away from crowds of people. I do not want any more houses built in this area.
R97	I don't live in Heathfield but know it well and agree with the issues stated
R99	Quiet and friendly community
R100	Easy access to motorway
R101	Quiet community
R102	The fields and surrounding area nearby for walking
R103	We live in Pepperslade and like the open space, outdoor gym, play area and walks along the bridle path.
R105	The green areas, quiet, lovely walks
R106	Peace and quiet, green areas.
R108	I don't live in Heathfield.
R111	I don't live in Heathfield
R112	We don't live in Heathfield

Consultee Ref.	Response to Open Question 2: Issues in Heathfield (if 'other' selected)
R1	Adopting street lights, roads need regular sweeping
R7	No community Amenities. The garage was out only source locally for bread and milk etc. The current BP garage is over priced and short shelf life. No community hall etc without having to travel to Thriplow or Duxford
R17	The footpaths beside the A505 are very often severely overgrown and almost impassable.
R35	A505 junction with Pepperslade needs significant traffic calming upgrade, similar to that used at Flint Cross.
R61	Speed of cars driving around the estate
R66	I have two issues with Heathfield, First is its identity, people never know that Heathfield is a village in its own right (even if it is a infill village like babraham) Some think we are Duxford and thats just not true! Second is the door numbers on the private estate. no one can ever find some of the houses. for example Woburn Place 1-18 then whitehall gardens 19 - 45 then back to woburn place 46 - 50. 50 woburn place is close to 50 kingsway. it sends delivery drivers nuts. to
R68	No pub
R80	Suggested emergency vehicle route Pepperslade to Heathfield is private land
R85	I have no strong opinion, All of the issues above appear to be centred around Heathfield private estate, which does represent the needs or requirements for the residents in Ringstone, Hurddlesway or Pepperslade, it would appear only one voice is being heard. Every point on the list above is a Heathfield private estate issue, the homes there where purchased at a reduced value to represent this, the limited emergency vehicle access is clearly just for residents to have an additional access point and not required, all other estate have a single access point which is not an issue, this is just for Heathfield private estate to try and have the roads adopted.
R86	The lack of amenities is an issue!
R89	Lack of respect for sticking to speed limits /consideration of others on the road is already a problem.
R106	No further community amenities are necessary. There is no space to fit this in. We are an infill village and should make use of the amenities in
R119	Limited road widths throughout - only in original base roads

Consultee Ref.	Response to Open Question 3: Heathfield 3 Improvements
R1	Adopting road systems, trees/paths kept tidy, street lights being adopted, parking made clearer with vans/cars not being used are moved, beautifying the estate, with local amenities
R2	I don't live in Heathfield
R3	Parking, road and verge maintenance
R4	Maintain the A505 frontage, no more commercial expansion, more access roads that are interconnected
R6	Community amenities
R7	I feel all of them are very important. It's been such a long time since Heathfield has had any attention. The HRA are doing a brilliant job now with making improvements, but years of neglect has taken its toll. I feel any improvements will be a start.
R9	lack of community amenities
R10	More parking spaces. Access in and out of the area. Lack of community amenities.
R11	They are not
R12	N/A as I don't live in Heathfield
R13	1. Car parking issues, 2. lack of amenities and 3. A505 noise
R14	<p>On-street parking (particularly in Ringstone) particularly on corners - possible issues with emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Entrance is unattractive (made worse by recent development that removed a number of mature trees and replaced them with metal industrial fencing)</p> <p>Current high metal fencing and eventual hedging will cause visibility issues at mini roundabout - suggest removing high fencing and replacing with low level barriers as provided at the front of forecourt.</p> <p>Implement one way system around Ringstone loop as road is too narrow for two way operation and on-street parking.</p> <p>Reinstate parking on the edge of the playing field using suitable materials (bricks and reinforced grass) to reduce the pressure on parking</p>
R15	n/a
R16	Maintenance of verges and pavements along the A505. Residential parking - clogs up the roads especially on Hurdles Way. More local amenities - a single petrol station isn't enough within walking distance to help make the population sustainable long term
R17	Footpath clearing and hedge cutting
R19	I don't live in Heathfield
R22	Amenities, parking, look of main entrance

