

Consultation Statement

Appendix 6: Response to Representations - About the Plan



Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Published as part of the Proposed Submission Local Plan - Regulation 19 consultation (August 2026 - September 2026)



GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

Summaries of Draft Plan Representations, and Response to Main Issues Raised

About the Plan

About the Plan Introduction

Abbreviations

PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Summary of Main Issues:

Some representors raised concern about the format of the draft plan material.

A number of neighbouring councils, statutory bodies, and infrastructure providers commented on the importance of continued liaison with them.

A number of Parish Councils raised specific comments about their village to this section of the plan. Stapleford and Great Shelford request that their neighbourhood plan is taken into account, and a number of specific comments around the policies map. Elsworth

Parish Council raise concerns about the impact of proposals that have not been fully addressed. Girton Parish comments included the need to protect the gap between Girton and Cambridge. Horseheath parish support the emphasis on biodiversity and climate change, but raise a general question about the detail of plan implementation. Histon and Impington, and Whittlesford, both raise issues around the delivery of necessary infrastructure. Boxworth Parish Meeting highlighted the need to consider impacts on exiting communities. Great Wilbraham Parish Council said they were supportive of many aspects of the local plan.

Comments challenged the level of development proposed, and that it did not take account of environmental impacts. Others considered that development targets should be more ambitious, and the approach did not and are align with the Local Growth Plan and National ambitions for the area.

Some comments on the development strategy offered general support, but others questioned whether it would deliver the homes needed, was too focused on large sites and new settlements, or did not include enough small sites or sites in villages.

Two representatives suggested alternative plan periods, extending the plan period. One comment said the plan did not adequately consider the draft NPPF, which is expected to be adopted in mid-2026, necessitating alignment to avoid future revisions.

General comments raised a wide variety of issues. This includes support for policy approaches but also concern about their effective implementation. The interdependence with infrastructure delivery and wider strategies was also highlighted. Issues included measures to support affordable housing, green infrastructure, rights of way, food growing, protection of heritage, supporting Cambridge's economic clusters, and sustainable transport. Hobsons Conduit Trust highlighted the importance of protecting the water environment. The importance of places to be creative and social setting were highlighted by a pupil from Comberton.

Cambridge United Football Club see either redevelopment of the current site or potential relocation as critical to the Club's long term viability and sustainability at a time when its current capacity is constrained, the City will grow exponentially and the financial pressures for all football clubs at every level are growing.

Comments on specific sites included concerns regarding Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 (Grange Farm), and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. East West Rail highlighted the relationship of site proposals with their scheme.

Response to Representations:

Comments on the consultation platform are noted. We endeavour to improve our consultations and learn lessons from each stage, so will take on board comments. We aim to make the consultation accessible, and offer help to anyone to make sure they can have their say. The plan is substantial document with a large amount of supporting evidence, so we did include a nontechnical summary of the plans proposals at the beginning of the document. Technical comments on format will be considered in preparation of the proposed submission version. The consultation includes a wide range of events. We can't go everywhere, but very much sought to deliver good coverage across Greater Cambridge. We also continuously engage with our parishes and residents associations through regular planning forums.

Officers have continued liaison with neighbouring councils, statutory bodies, and infrastructure providers throughout the plan making process. We continued this process since the draft local plan stage. And have published a record of our engagement.

The Great Shelford Neighbourhood plan was adopted in October 2020, making it a part of the development plan. Detailed comments on the defined development extend and other issues have been considered separately. Comments raise concerns

regarding on delivery and infrastructure, the Councils have sought to address these by further developing the evidence base since the draft plan stage. This includes further exploration of measures to address transport challenges by the Combined Authority.

The level of homes and jobs being planned for has been carefully considered, and is justified by the evidence being published alongside the Local Plan. National planning policy requires local plans to respond to the needs of the area. We have considered the needs of the economy and likely growth in jobs, and the number of homes needed to support it. This also accords with the standard method of calculating the needs for homes set by government. We have tested a range of strategic development approaches, considering their impact on economic, social, and environmental issues, and have developed an appropriate spatial strategy to accommodate development needs whilst and protecting the environment. The plan also sets out ambitious policies to guide the form of development responding to climate change.

The strategy for villages has allocated sites where it is sustainable to do so as part of the wider development strategy, but also included policies which would support appropriate windfall development and rural exception sites. Neighbourhood planning also remains a tool available to parishes if they wish to address local issue directly.

The plan period running to 2045 remains the Councils preferred approach. It provides an appropriate length of time after adoption. The plan also identifies a longer term vision, in particular for strategic sites. At time of writing the outcome of the government consultation regarding changes to the National Planning Policy is not yet known. It would not be appropriate amend policy to reflect draft policy approaches.

The wide variety of other issues raised are noted. Rights of Way and connectivity are important, and are addressed in Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity. The interdependence with the delivery of infrastructure has been recognised in the plan

and the evidence base. It would not be appropriate to add rights of way to the policies map. The county council maintains the definitive map. The councils continue to liaise with infrastructure bodies to ensure the growth needs of the area are addressed. The vision and objectives for the plan recognises the importance of the Cambridgeshire economy, but also that this must be balanced with consideration of social and environmental issues.

On specific sites, the issues raised on Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm and Cambridge Biomedical Campus have been carefully considered and addressed in the evidence related to site policies. They are considered to remain appropriate elements of the development strategy. Comments supporting the omission of specific sites are noted. Proposals for new or alternative allocations have been assessed through the Housing and Economic land availability assessment and Sustainability Appraisal process.

