

My ref: Heydon Neighbourhood Plan

Your ref:

Date: 13 June 2025

**Place and Sustainability
Planning and Sustainable Growth**

New Shire Hall
Emery Crescent
Enterprise Campus
Alconbury Weald
PE28 4YE

Heydon Parish Council

By email - HeydonNeighbourhoodPlan@gmail.com

Dear Sirs

Heydon – Pre-submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan

I refer to the consultation on the Heydon Neighbourhood Plan and thank the Parish Council for affording the County Council the opportunity to comment.

I have received comments from several services within the County Council and these are set out in the Appendix 1 to this letter and, in the case of Public Health, the supplementary document attached to the covering email. I trust that this will be of assistance to the Parish Council as it progresses the Neighbourhood Plan.

Please feel free to reach out if you wish to discuss these comments further.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]
[Redacted title]
[Redacted address]

Supplementary document attached to email:
Response by Public Health dated 5th June 2025

Appendix 1: Heydon Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Plan September 2024: Response by Cambridgeshire County Council

Response By	Policy	Response/Comment
Public Health	A comprehensive review of the Neighbourhood Plan by the Public Health service has been provided as a supplementary document to this response.	
Adult Social Care	Policy HEY10: Delivering homes that meet the village's needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have reviewed the document and it appears they have taken into consideration the need for housing that can be adapted to the needs of an older person and for it to be the appropriate size, to reduce under-occupation (paragraph 5.10.6 and 5. 10.7).
	Policy HEY11: Delivering improved community infrastructure for the parish community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'potential community space' is of interest, but appears to be some way off and the population of older adults in the village appears to still be around 20% even with the forecasting, so they do not hold the majority in terms of need. We would recommend further consultation with residents of all ages in due course about the 'potential community space' - its location, accessibility for all and the acoustics for those experiencing hearing loss."
	Policy HEY13: Protecting and improving our network of rural routes suitable for safe use by walkers and other non-motorised users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be helpful if there were "resting places" along the walking routes and more pavements, but it would be for the community to decide that. The Care Together programme has plans to offer some funding for benches in South Cambridgeshire, working collaboratively with Parish Councils, which could be bid for if the proposals are approved. The plan shows awareness of those who cycle and walk and the need for a central gathering place for socialising.
Transport Strategy	<p>Objective 9</p> <p>Policy HEY13: Protecting and improving our network of rural routes suitable for safe use by</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council supports Objective 9 and Policy HEY6 and any enhancements to the public right of way network and schemes that will promote active. With the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, the Council has undertaken the Royston to Granta Park Transport Study which can be found here. Appendix A - Royston to Granta Park Strategic Transport Study Non-Technical Summary FINAL.pdf

Response By	Policy	Response/Comment
	walkers and other non-motorised users	
Historic Environment Team	Policy HEY6: Conserving and enhancing heritage assets in Heydon parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Team (CHET) notes and welcome the particular emphasis placed on the identification and protection of non-designated heritage within the draft Heydon Neighbourhood Plan. This commendable commitment to preserve the historic character of the parish informs 'HEY 6: Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets in Heydon Parish' and supporting appendices, which further sets out the policy basis for future developments to achieve this, directly reflecting national policy requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also very welcome that the overall focus on identifying and protecting heritage has informed the inclusion of Community Action 3 (at 5.6.9) which seeks to 'secure review and extension of the existing Heydon Conservation Area (1979) boundary' based on historic environment assets identified as surviving within the village development envelope and which contribute positively to the existing settlement character. The Cambridgeshire Local Heritage List Project (https://local-heritage-list.org.uk/cambridgeshire) is currently in the process of developing a list of locally important assets for South Cambridgeshire and it is particularly encouraging that the steering group has engaged directly with the criteria as set out in this website in their production of the Neighbourhood Plan document. This robust, evidence-based methodology aligns closely with national guidance produced by Historic England (Historic England Advice Note 7: Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage). It would however be beneficial for the assets identified through the Plan-making process to be submitted through the Local Heritage List website for assessment and adoption in due course. Recognition of NDHAs as a dynamic dataset through the wording of Policy HEY 6 reflects a positive, data-driven approach and it is further recommended that the lists of assets identified in Policy HEY 6 and the corresponding 'Appendix 2: Heydon's non-designated heritage assets' may require a further review prior to adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan in order to be completely up-to-date. We would encourage on-going engagement with the LHLP website and with the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Conservation Team regarding any pending additions.