R23	A505
R25	Addition of community facilities like a shop or a community centre
R26	None. My concern is the green space behind Pepperslade and protecting it from further development. The play equipment was put in against objections from Pepperslade residents and was pushed through by Heathfield residents. It does not get used and is an eyesore. What is to stop the space from being developed further now? Please do not treat Pepperslade as part of Heathfield. The needs of the residents are VERY different.
R28	Main entrance; lack of community amenities; management of open space
R29	Not applicable, not resident in Heathfield but lack of amenities and management of open spaces is clearly problematic
R31	limited emergency vehicle access, unadopted road systems, lack of community amenities
R32	None, see above
R34	Lack of community amenities, unattractive main entrance to Heathfield, A505 pollution
R35	I think all have an equal weighting.
R37	Repurpose old Icen factory to open space/residential to enhance the site for all
R39	I don't live in Heathfield
R40	Parking issues due to high density of homes. Limited emergency access. Lack of community amenities
R41	More benches on open space, less dog fouling, speed bumps required.
R45	Main entrance image, A505 and lack of community amenities
R46	Limited emergency vehicle access
R47	Maintenance along verges and pathways - a resident's group could consider options like rewilding, mini-allotments, meadow flower strip planting, growing climbers up steel fencing and so on. Lack of community amenities - a hall would be useful. A505 noise and pollution - though this will be mitigated by the introduction of all electric vehicles.
R48	None, see above
R49	Lack of community amenities, Limited emergency vehicle access, car parking issues
R50	Emergency vehicle access, car parking issues caused by high density developments, lack of community amenities
R51	Commercial units, emergency vehicle access, lack of upkeep on A505 and verges
R52	Improve main entrance
R53	A local shop would be nice. Verges on A505 always full of rubbish thrown from cars. A bin at the entrance to Pepperslade from the 505 I'm always picking up rubbish. A lot thrown from cars and people sitting there and throwing out rubbish from their cars. Kids coming home from school chuck their rubbish too. Also, there is no maintenance done on the trees or foliage there.
R54	Lack of community amenities. Main entrance image dominated by commercial industrial units. High density development has lead to car parking issues throughout.

R55	The taking over of Heathfields House and EMG has produced a set of issues. The impact on the front of the estate appearance, the closure of the only other access and exit point to the estate and more traffic through the estate which already is not suitable for large vehicles. The estate is in need of adoption to address the upkeep of the roads particularly.
R56	Unattractive main entrance, Car Parking issues, emergency vehicle access
R58	Need another entrance to Heathfield ie for emergency services, parking with no space to walk safely, maintenance of a505 verges, etc
R59	Car parking, safe footpaths and lighting. Maintaining access to green areas
R60	Lowering speed on estate, parking, local shop
R61	The greenspace behind Hurdles Way/Ringstone
R62	(1) We need more parking for visitors. (2) I worry that there is now only one entrance and exit from the estate, which means emergency vehicles could be blocked by lorries delivering fuel, vans delivering packages etc. (3) I worry that our factory neighbour will try to add more unsuitable things (like the air conditioning units) and then attempt to get retrospective planning permission.
R63	Main entrance looks like an industrial park not residential. Emergency vehicles access. Community amenities
R64	Improved car parking provision, additional amenities,
R65	Main entrance, parking, emergency vehicle access, industrial units looking unsightly.
R66	Top priority is a village hub on the R.Smith site. Everything else would be nice, but can live without.
R67	The industrial feel of the front of the estate. The removal of the extra access road next to Heathfield House, that was useful if the other way got blocked. Parking spaces, road not big enough for people to park on roads, visitors find it difficult to park.
R68	Local amenities, Only one entrance to the estate, Commercial noise due to new owners.
R70	Parking! Preserving the green spaces
R72	Only having one access in and out of Heathfield is a problem especially in an emergency, the lorries in and out of the industrial site are a worry with children around and the appearance of the industrial site not only when you come in but also around the back of the building. The huge Heathfield sign/map in the entrance looks awful in my opinion. It makes it look even more industrial.
R74	Community amenities - somewhere to meet. Adoption of roads. Emergency vehicle access - having more than one route.
R76	1. Improved community amenities 2. Adoption of road systems 3. Improved maintenance of A505 frontage and pathways.
R78	Amenities and how it looks
R79	All of it
R80	Community amenities. speeding on Pepperslade