Table of representations:

Comments on the Consultation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Comments on the format of the local plan included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online version of this draft plan is different from the PDF one. • Online document presents layered information in silos, making it difficult to compare policies. • Complex to make representations. • A single whole PDF of documents would be useful. • Page numbers need to be corrected. 	<p>201222 (S Williams) 202349 (A Hall) 203274 (J Palmer) 203507 (J Neal)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be easier for the reader if the policies were numbered as well as/instead of having lettered codes. • Website is hard to navigate and the language is not easy for casual users, which may limit residents' understanding of the process. • Maps should be redrawn to clearly differentiate heritage assets from green-separation areas, removing the confusing pink shading. 	<p>208328 (Gladman Developments) 208329 (Gladman Developments) 208460 (Longstanton Parish Council) 210643 (Transport 2000 and W Suffolk)</p>
<p>Lacks a plain English summary, designed to help and support people with poor reading and comprehension skills, or indeed those whose cultural and language backgrounds may be diverse. There is a daunting amount of documentation for residents to familiarise themselves with and limited time. Detailed and complex document.</p>	<p>201471 (P Newton) 201901 (C Deer) 202334 (P Deer) 202324 (A Hamill) 203274 (J Palmer) 203507 (J Neal)</p>
<p>More regular consultation with residents is needed for the new railway bridge and station access. We would like clarification on how the Local Plan will align with other consultations and plans.</p>	<p>205785 (Rustat Neighbourhood Association)</p>
<p>I attended the Greater Cambridge Local Plan - Residents' Associations presentation via Teams on 13 January. The Greater Cambridge Local Plan is a very detailed and complex document, which makes it difficult for residents who are not expert in the whole range of areas covered to make informed comment on all those areas. That said, each resident who provides comments has a valid point of view and their opinion must be taken into account.</p>	<p>202342 (A Hamill)</p>

Comments from Duty to Cooperate Bodies, and general cooperation issues

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>As the immediate neighbouring authority to the south, UDC shares a significant functional geography, through the M11 Innovation corridor and a landscape feature to the Northern edge of the district. The two areas are intrinsically linked by critical infrastructure corridors—including the M11 and the West Anglia Mainline and by the shared chalk aquifer that feeds chalk streams in the sub-region. Uttlesford District Council remains committed to working collaboratively to support the Greater Cambridge emerging Local Plan to address these cross-boundary challenges. The alignment of our policies on water efficiency are critical for enabling the sustainable growth the region.</p>	<p>204968, 204981 (Uttlesford District Council)</p>
<p>The delivery of new healthcare infrastructure is resource intensive, and the NHS faces funding constraints that are exacerbated by population growth from new housing developments. New developments should contribute proportionately to the healthcare needs arising from increased population due to housing growth. Access to essential healthcare services is vital for promoting good health outcomes and supporting the social and economic wellbeing of an area.</p> <p>Residential developments significantly impact the demand for additional primary healthcare provision for future residents. Healthcare infrastructure should be a priority for infrastructure delivery, given its strategic importance in supporting housing growth and sustainable development. The healthcare estate must be continually reviewed, optimised for land use, and modernised in line with integrated NHS</p>	<p>205042 (NHS Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Integrated Care Board)</p>

<p>strategies. Planning policies should facilitate the delivery of essential healthcare infrastructure and be developed in consultation with the NHS to aid in estate transformation.</p>	
<p>The ECC response supports the preparation of the Plan and provides broad support. ECC is committed to working with the respective Local Plan Authorities in seeking to develop the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and understand how our representations can be addressed through modifications. Given their proximity to Essex it is essential that the Local Planning Authorities works collaboratively with ECC and other partners, to ensure consideration is given to the cross boundary impacts within Essex, in particular highways and transportation, Early Years and Child Care, Education and Adult Community Learning.</p>	<p>207668 (Essex County Council)</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan. We have reviewed the Local Plan in conjunction with the associated supporting documents. We have provided comments and recommendations below which align with the various constraints within our remit.</p>	<p>207670 (Environment Agency)</p>
<p>Thank you for consulting the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST) regarding Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Detailed comments on individual policies provided.</p>	<p>207671 (East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust)</p>
<p>Both Bedford and Greater Cambridge are located within the Ox Cam corridor and this shared geography means numerous strategic matters have a cross-boundary dimension. These include housing, socioeconomic, infrastructure and water scarcity. It is noted that there are established governance arrangements for the combined CPCA and within this area a local government reorganisation process is ongoing. It is expected that Greater Cambridge will look to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough geography for its strategic plan making context. There will however</p>	<p>208223 (Bedford Borough Council)</p>

<p>remain an important need to ensure that the Local Plan also responds to the drivers of growth originating in the sub region to the west particularly in relation to the following national projects: Universal Studios, the proposed Milton Keynes renewed new town, Tempsford new town and East West Rail.</p>	
<p>CBC are unclear at this stage if the statement of common ground statement that there are no areas of disagreement can be supported due to our concerns over the transport implications arising from the cumulative impacts of the allocations and proposed allocations at Cambourne.</p>	<p>208507 (Central Bedfordshire Council)</p>
<p>Historic England very much welcomes the emerging plan and the considerable work undertaken to date. We can see the incorporation of many of the comments we have made in previous consultations which is appreciated. We particularly welcome the substantial effort that has been made in preparing a comprehensive evidence base including both strategic and site-specific heritage impact assessments, topic papers, skyline and tall buildings strategy, townscape characterisation study, landscape sensitivity assessment including renewable energy assessment.</p> <p>We recognise the area faces intense pressure for growth, driven by both the economic success and the attractiveness of the area, in large part a consequence of its rich architectural and cultural heritage. We are keen to support sustainable growth in the right locations, but this growth must be carefully managed to ensure that the very things that contribute to the success of the City and surrounding area are not harmed in the process. Historic England is keen to ensure that the emerging plan gives full consideration to the historic environment, both in the choice of site allocations and policy criteria for</p>	<p>208918, 208919 (Historic England)</p>