Response By	Policy	Response/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst CHET also welcomes inclusion of policy reflecting the importance of non-designated heritage, we would note that the list of identified non-designated local heritage assets currently appears to exclude buildings from its list of assets under consideration, as set out in Appendix 2. Consequently, whilst the plan contains some information on the built character of the settlement, a number of locally important heritage buildings and features are not included nor explicitly protected under the provisions of HEY6 and Appendix 2. Possible additions for consideration could include no.33 Chishill Road, no.14 Chishill Road ('Picots') and no.20 Chishill Road (Hall Farmhouse) – in addition to its front boundary wall – as well as a number of houses constructed of flint with brick dressings, reflecting strong local vernacular traditions. Separately, the list of 'Visually and historically important walls' (Proposed Asset 8) may require some revision to avoid conflicting regulatory frameworks, as a number of these form boundaries to nationally listed buildings or structures and so are already afforded protection under the corresponding statutory designations. • Asset 4: linear earthworks that cut across the landscape west of Bran Ditch, is indicated on the lidar imagery and described as potentially prehistoric field systems. These are also recorded in the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record ref MCB27303 as Furlong boundaries. Although an important part of the landscape as visible remains of the medieval field system it is unlikely that they are prehistoric in date. However just to the north and visible on the same lidar image, running southwest northeast another earthwork (CHER 08938) roughly aligns with a branch of the Icknield Way to the east, is more likely to have a prehistoric date and could also be considered as an asset. • Both above and below-ground non-designated assets can play an important role as streetscape and/or landscape features in the development of settlement character and we recommend that the steering group should contact Cambridgeshire County Council's Historic Environment Record (HER) to further build on the non-designated historic environment evidence base within the Neighbourhood Plan document (archaeology@cambridgeshire.gov.uk).
Biodiversity and Greenspaces	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of a development on biodiversity is a material consideration in the planning process, and we are extremely pleased to see biodiversity considered thoroughly in this neighbourhood plan. It was of particular note that the community-run online blog consisted of

Response By	Policy	Response/Comment
		<p>several articles demonstrating the value of biodiversity within Heydon and how residents strive to protect it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In light of the above, we are satisfied that the Heydon Neighbourhood Plan has thoroughly considered biodiversity, and the impacts future development could have on habitats and species within the village. We have highlighted some minor points below that we feel the plan could incorporate/amend.
	<p>Policy HEY9: Protecting the dark skies in Heydon</p> <p>Policy Hey10: Delivering homes that meet the village's needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On page 25 Policy HEY 10 is listed with two definitions under Themes 3 and 4 – 'Protecting the dark skies in Heydon' and 'Delivering homes that meet the village's needs'. We presume this is a mistake as in the main body of the document dark skies is primarily covered under Policy HEY 9. Please amend this so each policy clearly belongs to a single label.
	<p>Policy HEY8: Protecting and enhancing Heydon's features and sites of biodiversity value</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8.6: Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity Net Gain is covered under point 5.8.6 on page 58 and we welcome this inclusion as mandatory 10% BNG now applies to most development in England. However, we would hope developers across Cambridgeshire aim to achieve greater than the minimum value of 10%, which is explained within Greater Cambridge Shared Planning (2022) Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document. We would therefore suggest Heydon parish council consider their proposed neighbourhood Plan should aim to achieve a higher BNG target, such as 20% BNG.
Lead Local Flood Authority	General comments and guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the group has acknowledged the flood risk in the Heydon area. It is important that there is a policy in place to address the flood risk in the Heydon Neighbourhood plan, this would be used to advise new developments of the minimum expectations in terms of drainage and aid to prevent developers from installing inadequate drainage systems. It is recommended to include reference to the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document to seek advice and guidance on surface water management in development. This document is adopted by South Cambridgeshire District Council. The SPD can be found on the following link: Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Response By	Policy	Response/Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference can be made to our Surface Water Planning Guidance document which can be found at: Surface Water Planning Guidance • Policy CC/9 is of particular importance in the South Cambridgeshire local plan (or any subsequent version of this plan) which can be found at: South Cambridgeshire Adopted Local Plan 2018 • Reference can be made to Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework also, this can be found at: National Planning Policy Framework • If the Parish Council requires further assistance or a meeting regarding the Neighbourhood Plan the Lead Local Flood Authority can be contact at this email address: FR.Planning@cambridgeshire.gov.uk.