R81	main entrance, amenities, open space
R82	Lack of community amenities, Lack of maintenance along frontage, limited road widths.
R83	Lack of amenities, main entrance appearance, limited emergency vehicle access
R84	Roads adopted, lack of amenities and main entrance dominated by commercial premises.
R85	green open spaces
R86	Development of a local park/pond to enhance biodiversity, Development of some sort of amenities (local shop), no more housing as parking is already an issue!!
R87	Entrance uninviting, design and management of open spaces, parking
R88	Turning into Pepperslade from A505 is narrow,
R89	Local amenities would be good, better road layout within the estate, not too much more traffic as nowhere for it to go.
R90	Limited emergency vehicle access
R92	Improving the main entrance, improving access for emergency vehicles, reducing noise & pollution
R95	None
R96	Both
R99	A shop, and pub should be a high priority
R100	Road adoption
R101	Emergency access is my only concern.
R102	Amenities, parking, lack of cycle path or upkeep of existing paths
R103	1. Removal of 'derelict' cars including the white van and the many BMWs that do not move. 2. Additional of amenities such as a local shop would be useful and also bring the community together. 3. Some of the properties in Heathfields/Kingsway estates appear somewhat uncared for. Planting/landscape gardening of communal areas would improve its overall image.
R105	more community amenities Better road access a505
R106	More car parking. No additional building and construction! We have enough amenities and people who want more can use the amenities in Duxford and Thriplow. We are an infill village and most people moved here for peace and quiet.
R108	Unadopted Roads, parking issues, limited emergency vehicle access.
R111	1, 2, 3 and 5
R112	No comment
R113	Lack of community amenities, A505 noise and pollution, car parking
R114	Community facilities, A505, parking

R119	Possible development on Smith Farm field would have no access, except via the Heathfield Residence private roads, which they pay up keep of.
------	--

Consultee Ref.	Response to Open Question 7: Grainstore site additional concerns
R1	Style of house be in keeping with existing
R3	Village amenities are only small, so some extra support ie for shop and school would be welcome
R4	Grain store site can easily accommodate a much higher housing density, you only have to look at Ringstone down in Heathfield to see how many houses you can build on the area. Thriplow is crying out for affordable housing to keep the village alive. restricting the grain store site to only 24 units will not bring enough new young families into the village to keep it sustainable.
R5	So glad that REVIVALS Garage will not be re sited!
R6	We currently rent on Heathfield and would love to buy a house nearby in the future, this development would be perfect for us.
R7	I have lived in the parish 38 years and I'm concerned these won't get allocated to people who live and work in the area but can't afford the so called "affordable housing" I'm concerned this will be the case here and that the only people who will be able to afford it won't have been local
R8	<p>Firstly this is right by my house so the limited farming noise we get is nothing compared to the work required to build 24 new houses 7 days a week in the short to mid term.</p> <p>Secondly I don't see how the village has capacity for 24 new families. The local amenities are limited and small in size and has anyone considered if the primary school has capacity for what could be double digits of additional children.</p> <p>I also do not believe this site was included in the greater Cambridge plan so can only surmise this is local land owners looking to profit as opposed to a genuine need for more housing / affordable housing in the village in line with Government targets.</p> <p>The village is not exactly the best placed in the area for local transport links so not sure I see the value of the houses from a commuter point of view - especially those on lower incomes.</p> <p>Potentially looking at anything from 24 to 50+ additional cars in the village creating more traffic noise.</p> <p>If the current farming facilities are truly no longer viable and cannot be upgraded on the current site then I would much prefer to see the land re-wooded as a small local area of woodland for the local community or some other form of use that benefits the existing community and / or environment.</p>
R9	I think it is excellent to include affordable housing in Thriplow
R10	Traffic. Use of road will become harder than it already is. Garage will be affected.
R11	20 houses maximum
R12	Access from Fowlmere Road, not Lodge Road is preferable to limit traffic down Farm Lane
R15	The idea that the building style should reflect a local character seems odd to me as the character of Thriplow is very mixed. I think the emphasis needs to be more on ensuring that the new homes all include modern energy saving and generating technology.
R16	I'm relatively new to the area and live in Heathfield hence I feel unable to comment on developments in this part of the parish

R19	<p>Traffic isn't mentioned at all and this proposal will create more traffic on all village roads. This proposal needs to include some traffic calming measures in Thriplow to include Middle Street, School Lane and Church Street at a bare minimum. Ideally calming plus a 20MPH speed limit.</p> <p>Parking seems not to have been considered much in the planning given the number of houses and size of plot this will spill onto the roads around the development and potentially cause safety issues.</p> <p>Drainage and water run off seems not to be considered at all in the plan.</p> <p>Amenities aren't considered for Thriplow at all...we have one small shop and one small pub.</p>
R23	24 houses would be an overdevelopment on this site. 15 would be more appropriate 5 need to be for housing association rent. No shared Ownership on this development
R24	The roadway Lodge Road - Lower Street - Farm Lane is too narrow to allow any of the developments proposed, so that any development on the lines suggested is entirely impractical. It follows that the proportions of commercial and 'affordable' housing stock cannot be calculated, and the nature of materials, building height, &c, are all equally chimerical.
R25	The development should come along with some infrastructure improvements such as sewerage and drainage improvements, provision of footpaths, space for additional parking in the village. The site itself should come with at least 2 vehicular spaces (garaged/off-road hard-standing) per household.
R28	Need for adequate parking space on premises rather than roads. Traffic management
R29	Village infrastructure e.g. roads, drainage, school must be upgraded to ensure no detriment to rest of village
R31	More affordable houses are essential in Thriplow. With the number of houses being extended resulting in higher prices if put up for sale, low-income families can no longer afford to move to Thriplow. This destroys the social character of the village.