<p>sites, as well as through a robust and clear suite of historic environment and other policies that seek to both protect but also enhance the historic environment.</p>	
<p>It is important that in setting the portrait of Cambridge there is acknowledgement of the cross boundary and strategic matters that must also be clearly articulated. In particular for the economy, the for the emerging Local Plan to be effective, it must appreciate the opportunity provided by international and domestic connectivity by London Stansted airport, as well as the biotech and advanced manufacturing business clusters evident within Essex (e.g. at Chesterford Research Park and Harlow). Given the “international significance” of the employment clusters, it is essential that there is appreciation of the proximity to London Stansted airport, and also seeking to ensure that surface accessibility to improve connectivity with Greater Cambridge is fully explored when developing the emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>210466 (Essex County Council)</p>
<p>ECC recommends that the regional planning context be amended to ensure there is clarity concerning ECC’s role and relevant statutory plans/strategies. Furthermore it is important that reference is explicitly made to the following plans and strategies – Essex Local Transport Plan 4. It is also important to note that ECC, will be part of a new single strategic authority for Greater Essex. It will take the form of a mayoral combined county authority. It is expected that a new mayor for Greater Essex will be directly elected by the public in 2028.</p>	<p>210467 (Essex County Council)</p>
<p>The LLFA are pleased with the holistic approach taken to promote surface water management, SuDS, water quality, biodiversity, and climate change. We highly advocate more emphasis on watercourse management and maintenance. Reference should be made to section 25 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 which requires riparian landowners to maintain ordinary watercourses. In addition,</p>	<p>210506 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>

<p>Cambridgeshire County Council's Flood Risk Team have published The Watercourse Reinstatement Guide (2022).</p>	
<p>Cambridgeshire County Council is referenced in several places, please ensure that the Council is referred to as Highway Authority where appropriate.</p>	<p>210524, (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>
<p>While there are many areas of agreement, as far as we are aware, the Statement of Common Ground was not checked with Transport Strategy or wider CCC colleagues prior to publication. The Council would therefore welcome discussions regarding future iterations of the document</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council, was, along with a number of other organisations signatories to the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground (November 2021). As the safeguarding of waste and minerals remains a strategic matter that affects more than one authority, a reaffirming or update to that statement of common ground to support this draft plan is requested.</p>	<p>210520, 210545 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>
<p>Public health are pleased to see that the vision for Greater Cambridge is based on the seven strategic priorities. Public health welcome the 'Draft vision' for inclusive communities that aim to provide a high quality of life with housing and social infrastructure that meets people's needs through all stages of life; food security; and that the physical and mental health and happiness of people will be prioritised; and that open spaces will be easily accessible and that large scale natural spaces will be able to be reached by active travel modes</p>	<p>210547 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>
<p>The influence of Cambridge on western Suffolk is acknowledged in the Suffolk Local Growth Plan and by the fact that it is part of the Cambridge-Norwich Tech Corridor, and the Cambridge Housing</p>	<p>210630 (Transport 2000 and W Suffolk)</p>

<p>Market Area. The County Council would welcome strong recognition of the role of South Cambridgeshire in the wider sub-regional economy as part of this strategy, as alluded to in paragraph 1.17.</p>	
<p>As you will be aware the new plan-making system provided by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, and the November 2025 Commence and Update Local Plan (CULP) guidance, does not include the Duty to Co-operate. It has been advised that LPAs should continue to collaborate across their boundaries, including on unmet development needs from neighbouring areas and Inspectors should continue to examine plans in line with the policies in the NPPF on 'maintaining effective co-operation'.</p>	207669 (Transport 2000 Cambs and West Suffolk)
<p>National Highways welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Greater Cambridge Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation. The emerging Local Plan aims to set out the required growth and development for the period of 2024 to 2045. National Highways is a key delivery partner for sustainable development promoted through the plan-led system, and as a statutory consultee we have a duty to cooperate with local authorities to support the preparation and implementation of development plan documents.</p>	210847 (National Highways)
<p>Strongly recommends that the engagement referred to on page 5 of the Spatial Strategy is recorded via a Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') to evidence effective joint working on cross boundary strategic matters (as per the NPPF at paragraph 36(c)). The SoCG does not require agreement between the parties, but does require evidence of constructive, active, and ongoing engagement.</p>	208669 (Guilden Morden Developments Ltd)
<p>The Council has included in its evidence a Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance and Statement of Common Ground. In principle, it is supported that these interim documents have been prepared to support the current consultation. Whilst it is recognised that there is engagement between Cambridge</p>	208895 (Nightingale Land and Hill Residential Ltd)

<p>City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council as this reflects the geographical and functional relationship of the area, there are wide ranging cross boundary strategic issues which the Councils will need to demonstrate a written record of the progress to the point of submission with relevant key stakeholders, particularly in relation key infrastructure bodies and whether any requests to accommodate unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities have been received.</p>	
--	--

General Comments from Parish Councils

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The Stapleford & Gt Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (adopted Oct 2025) has not been incorporated into the draft greater Cambridge Local Plan and that this will need doing before the next version of the Local Plan is produced. The draft Policies Map will also need updating to reflect this</p> <p>For example, there is a new Important Countryside Frontage between 41 Gog Magog Way and houses at Chalk Hill, Stapleford, which is not shown and the defined development extent of Stapleford is inaccurate, as is the mapped extent of the Gog Magog Hills in documents supporting the draft Plan. Open spaces, Local Green Spaces and Protected Village Amenity Areas from this Neighbourhood Plan need to be included in the Policies Map.</p>	<p>201526 (Stapleford Parish Council)</p> <p>208087 (Great Shelford Parish Council)</p> <p>202661 (S Berridge)</p> <p>202182 (A Sykes)</p>
<p>The proposals in the Local Plan have some potential benefits but there are also a lot of concerns which the Plan does little to allay. Plan says little or is silent on a number of critical issues, such as travel, flooding, etc, and there has been little apparent consideration of the impact of significant new housing /</p>	<p>202110, 202114 (Elsworth Parish Council)</p>