R32	<p>The village doesn't have spare capacity at the school. School lane is regularly blocked in the morning and afternoon from vehicles doing the school run. Increasing the number of homes with approximately 50 more vehicles will hugely impact on this parking in School Lane and Fowlmere Road.</p> <p>Grain Store Development Farm Lane and Lodge Road are without pavements. These roads are currently used as 'rat runs' and with more properties and potentially more delivery vans will make this a 'no go' area for pedestrians. Farm Lane is especially narrow and should operate a one-way system. New residents will feel obliged to use this lane to gain entry and exit to the village. To imagine they will go the long way around using Middle Street (again without footpaths for pedestrians) or the blocked School Lane is a pipe-dream!</p> <p>South Cambs District Council have indicated they have adequate housing in their plan, so I am confused at the necessity for this additional housing in Thriplow. Most residents will confirm Thriplow suffers from speeding vehicles which I can attest to as organiser of the Thriplow Community Speedwatch Group. Increasing the traffic will impact on current residents.</p> <p>Your statement that there will be potential to allow Thriplow & Heathfield Parish residents priority access to the affordable housing is irrelevant as these properties will be sold on the open market!</p> <p>There is insufficient plans for Recreation and Open Spaces.</p> <p>Could you explain why residents of Heathfield can have an opinion about additional housing in Thriplow village? I appreciate these residents are in the Parish, but are not affected in any way by these building proposals.</p> <p>Too many issues that need to be resolved for existing residents!!</p> <p>Subsequent to COP26, there are many Green issues that don't appear to have been addressed and should be listed in this Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
R38	Increased traffic flow on Fowlmere Rd. and Middle St. Need additional measures to reduce speed through these areas ie speed cushions and width reductions.
R39	It is important that Revivals business is retained. Segregate the housing by native hedges, not hash fencing.
R40	the homes built should reflect the style of houses already in the village
R42	<p>Increase in number of cars - 24 houses would mean a minimum of 48 cars - many cutting through Lodge Road and Farm Lane and Lower Street.</p> <p>Previous plans by Hills had appallingly insensitive house designs with nothing that actually reflected village and local housing styles and materials. It would have had a very negative impact on the village.</p>

R43	<p>The village does not have the amenities for another 24 homes. Public transport and school spaces are limited. Are there spaces at the school to cater for, potentially, 24 new families?</p> <p>It feels like 24 homes is ambitious for the space meaning plots would be small with little or no garden which would lead to the homes being undesirable. I would prefer no development there but if one needs to be done it would be better to have a low density development.</p>
R45	<p>Appearance of properties and surrounding vegetation important. Volume and speed of traffic a concern but DONT WANT SPEED HUMPS OR CHICANES</p>
R47	<p>A modern barn/agricultural/rural character style of housing might conserve the nature of some ranges of agricultural buildings but examples in the wider area show it is often at the expense of private pedestrian and vehicular access; housing without private front-door access does not currently exist in Thriplow; it is safer for young children to have a front door onto a private path/driveway; communal access areas can become neglected (examples exist in nearby villages); garages separated from the house are not seen as an asset - for example an existing Thriplow resident who is trying to sell tells me the estate agent says the house is not selling because the garage is some distance away.</p> <p>I would like any development to conserve the mural painted by Julian White in 1985.</p>
R48	<p>The Grain Store is not part of the current Greater Cambridge, South Cambs local plan for Housing as they have indicated they have already agreed to the construction of 48,794 new houses.</p> <p>The suggested Grain Store housing development.</p> <p>Lodge Road and Farm Lane are without pavements. Farm Lane is used as a rat-run and with more properties and potentially more delivery vans will make this a 'no go' area for pedestrians. Farm Lane is especially narrow and would need to be operated as a one-way-system. New residents will feel obliged to use the lane to gain entry and exit to the village.</p> <p>I cannot imagine they will travel the long way round using Middle Street, which does not have any footpaths for pedestrians and is also very narrow in places.</p> <p>The village suffers from speeding traffic and I am confused as to why there is a need for additional housing other than infill properties. The village is also used as a rat-run when accidents occur on both the A10 or A505 when traffic is redirected. If the Foxton hub goes ahead there will be even more traffic through Thriplow.</p> <p>The village doesn't have spare capacity for additional students at the school. School Lane is regularly blocked with parents dropping their children off at school. Increasing the number of homes, with approximately 50 or more vehicles, will impact on the parking along School Lane, The Green and Fowlmere Road.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood plan has not taken into account the lack of recreational areas.</p> <p>I am concerned that Heathfield residents (even though they are in the Parish) will be given the opportunity to agree to building development in Thriplow! There is a high probability Heathfield residents could vote this through to avoid having to suffer building developments in their own back yard.</p>

R50	Consideration should be given to bungalow type dwellings for elderly residents
R62	I would be concerned that more development might lead to more cars on the A505, which is already under strain during rush hour.
R63	No more than 24 houses
R64	N/a
R65	No
R66	Going back to Q6. I am not sure how many houses would benefit for the site, however i would like to see the development follow the same type of plan as Hill used for Anstey Hall Barns. Please see link. https://www.david-miller.co.uk/anstey-hall-barns.php#loaded however this is a high-end development and doubt they would have affordable housing.
R67	The a505, would it cope with the extra flow of traffic onto it, it's crazy busy already without the extra cars to the new builds
R70	More traffic No amenities No access
R71	Impact on Middle Street traffic levels as per question regarding Rectory Farm site
R73	Ensure there is space for 100% offroad parking noting the realistic high levels of car ownership. Also note how many cars will consequently be using Lodge Road and limit that.
R75	Primary school could not cope
R78	The road becoming busy- Fowlmere rd with more people speeding and no traffic calming. The sewers are already bad
R79	I'm concerned about the impact of 24/48 more cars on our relatively quiet village, especially on Fowlmere Rd, and also the extra strain on water drainage and sewage. Our water table is very high here and the pumping station does not always work as I experienced very unpleasantly last year. So I say, still query the number of houses, and we need a pumping station upgrade.
R84	None
R86	In an area with no local shop / local pub / community centre etc - there seems to already be quite a lot of housing.
R91	24 houses as a maximum!
R93	24 houses too many
R94	24 is still too high
R95	More housing will impact on services within the area e.g schools
R96	I think that Thriplow should be kept as it is just like I believe Heathfield should be kept as it is with no new housing.
R97	Thriplow is congested enough, new housing development including in-filling is inappropriate and will spoil the village environment
R98	This is an opportunity to develop more affordable housing for young families looking to move into the village. This would in turn help to keep the Thriplow community evolving and support the local amenities that are so highly valued within our village (eg the shop, the school)

R100	No
R101	No
R105	Increase of traffic around this area, local amenities for families living here, increased noise, taking away the individualism and character of housing in this village, even if the homes are built with local stone in a style in keeping with the area, this will create a mini village of its own within the area, possibly devaluing some existing homes as this will no longer be a quiet traditional village. I do agree some affordable homes should be considered but perhaps the number being considered is too many
R107	more traffic in Farm Lane (is it possible to make it one way only)
R108	No flats to be built and at least two parking spaces, if not three for every home so that Lodge Road does not become a parking nightmare.
R109	Lower St and Farm lane are unsuitable for extra traffic. This development should exit on to Fowlmere Road only.
R111	The major issue is that Lodge Road - Lower Street - Farm Lane is too narrow for existing traffic, let alone the increase that development of the Grain Store site would cause
R112	Traffic calming measures to protect pedestrians on Farm Lane. Plus traffic calming in the village. A one-way system to access the development should be considered
R116	1/ There is no point of building houses if another grainstore has to be built. 2/ A lot of asbestos will have to be moved - this activity is a risk
R117	Increase in traffic along approach to the village and possible danger to pedestrians and cyclists
R118	Too many extra cars within the village. Speeding injury risk as lack of pavements round there. Farm Lane vegetation damaged through increases in cars passing.
R121	Development needs to be integrated with the village - not 'cut off' by putting a hedge along Lodge Road. Some houses should front Lodge Road and overlook the Cricket Meadow. Ample onsite parking should be provided - at least 2 spaces per dwelling. Each dwelling should have its own garden space.
	The previous scheme was refused because its access roads are too small to take the extra traffic. Lower Street near Lode Road two cars cannot pass easily and the increased delivery vans (DPD + supermarkets) block the road. ALSO the original plan did NOT allow access from Fowlmere Road because of it's speed of the cars on that road. 24 houses on the site is just as dense as 36 on the whole - too many - especially if the barn is included.