<p>logistical developments beyond the immediate Cambourne area. Dissatisfaction about commenting on the Plan when there is so much yet to be done. It is noted the plan provides a framework but it is for developers to come forward with proposals and deliver them. Speed of build out has implications for delivery of community services and facilities. Concerns about the involvement of unelected bodies with which parishes have no contact and no influence, and the possibility of the appointment of a Development Corporation.</p>	
<p>Policies Map for Girton is a great step forwards from the version in the Local Plan 2018.</p>	<p>202170 (Girton Neighbourhood Plan Team)</p>
<p>GPC seeks discussions on topics such as Girton Gap protection, alignment with national policy, development extents, active travel, grey belt methodology, and community enterprise space. GPC is committed to evidence-based planning that protects Girton's identity and ensures the Local Plan accommodates the realities of a Green Belt settlement.</p>	<p>202278 (Girton Parish Council)</p>
<p>Horseheath PC agree with the aim of having a vibrant economy that also significantly reduces impacts on the environment and climate. We would like to see a defined aim to increase biodiversity as we understand this is intimately linked with mitigating climate change and environmental degradation. We support a higher level of biodiversity gain to be required for new development than the current national requirement. Support an emphasis on active travel together with enhanced cultural opportunities.</p>	<p>203262, 203265 (Horseheath Parish Council)</p>
<p>Whittlesford Parish Council supports the overall ambition to plan for growth but considers that the scale and phasing of development proposed in Rural Southern Cluster area is not currently aligned with deliverable infrastructure, particularly transport, water supply and community facilities.</p>	<p>203549 (Whittlesford Parish Council)</p>

In general we support the direction of travel, but it is very difficult to fully endorse this document when in so many areas there are few details about the process of implementation and particularly the measures that will be put in place to detect and deal with non-compliance.	210708 (Horseheath Parish Council)
A critique of the plan would be that major housing development sites are north/ northwest of the city outside the green belt and a large amount of employment sites are south. The current public transport model is hub and spoke with a congested spoke/city centre. These are challenging problems but bearing in mind the relative flexibility of the jobs market vs the inflexibility of public transport options it arguably designs in continued reliance on cars for the majority of south cambs residents. Aspirations for public transport ring roads or some alternative solution feel necessary.	204741 (Histon and Impington Parish Council)
Boxworth Parish Meeting supports the need for Greater Cambridge to continue to develop and there is a requirement for additional housing and employment in the area. It is vital that these developments are managed in such a way that they not only provide for the future needs of a growing population but do so in a way that does not adversely affect existing communities. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan and hope that our constructive engagement can add value.	202748 (Boxworth Parish Meeting)
We are supportive of many aspirations in the Local Plan and congratulate the planners on completing this major work.	206565 (Great Wilbraham PC)

Comments on Levels of Development

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue

<p>Plan is based on outdated perceptions of the need for, "growth" not taking into consideration climate change or AI and assuming that the previous attractions of Cambridge as a place to live and work will hold good in a changing world..</p>	<p>202944 (C Hills)</p>
<p>Cambridge Friends of the Earth, yet again, cannot and will not provide a veneer of democratic accountability by participating in yet another Consultation to, effectively, enable further environmental and social destruction of our region to placate the voracious appettes of developers and landowners and the policies of an environmentally and socially ignorant administration, who can see no further than the next election.</p>	<p>210709 (Cambridge Friends of the Earth)</p>
<p>Given the blythe assumption of the 'need' for ever increasing 'economic growth' in the region, Cambridge Friends of the Earth refuses to respond in full to this 'consultation'. We feel that doing so would, potentially, provide credibility to the edicts driving the creation of this Local Plan. Given the continual push for growth in the region, far in excess of its ecological, environmental and social limits, do we have to assume that the Local Plan is being promoted by madmen, economists or, quite possibly, mad economists?</p>	<p>203251 (Cambridge Friends of the Earth)</p>
<p>The plan makes an assumption that there is such a thing as 'sustainable development'. The climate crisis and the need for immediate and steep reductions in emissions means that most development is not sustainable and that the expression 'sustainable development' has become a contradiction in terms. Rethink the focus on development and substitute a focus on steep emissions reduction and protection of the natural environment.</p>	<p>204860 (R Randall)</p>
<p>Does not plan for enough housing. In particular, government targets should be treated as a minimum, not a maximum.</p>	<p>204502 (Redrow South Midlands)</p>

<p>Future proofing Cambridge to be successful by 2050 requires the food production system to be supported and invested in as a high priority. To achieve the wellbeing of our community will require investment and support to those producing our food. Any proposed development will reduce our ability to produce our own food in this country.</p>	<p>205175 (Y Dignon) 2098715 (J&C Collins)</p>
<p>Food Security does not appear to be considered as a Strategic Priority. Any proposed development will reduce our ability to produce our own food in this country. Whilst none of know what the future may hold, the farming of any arable land in this country should, in our opinion, be preserved for future generations. Whilst it could be argued that the arable land that is proposed to be developed upon is a relatively small proportion of the country's overall arable land, more and more land is being developed upon nationally.</p>	<p>208715 (J & C Collins)</p>
<p>The vision for Greater Cambridge is supported. However, to achieving this vision it is necessary for the Plan to be based on ambitious targets for growth. It requires amendments to ensure that the level of growth and housing allocations reflect the Vision and are aligned with the Local Growth Plan and National ambitions for the area.</p>	<p>208395 (Ceres Property on behalf of land owner at Friesland Farm, Swavesey)</p>
<p>The plans are a response to Government pressure and arbitrary targets: why should 73,000 jobs and people end up here? The present large settlements are too near Cambridge and are not self-sufficient: Waterbeach, Cambourne, Northstowe. That means traffic into Cambridge. Other planned developments threaten to link nearby villages into one large conurbation. The inevitable rise of traffic and pressure on water supply and sewage disposal cannot be satisfactorily accommodated by the scale of development that is proposed. Some vested interests will profit from the economic development, but many ordinary people will see no benefit from the 'prosperity' that is promised.</p>	<p>D Jones (208480)</p>

The preferred housing target, the development strategy and the selected allocations for the draft GCLP are unlikely to fully deliver the Vision for Greater Cambridge. The housing requirement is not aligned with jobs growth, which would lead to more people commuting into Cambridge to work mostly by car.	211605, 211606 (Bloor Homes)
---	------------------------------

Comments raising general issues related to the Development Strategy

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Supports the Vision for Greater Cambridge, emphasising the need for sustainable and prosperous growth in the area. Development Strategy is overly reliant on new settlements and major development sites dependent on significant infrastructure projects. Overly optimistic about delivery timescales for draft allocations, risking failure to meet housing needs within the plan period. Need a more balanced approach to growth distribution, recognising the potential of villages.	203025 (Cemex UK Properties Ltd)
I support the plans for protecting the environment while trying to accommodate growth. However I live in a village in South Cambridgeshire and do not support the idea that villages should not take their share of extra houses. Our village (Haslingfield) needs extra affordable houses so that it continues to be a place that normal families can live. It also needs footpaths and cycle paths connecting it to all the villages around, where vital services (doctors, dentist, hairdresser, shops, small industries) are based, so that people can access these without cars. Stopping it from growing is not a sustainable strategy.	203130 (R Hatfield)
The introduction recognises South Cambridgeshire villages but largely frames growth around Cambridge and major transport corridors. Focuses strongly on Cambridge's growth and innovation economy, with less emphasis on the distinct needs of rural communities.	203137, 203139 (Cambridge ACRE)

<p>The strategy prioritises locations with high public transport accessibility, which risks limiting opportunities for rural communities unless investment in rural services, digital connectivity and community infrastructure keeps pace. There is little evidence on rural housing need, employment patterns or service access challenges. Parish councils and rural community organisations are not clearly referenced in shaping infrastructure or growth decisions. Stronger rural proofing would include clearer rural evidence, safeguards for village services, support for rural-enterprise and firm commitments to transport and digital inclusion in smaller settlements. Stronger rural proofing would include clearer rural evidence, recognition of village infrastructure constraints and a stronger commitment to inclusive engagement and place based solutions for smaller settlements.</p>	
<p>I share the aspirations of the Local Plan expressed in the Introduction: reduced climate and environmental impacts, an increase in the quality of everyday life for local people, minimising carbon emissions and car-dependence, supporting the infrastructure we need, increasing nature, wildlife and green spaces, and safeguarding our distinct local heritage. I also support the ambition to make Cambridge “a place where walking, cycling and public transport is the natural choice for travel”. Further, I support the stated intentions of only very limited infill development in rural villages with little or no public transport, where car travel is the only realistic option for most people.</p>	203275 (J Palmer)
<p>The Plan’s development strategy, which underpins the Plan as a whole and its requirement to meet identified local housing and employment needs in full, is flawed.</p>	203313 (Wilson Bowden Developments)
<p>The plan fails to allocate sufficient small sites (1-2.5 hectares) for housing, focusing too much on large urban developments, which does not meet the needs of the wider area.</p>	203401 (ESCO Prospect)

<p>Broadly support the ambition to plan positively for growth across Greater Cambridge; however, I have serious concerns regarding the soundness of elements of the draft Plan, particularly in relation to transport infrastructure, cumulative impacts on the villages I represent, omissions in the spatial strategy, and deficiencies in the supporting viability evidence. (submitted in my capacity as District Councillor for Whittlesford, Thriplow & Heathfield, and Newton)</p>	<p>204086 (Cllr R Williams)</p>
<p>Does not support equality of access and opportunities or ensure everyone can benefit from development of new homes and jobs. The current strategy seeks to concentrate development in large strategic sites, which does not account for rural housing and employment needs. The lack of allocations in villages means that any new development will inevitably be smaller scale and ad-hoc, will not provide affordable housing, and will not allow for transport and community facility upgrades that would make rural communities more sustainable.</p>	<p>204502 (Redrow South Midlands)</p>
<p>Plan relies on strategic sites without placing reasonable level of growth towards sustainable settlements such as Great Shelford and Stapleford.</p>	<p>208914 (Nightingale Land and Hill Residential Ltd)</p>
<p>We support many of the Draft Local Plan's strategic objectives, including meeting housing need, addressing climate change and enhancing the environment. However, our representation focuses specifically on residential development delivered by SME developers on windfall sites, small brownfield sites and sensitive urban redevelopment within existing sustainable locations, which can often be delivered more quickly and sustainably than larger strategic sites.</p>	<p>209704 (NP Architects)</p>
<p>The plan is completely unsustainable with regards sustainable transport. Focus the proposed developments sites on being as close to Cambridge city centre, in locations that do not rely on car travel. Increase the density of the proposed sites in order to allow as many people as possible to access</p>	<p>203597 (H Thomas) 203744 (W Clements)</p>