Consultee Ref.	Response to Open Question 10: Rectory Farm site: If developed what would you like to see?
R2	Only development within the red marked area on the map. The current planning application extends beyond the red marked area and includes development behind existing properties 22, 22a and 24 Middle Street and I do not support this aspect of the current planning application
R4	Cram in as many affordable houses as possible. The village does not need any more million pound houses.
R5	Houses built to look in keeping with the village and affordable!
R6	Affordable housing
R7	Better road infrastructure as its sited in the middle of country roads.
R8	a very small number of properties that retain the character of the site.
R9	affordable properties for local people
R10	Nothing.
R11	No more than 20 dwellings
R12	Sympathetic development using the existing barns, where possible
R14	affordable housing
R15	Good quality homes - well designed and built with care.
R16	No comment
R19	Low density housing with plenty of off-road parking for more than two vehicles so there is no impact to roads in relation to parking and less traffic through the village. Some form of traffic calming and speed limit reduction in the village is required if you're adding more properties and more cars given it is not feasible to be without a car in these village locations.
R20	Sufficient parking within the development to prevent overflow of cars into Middle Street
R21	No road behind existing houses in Middle Street.
R22	Affordable housing
R24	No change in the character of the buildings or their density on the site.
R25	The plans are acceptable to me as they are but I wish they would get on with it.
R26	N/A
R28	Some smaller low cost housing suitable for example for retired couples who wish to downsize
R29	Road traffic control, speed limitation but not speed bumps
R31	More social housing
R32	The main issue is regular flooding. Unless this is seriously dealt with, current residents backing onto/near to this proposed development will be affected. See 'Global Warming' for a further explanation.

R33	A build that is tastefully done and pleasing to the eye
R34	Sensitively and considered development in keeping with the rural nature of the village - good use of derelict site
R35	As per the NP suggested design styles.
R36	Some affordable housing
R37	Protection of green space to the West of the site from any development
R38	No development outside Village envelope
R39	No large properties. Low level lighting only (no "town" street lights).
R40	Buildings which are only 2 stories and are similar to existing residential houses in local villages For example like the small development on the edge of Foxton coming into the village direct from Fowlmere. This sit very well in the village landscape
R42	Liked the rural feel of the house designs.
R45	A select small in keeping aesthetically pleasing development to be retained within the farmyard and farmhouse area (development framework only) and not over developed
R46	Something that reflects the village
R47	I would prefer at least part of the Tithe Barn to be used as a village museum.
R48	The potential flooding issue is dealt with!
R49	It should stay as a farm, this country need to produce as much of its own food as possible. The farm if NOT redundant and is working still.
R50	bungalows, semi or detached dwellings for local people not just the wealthy
R51	In keeping with the neighbourhood
R53	Not an eyesore!
R56	40% affordable housing mixed in
R63	Single storey barn style housing
R64	More affordable housing, low density, amenity space
R65	Affordable homes
R66	same as q6.
R69	3 houses
R71	As per notes in Q9 - along with clear visibility of what, if anything, may follow on the same site, and how that might impact the overall financial viability calculation
R73	The current neighbouring houses are rural in outlook. Impacting that would be the wrong thing for the village.
R75	Small scale, traditional varied buildings (e.g cottages)
R78	Small number of houses in keeping with nature - sustainable too

R79	Don't want double depth housing like the last scheme. Don't want incursion into the field between Middle and Lower.
R84	Suitable houses for the area.
R86	Inclusion of some amenities, like a shop, a site of natural beauty.
R89	Something that is tasteful and in keeping with the listed buildings on the site.
R90	More public spaces.
R91	A few houses, within the character of the village and ideally not astronomical prices!
R92	No opinion
R95	Village outlook is maintained
R96	That the current buildings are updated with modification if necessary.
R97	The site should not be developed, minimal at best
R98	Preferably some more affordable housing if feasible, rather than more expensive properties that are aimed at a much smaller market.
R103	In keeping with Thriplow's charm and character.
R105	affordable homes, some separate and some around a courtyard. Not too many homes to keep traffic at a reasonable level
R107	in keeping with village character
R109	Low density housing
R111	minimum change
R112	See above. Confined to a small number of dwellings
R113	Middle Street improvements 20 mph limit and pavement
R114	Middle Street, 20 mph limit and pavements; and some limit to times and number of site traffic movements
R116	No more large houses
R117	Screening from the road as much as possible
R118	Small development but not Million pound properties
R121	Ample on site parking - at least 2 spaces per dwelling