<p>amenities within a short walk. Design around people without cars, for example teenagers, the disabled and the elderly.</p>	
<p>The plan is completely unsustainable with regards sustainable transport, which will lead to both lives blighted by massive congestion on the car journeys people are forced to make, and lives removed from the amenities and relationships people actually want. People are moving here in large numbers because of the city of Cambridge, why are we forcing them to lives a half hour drive from where they want to be? Focus the proposed developments sites on being as close to Cambridge city centre, in locations that do not rely on car travel. Increase the density of the proposed sites in order to allow as many people as possible to access amenities within a short walk. Design around people without cars, for example teenagers, the disabled and the elderly.</p>	<p>203579 (H Thomas)</p>
<p>Advisory Board of Albion City Development Corporation Ltd strongly support the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The Forest City project is a proposed self-sufficient urban settlement of 45,000 acres, located east of Cambridge and broadly aligned between Newmarket in the north and Haverhill in the south. the Greater Cambridge ecosystem; one of the world’s leading centres for science, technology and innovation, with strengths in life sciences, data and digital technologies, advanced manufacturing and research-intensive industries, is a national strategic asset. Strongly supports planning that recognises and enables the continued growth of this ecosystem.</p>	<p>208128 (Albion City Development Corporation Ltd)</p>
<p>Development strategy is too focussed on the delivery of large strategic sites including an expanded Cambourne, existing new settlements at Northstowe, Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield, and a proposed new settlement at Grange Farm. The delivery timetable for infrastructure to support an expanded Cambourne and at Grange Farm is uncertain. For all of the large strategic site allocations the predicted</p>	<p>211605, 211606 (Bloor Homes)</p>

<p>housing delivery rates are unrealistically high, and the delivery of policy compliant levels of affordable housing is often not achieved. The development strategy avoids directing development to the larger villages, including Papworth Everard regardless of their sustainability credentials, existing services and facilities, accessibility by sustainable modes of transport, or affordable housing needs.</p> <p>Approach does not support the residents or services and facilities in those villages, and would not meet the great places, homes, connectivity and infrastructure strategic priorities. Will not deliver green infrastructure.</p>	
---	--

Comments on the Plan Period

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The minimum end date of the plan should be 15 years from adoption, as per paragraph 22 of the Framework. The draft plan seeks to cover the period 2024-2045, i.e. 21 years. Gladman supports this approach as it gives additional years should there be any delays in the plan-making process or during examination. However, in order to be consistent with national policy, Gladman would recommend that the plan period to starts in a more recent year – 2025, ending in 2045. The council may then want to amend the ending year to 2046 to maintain the 21-year plan period.</p>	<p>208330 (Gladman Developments)</p>
<p>The plan period should be extended to 2050. A longer plan period is considered to clearly be the most reasonable strategy, when considered against the alternatives.</p>	<p>208383 (NAIB Trust)</p>
<p>To align with the Cambridgeshire Local Plan and emerging Spatial Development Strategy, and accounting for the number of large strategic allocations in the plan, it is considered that the plan period</p>	<p>211595 (Places for People)</p>

should be extended to 2050. A longer plan period is considered to clearly be the most reasonable strategy, when considered against the alternatives	
---	--

Comments on the relationship with National Planning Policy

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The plan does not adequately consider the draft NPPF, which is expected to be adopted in mid-2026, necessitating alignment to avoid future revisions.</p> <p>The draft NPPF aims to reduce development management policies that exceed national standards, which creates unnecessary burdens. Recommend council review local plan once new NPPF adopted deleting or amending any local plan policies that are inconsistent with the new NPPF to avoid lengthy discussions regarding their weight during application processes.</p>	<p>203401 (ESCO Prospect)</p> <p>205096 (Home Builders Federation)</p>
<p>To ensure longevity of the emerging Plan, it is recommended that the Council is consistent, where possible, with the NPPF when published in its final form.</p>	<p>206943 (Henry Boot Developments)</p>
<p>We support the overall vision of creating well-designed, sustainable and resilient communities, and welcome the ambition shown in the draft policies. However, a number of the detailed requirements go beyond national standards or lack sufficient flexibility and therefore risk undermining deliverability or delaying the housing trajectory.</p>	<p>208958 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)</p>

Comments raising General Issues

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
CPRE Cambridgeshire and Peterborough supports the ambition of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan to deliver sustainable growth. However, sustainability must include environmental protection, inclusive access, resilient infrastructure, digital connectivity, and safeguarding of water resources.	208957 (CPRE Cambs and Peterborough)
Support the principles of sustainable growth underpinning the Draft Local Plan.	211112 (Cam Valley Community Rail Partnership)
PfP supports the vision for Greater Cambridge to be a place where a big decrease in our climate and environmental impacts comes with the continued flourishing of the internationally significant innovation economy, and a big increase in the quality of everyday life for all our communities.	211596 (Places for People)
The Owners and Board see either redevelopment of the current site or potential relocation as critical to the Club's long term viability and sustainability at a time when its current capacity is constrained, the City will grow exponentially and the financial pressures for all football clubs at every level are growing given the flow of investment into all the English leagues. We hope the GCLP will prioritise the Club's needs, recognising its unique role in Cambridge	209103 (Cambridge United Football Club)
Newnham Labour ran an informal engagement event to allow the Newnham community to discuss the draft Local Plan with Cllr Katie Thornburrow. 45 people attended and their views are summarised in the report submitted below. Key points arising were 1) support for more Affordable Housing. 2) Support for the REJECTION of development on West Fields, Site ID 115681 3) Support for policies on Climate Change, Green and Open Space, and River Corridors. Widespread uncertainty about the aims of the	201344, 210676 (Newnham Labour)