Consultee Ref.	Response to Open Question 11: Other concerns or priorities regarding Rectory Farm
R2	As above, the site boundary as marked in red in the parish update IS acceptable, I think but it does NOT reflect the current planning application from Laragh homes which is NOT acceptable
R4	Lots of affordable houses please, spread onto green belt if necessary
R5	Not too many houses to prevent congestion on Middle Street!
R6	No
R7	As above
R10	Road will become hard to use and will restrict access.
R11	No
R12	As there will be increased traffic in Middle Street - in the interest of safety a pavement would seem sensible
R16	I live in Heathfield and I am new to the area hence don't feel like I am in a strong position to comment on developments in Thriplow village
R19	<p>Traffic isn't mentioned at all and this proposal will create more traffic on all village roads. This proposal needs to include some traffic calming measures in Thriplow to include Middle Street, School Lane and Church Street at a bare minimum. Ideally calming plus a 20MPH speed limit.</p> <p>Parking seems not to have been considered much in the planning given the number of houses and size of plot this will spill onto the roads around the development and potentially cause safety issues.</p> <p>Drainage and water run off seems not to be considered at all in the plan.</p> <p>Amenities aren't considered for Thriplow at all... we have one small shop and one small pub.</p>
R20	none
R23	Number of cars with development how it is there could be as many as 30 extra cars. So would like to see each property to have a restrictions of one vehicle.
R24	None.
R25	Some contribution to infrastructure in the village should be made, eg sewerage and drainage improvements, village parking and street lighting
R26	no
R28	Management and safety of access onto Middle Street. Lack of footpaths on Middle Street which creates safety issues on a busy road.
R29	See above, no detriment to village infrastructure, school, drainage/sewerage
R31	The temptation will be to develop only a few large dwellings beyond the reach of, say, young families or younger Thriplow residents who are already not able to remain in the village of their birth because of the cost of the houses.

R32	This development should not go outside the Village envelope. See Q 10. re flooding
R35	No
R38	Safe access to and from Middle St. (a through route/rat run from villages to the west towards M11)
R40	road safety in Middle Street
R42	The previous plans had "Trojan Horse" access points to the Green Belt fields or the existing farmhouse - leaving openings for future development. These need to be closed! Slight concern about the lack of footpath down to the centre of the village - Middle Street is a busy and winding road.
R45	The development should be very low density, built within the development framework only, and a pleasing architectural design. Volume of traffic and the speed is grave concern.
R47	Drainage is a significant issue. A developer may need to include improvements in the adjacent areas in order to stop flooding on the site.
R48	As above. This development should not go outside the Village envelope.
R49	Middle Street has no footpath, it is not safe for pedestrians to have more cars on this road.
R50	The design styles displayed in the glossy brochure whilst in keeping with a farm design theme do not in any way resemble existing property designs in the village. I think they would look completely out of place.
R71	Assuming adherence to the principles set out above in Q9... A key concern with any development on Middle Street is the impact on traffic levels on an increasingly busy road with no pavement on either side. Several small children currently use the road daily, in addition to many adults who regularly walk along its length. In addition to concerns on any increase to volume of traffic, considerations should also be given as to whether 30pmh is a suitable speed limit for such a road, especially given examples of areas reduced to 20mph in the surrounding villages. In line with the answer to Q10, it is important that any financial viability calculation and justification for the total number of houses for any planning application made now or in the future takes into account additional applications that may be made. Finally, there are some attractive and mature trees across the site which should not be impacted as these would severely impact the character of the site and surrounding area.
R73	Middle Street is EXTREMELY narrow for a through road, to the extent that two cars cannot pass each other on certain sections of the road. There are narrow sections close to the proposed development, and any development cannot make Middle Street more dangerous for pedestrians than it is now, e.g. new traffic on Middle St should be kept to a minimum.
R75	The road is already insufficient to deal with the number of vehicles traveling on it - including a large number of lorries. There isn't even a footpath for local residents. The road could NOT COPE with an increase in vehicle numbers.
R78	No