Cambridge Growth Company, and whether it would comply with the democratically developed policies and plans in the Local Plan. Many were also concerned about power of the University Colleges.	
Fails to adequately address the interlinked nature of so many of the issues. The holistic vision is important. It also fails to clarify the relative costs and the difficulty of enforcing the provisions. There is a risk of imbalance in the responses and expenditure. Very little mention of how provisions affecting developers and other third parties are to be enforced.	205462 (D Stoughton)
CLAF supports the overall vision of the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan but urges stronger, more explicit policy commitments to protect, enhance and integrate public rights of way and access networks across Greater Cambridge. Clearer policy language and delivery mechanisms will help ensure that access infrastructure contributes fully to the Plan's objectives for sustainable development, healthy communities and green infrastructure.	210965 (Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum)
CSF CIC would welcome working with Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, public health and developers to help shape implementable guidance (for example, a short "Healthy and Sustainable Food in New Development" note or SPD module), building on the draft policy foundations already in the Plan.	210972 (Cambridgeshire Sustainable Food) 205609 (Y Dignon)
Use Traditional Architecture Design Codes for new construction and protect all historical buildings including officially listed and non-designated heritage assets from demolition with a ban on demolition of buildings constructed prior to 1950.	130661 (D Barton)
Comments offering general support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All looks well thought-out, balancing residents' needs plus wildlife and the planet. Support, if it can be delivered without compromising in the face of finance/pressure from developers etc. 	203443 (G Pountain) 204365 (J Nelson)

<p>The Local Plan is interdependent with wider strategies, infrastructure delivery, and enabling services such as water, energy, and social infrastructure. As these strategies and interventions progress, it is important they are informed by consistent evidence and aligned assumptions on spatial strategy, infrastructure provision and phasing, with greater clarity on the assumptions being made where delivery relies on decisions or investment beyond the planning system. Clear recognition of these interdependencies and stronger systems alignment will be critical to ensuring coherent land-use and investment decisions to strengthen the robustness of the Plan in unlocking future growth potential of the Cambridge city region.</p>	<p>203518 (Cambridge Ahead)</p>
<p>The Local Plan broadly is a comprehensive document inclusive of relative analysis detailing the Planning Authority's intentions over the over the next 5 years for Jobs, Housing, Business Environments etc. Perhaps I have missed this, I've seen no 'Impact Assessment' on the impact of extortionate business rates and other Government non-incentivising taxes, the authors of the plan should be complemented.</p>	<p>201571 (Turks Head Farm)</p>
<p>Highlights the rich heritage of small villages in South Cambs and expresses concern over the current housing developments, noting that many houses are being bought for rental purposes, which does not benefit local infrastructure. Concern about the affordability of housing for young couples and low-wage earners, as house prices are rising beyond their reach.</p>	<p>202358 (E Dean)</p>
<p>While the vision and strategy are worthy of support, details matter. The Plan assumes the infrastructure problems (primarily water and transport) will magically be solved, but does nothing to provide those solutions. What is the alternative Plan if the local infrastructure needs the Plan relies on are not delivered?</p>	<p>202550 (P Tribble)</p>

<p>Cambridge Junction's future redevelopment and re-provision, and the detailed implications of the Draft Local Plan, have only become clear at Regulation 18 stage.</p>	<p>202802 (Cambridge Junction)</p>
<p>We are supportive of the processes detailed in this section.</p>	<p>202818 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)</p>
<p>We welcome the Plan and recognise the extensive work and stakeholder engagement underpinning its development. We support the Plan's ambition to balance climate and environmental objectives with the continued flourishing of Cambridge's globally significant innovation economy and improved quality of life for local communities. The Local Plan is a critical lever for sustaining international competitiveness, enabling company formation, retention and scale, and attracting global investment. We particularly welcome the emphasis on building on existing clusters and campuses and the recognition of the innovation infrastructure that underpins growth. We encourage the Plan to further strengthen this system-wide approach by explicitly supporting the intensification and expansion of established innovation clusters to maximise agglomeration benefits.</p>	<p>204900 (Innovate Cambridge)</p>
<p>General comment to be consulted as the plan moves forward.</p>	<p>206953 (Cambridge Realty Ltd)</p>
<p>Railpen support the Councils' recognition throughout the draft Plan's preamble and supporting text that the region makes a substantial contribution to national economic health. However, we suggest that the growth of the Cambridgeshire economy should be specifically mentioned within the Council's 'Vision for Greater Cambridge'. We would encourage the Council to be bold, and to recognise that the region's</p>	<p>207454 (Pioneer Group Ltd Railpen)</p>

<p>continued growth – fuelled by both housing and jobs – is critical to delivering the environment in which future generations can flourish.</p>	
<p>Railfuture East Anglia welcome the plan’s ambition to tackle climate change, health and create high-quality places with a strong focus on sustainability, wellbeing, good design, walking, cycling and public transport. Railfuture is a partner within the Cambridgeshire Sustainable Travel Alliance of CamCycle, Cambridge Bus Users and Cambridge Living Streets. We fully support their responses to this consultation.</p>	<p>208028 (Railfuture East Anglia)</p>
<p>The emphasis on high-quality placemaking, green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain is essential to maintaining quality of life, while the strong focus on climate change mitigation and adaptation appropriately aligns local growth with national net-zero objectives. We also welcome the integrated approach to transport, utilities and digital connectivity, which will be critical in supporting innovation-led growth at scale.</p>	<p>208132 (Albion City Development Corporation Ltd)</p>
<p>Welcome the ambition of the Greater Cambridge Plan and understand the need to plan positively for the city’s future. However, I am deeply concerned that, without stronger protections, rural communities like mine are being placed at risk to accommodate growth that primarily benefits the city rather than the wider area. Cambridge’s future should not be built by sacrificing the countryside that gives it its character and identity. Planning for long-term success means working in partnership with rural communities, not placing a disproportionate burden on them. I hope this Plan will stand up for places like Weston Colville, so that young people like me can look forward to a future where growth is fair, sustainable and shared.</p>	<p>208483 (E Hepworth)</p>