R79	Access. Middle street is very fast flowing. I think we need serious traffic calming on middle st (and fowlmere roads). Not great for pedestrians - or the village cats!
R84	No
R86	Number of cars in the area and access
R91	school, traffic
R92	No opinion
R93	I am concerned that the plan left the opportunity to develop in the fields beyond (therefore outside the village envelope). All areas the developer is leaving 'open' to enable future access to the fields should be removed.
R95	No
R97	Middle Street is congested now, the road is dangerous, busy and very narrow, it cannot take any more development including in-filling, the site access would be dangerous. It is inappropriate to develop the site as there are insufficient village facilities.
R98	Middle Street is one of the busier roads in the village, being the main route to the A505, M11 and the tip. I feel that the road is dangerous to pedestrians already, with vehicles driving quickly and often with little regard to other road users. I frequently walk along there with my young children and feel very unsafe doing so, feeling the need to constantly stop to pull them over into a driveway / up into the verge as another car / van / lorry speeds by. Development on the Rectory Farm site will increase the number of users for Middle Street, and given the proximity of the development site to the section of the road where it narrows around a corner, could increase the risk of accident. Therefore I would want to see the authorities prioritise making this road safer before proceeding with approval of the development (eg reduced speed limit, and implementation of traffic calming devices along Middle Street).
R107	make farm access to Middle Street safe
R108	The site not to be overdeveloped so that Middle Street becomes a rat run.
R109	The field behind the development between Middle st and Lower st must not be built on and should be kept for grazing purposes
R111	none
R112	As above, road safety must be a priority because of the lack of footpaths and narrow roads.
R113	Increased traffic in Middle Street which is already heavily used
R118	More cars on our small village roads = more risk of danger and no pavements there.
R119	If not developed, the barn will fall down and be an eyesore

Consultee Ref.	Response to open question 14: other comments on architectural styles
R4	You are not giving any opportunity to disagree with all the options provided. Model the development on Ringstone to get in plenty of affordable houses the village is in desperate need of to keep it sustainable.
R6	No
R11	No
R15	I am not an architect and style is a very personal thing. The photos above are all quite similar so very hard to choose. More emphasis on the building standards and energy efficiency is important to me. I do not see any PV's panels on the roofs of any of the photos shown. Let's ensure these new houses are built will the long-term sustainability in mind.
R16	Anything other than looking like the dreaded standard new build boxes!!
R20	none
R24	It would be better if the traditional lath & plaster white-washed plaster exteriors were maintained.
R25	No
R26	no
R32	No
R34	Buildings appropriate to rural/farm/village
R35	No
R37	Sympathetic restoration of historic barn and roadside wall.
R40	Very very modern designs would be out of keeping with others in this area
R42	Brick is not the sole village building material - it's Victorian and much of the village is rendered or weather boarded. Harsh grey knapped flint should be avoided as it is alien to South Cambs - field cobbles are THE local building stone - see walls of 5 Middle Street, Cochrane's Farmhouse garden wall, and garage of The Old Bakery, The Green.
R47	I do not favour courtyard dwellings for the reasons given above in my Grain Store feedback, but I repeat them here: housing without private front-door access does not currently exist in Thriplow; it is safer for young children to have a front door onto a private path/driveway; communal access areas can become neglected (examples exist in nearby villages).
R48	No
R49	This is not an appropriate use of an Important historic site, farming has been carried on here since the 13th century. It is still a working farm.
R50	Q12 does not give you the option of indicating that if you don't like any of the designs on offer
R51	No
R58	Nothing modern, cannot stand new box type housing in Cambridge
R61	The style that would fit in Thriplow would not necessarily be the same should any housing be proposed in Heathfield
R64	N/a

R65	No
R66	q6
R73	If any development is permitted, I very much hope it is in keeping with the relatively low density and varied style of the centre of Thriplow Village.
R75	Please please please keep it traditional and not like a generic housing estate. We are blessed with this village and it would be a shame to ruin it.
R78	No
R84	No
R89	Nothing that looks like a box - these are ugly and unimaginative
R92	No
R94	I think it important that houses have their own front spaces; courtyard developments would feel out of place within Thriplow village.
R95	No
R97	None are appropriate. All are high density and inappropriate for the village. The drawings do not reflect how the site would look in reality eg many more cars, wheelie bins?
R103	Not like the Eddington/Trumpington new build styles. Buildings should reflect buildings and styles already in the area.
R104	What is the obsession with a farm design? It's fake and doesn't represent the majority of buildings in Thriplow. Why can't we have imaginative design rather than a pastiche of a non-existent rural fantasy?
R111	Better use of existing styles
R116	We need a lot of social housing in the village. Some low height flats would be useful. All new properties should require an assessment of CO2 used in building them: materials, transport to site, used in construction.
R121	Must fit in with that which already exists - not stand out as something totally different and out of keeping with the rest of the village