<p>Support the strategic direction of the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan. However, to deliver a genuinely inclusive, safe and sustainable transport and access network, the Plan must explicitly and consistently include equestrian users across its sustainable transport, active travel, public realm, green infrastructure and Rights of Way policies. Without clear policy direction, equestrian access will continue to be excluded at the delivery stage, undermining the Plan’s objectives for health, wellbeing, equality, safety and rural economic resilience.</p>	<p>208662 (British Horse Society)</p>
<p>The Cambridge Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) does not appear to be explicitly referenced in the Draft GCLP. The ROWIP is a statutory document that set out priorities for the management, improvement and accessibility of the public rights of way network and is directly relevant to policies on green infrastructure, sustainable transport, active travel and open space provision. The Local Plan should formally reference the ROWIP within its evidence base and policy framework to ensure alignment, consistency and effective delivery of rights of way improvements through new development.</p>	<p>208660 (British Horse Society)</p>
<p>Putting people, places and choice first. We support the ambition of the Local Plan to address climate change, improve health and deliver high-quality places. However, this must be achieved without prioritising one transport mode over others, without unnecessary destruction of green spaces and orchards, and without policies that reduce choice, resilience, or fairness for residents.</p> <p>the Local Plan should: Explicitly commit to transport neutrality, not transport hierarchy. Protect orchards, green spaces and historic landscapes as strategic assets. Treat cars as part of the transition, not the enemy. Support cycling and walking without coercion or exclusion. Ensure policies work for all ages, abilities and life circumstances. Avoid road closures and restrictions that worsen congestion and</p>	<p>208834, 208880 (D Smith)</p>

emissions. Require evidence of deliverability, not aspiration. Balance climate goals with social and economic reality	
We suggest replacing the term “people with disabilities” with “people with care and support needs” throughout the document. This terminology is more inclusive, as it encompasses a broader range of needs, including those relating to mental health, physical health, and learning disabilities. A range of other detailed wording points are also provided.	210541, 210543 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Policies Map shows protected open spaces and nature reserves. Public rights of way are an amenity as well as providing connectivity to key sites. As such could they be included on the policy mapping.	210626 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
There are overlapping themes, such as Town Centres, Placemaking, combatting the Climate Crisis and economic applications that feature Traditional Architecture as a primary vehicle towards achieving the greatest possible positive outcomes for all of these themes.	201010 (Community Campaigner D Barton)
For four centuries the Trust and its precursors (known as the Feoffees) have been responsible for the protection and maintenance of Hobson’s Brook and Conduit, with rights and obligations deriving initially from the 1610 Tripartite Indenture. The Local Plan needs to acknowledge and to state much more explicitly the extreme importance of the maintenance of water quality and the natural environment and habitats along the city’s green corridors, including that from Nine Wells to the City centre formed around Hobson’s Brook and Conduit.	211724 (Hobsons Conduit Trust)
I support the Local Plan as a whole. I respectfully ask that the missing information be made available for comment and that my comments are taken into account in order to make the Local Plan more robust	211933 (C Newell)

and appropriate at a local level. These predominately concern issues about character, landscape, flooding, heights and the viability of infrastructure.	
Note from Comberton Village college student Kids like more social settings and prefer fun activities to do with the Local Plan, with opportunities to stand and sit, less talking and more reading and doing things (drawing, making things, being creative) with multiple activities inside and outside. Interacting with different forms (joint classes) and exploring new subjects - music sounds relaxing. Allow kids to share ideas (talking or writing) and let the kids choose some ideas.	211975 (K Thornburrow)

Comments raising points on specific sites

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Without EWR Co's proposed amendments to policies and the policies map, development of land within the safeguarded area may conflict with, or prejudice the delivery of, EWR and be subject to an objection from EWR Co at the planning application stage or compulsory acquisition authorised as part of the EWR Development Consent Order (if granted), potentially making it undeliverable or undevelopable. EWR Co's proposed amendments would provide the necessary policy tests to ensure that all parties continue to work together to develop proposals which avoid this outcome, whilst also aligning with the safeguarding guidance.	211907 (East West Rail)
Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 (Grange Farm)	202358 (E Dean)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A505 is a busy road with accident hotspots, particularly at the A1301/A505 junction, and warns that the area cannot handle more traffic without significant infrastructure improvements. The A1307 is a high traffic route, warning that increased traffic from the development will negatively affect surrounding villages. • Local services such as GPs, schools, and shops are already at capacity and cannot accommodate an influx of new residents. Opposes the proposed development on Roman Rd, citing its status as an area of local beauty. • Strong concerns about the proposed development, it should not proceed due to the availability of suitable brownfield sites, such as Cowley Road. • The scale and density of the proposed housing in a rural location are troubling, with concerns about disruption to the rural appeal and negative impacts on wellbeing due to construction noise. • Development will harm the local environment, with doubts about the adequacy of mitigation measures for rare sites. The plan for a sewage works upwind of the respondent's property raises concerns about outdoor enjoyment and property value. • Concerns are raised about a permanent site for travellers. 	204517, 207552, 207533, 207554 (C Tjen)
<p>Cambridge Biomedical Campus</p> <p>Proposed vehicle access from Granham's Road into the Cambridge Biomedical Campus contradicts the goals of Policy BG/GI by threatening the Gog Magog Hills and chalkland fringe, which should be protected. The respondent for the 'Better Ways for Busways' alternative, suggesting a busway spur off the A1307 Hinton Way roundabout as a less invasive solution that would improve emergency access and connectivity.</p>	204551 (E Wilson)
<p>Land North West of Balsham Road, Linton (Site reference 115927)</p> <p>Promoting the site for allocation, it would support local business growth and provide facilities such as a nursery and café for residents.</p>	204823 (Vistry Group)

St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge Site Reference 115524 Given an Overall HELAA Score of 'Red'. The exclusion of Site 115524 must be permanently enforced.	201277 (M McColville)
--	-----------------------