

Consultation Statement

Appendix 4: Response to Representations - Summary of the Plan



Greater Cambridge Local Plan

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

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

Summary of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Abbreviations

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

Summary of Main Issues:

A number of comments offered broad support for the draft plan and its approach. Issues cited include approach to balancing support for the economy with environmental and social issues. The importance of ensuring that the policies and principles were effectively applied was mentioned in a number of the comments.

Some representors expressed concern about the level of growth that was proposed by the draft local plan. The impact of development on the area, that it was overly focused on economic development, and that government focus on Cambridge meant people had little say. Impacts of growth on infrastructure, congestion and character of the area were mentioned, as well as concern about the impact on the heritage of the area. There was also concern that it wasn't addressing problems, such as a lack of affordable housing, and transport.

Other comments considered that the plan did not respond to the needs of the economy or to government aspirations. Some stated that plan was not delivering enough for villages, and considering how villages could be made more sustainable.

Some commentators considered the plan should have less focus on climate change and biodiversity, and more on meeting community needs. Others were concerned that the plan would not deliver its climate ambitions because of the scale of proposals.

Comments were made on the summary on particular sites. Concern was expressed about the impact of East West Rail and Cambourne North, including on wildlife, heritage, and the impact it would have on surrounding communities. Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm raised a number of comments objecting to the proposal, similar to these made on the site policy itself, including questioning the choice of site, landscape, biodiversity and heritage impacts, transport access, and the impact on nearby communities. A number of other sites were referenced in comments, wither seeking their inclusion or supporting their omission from the plan.

On infrastructure, comments from emergency services bodies sought to ensure their areas were appropriately addressed by the plan. Other comments highlighted the importance of infrastructure being delivered when it is needed, and examples were sited of when this had not happened. Specific infrastructure issues were mentioned, including the need to support food growing.

Comments on cultural infrastructure stressed the importance of maintaining and funding provision, including if the Junction is redeveloped.

A wider variety of transport issues were raised. There was concern about the quality of bus services, and that they would need to be improved to accommodate growth. Light rail was suggested by some. More needed to be done to support active travel, and this should be a high priority when designing places. The quality of road infrastructure was raised, including concern about potholes.

Some representors raised concern about the format of the draft plan consultation. The level and technicality of the consultation material and the consultation platform may have discouraged participation. Some also question the difference consultation made, as the local plan hadn't changed significantly from previous stages.

Other comments picked up a variety of issues.

[Response to representations](#)

Comments offering general support for the draft plan and the approach are noted.

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 protecting the environment.

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 issues directly.

The development strategy proposed has been strongly driven by climate change considerations, along with a set of robust policies to ensure the form of development responds as well.

On specific sites, the issues raised on Cambourne North and Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm 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.

The plan has been informed by a significant evidence base related to infrastructure provision. This includes the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and topic specific evidence such as related to water supply. Policies seek to ensure that the right infrastructure is provided when it is needed. This has included liaison with emergency services, healthcare and education providers. A study specifically exploring food growing was also commissioned to inform the plan. The plan has also been informed by a study exploring cultural infrastructure provision.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority are producing a Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy. This identifies how transport measures will accommodate planned growth. A draft is being published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The development strategy has also been subject to transport modelling, used to identify the specific measures needed to support development.

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. In terms of responding to the feedback, we cannot always change the plan in the way individual comments seek, but we carefully consider all comments received.

Table of representations:

Comments expressing general support for the plan

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Strongly support the Plan's: • Commitment to planning positively for innovation-led economic growth, informed by robust local data and an understanding of the clustered nature of the Cambridge economy. • Recognition of the need to plan for a diverse range of housing types and tenures, ensuring that housing delivery keeps pace with job growth and supports workforce retention at all stages of life. • Support for flexibility and headroom in employment space and housing provision, enabling the Plan to respond to higher-than-anticipated economic performance. • Emphasis on innovation infrastructure, including the intensification and evolution of existing clusters, campuses and science parks. • Integrated approach to infrastructure planning, including transport, utilities, digital connectivity and energy, and the recognition that delivery depends on strong system-wide alignment across multiple strategies and delivery bodies. • Support for appropriate densification to high design and environmental standards, particularly in locations well served by transport and services. • Balanced provision for “whole economy” needs, including mid-tech, industrial and logistics space. Commitment to climate change mitigation, biodiversity net gain and high-quality placemaking, which are essential to long-term competitiveness. We also support the Plan's recognition of Greater Cambridge as the intellectual and innovation engine of the Corridor. The success of Greater Cambridge underpins growth across the wider Corridor, including in Stevenage, Harlow, London and Peterborough, supporting high-value jobs, skills pipelines and resilient supply chains.	208493 (UK Innovation Corridor)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
CA welcomes the vision of good growth, which balances support for the internationally significant innovation economy with improved quality of life for local communities. We support the use of robust local data and the recognition of the clustering nature of the economy, alongside flexibility to allow additional commercial space and housing where performance is strong and infrastructure constraints are addressed. The Plan's reliance on externally delivered infrastructure, particularly transport, highlights the need for system-wide alignment. Greater flexibility on high-quality densification and a more strategic approach to grey belt assessment would further support sustainability, housing delivery, and growth objectives.	203517 (Cambridge Ahead)
We are very supportive of the proposed themes and strongly support the high aspirations of this proposed local plan including the policies on Climate, biodiversity, water management, well being and social inclusion, green spaces, jobs, homes and infrastructure	202817 (Cambridge City Council Liberal Democrat Group)
Linton Parish Council (LPC) are broadly in favour of the principles included in the draft Local Plan. LPC are in favour of avoiding the spread of development throughout local villages as thus smaller scale development would fail to provide adequate infrastructure and services.	201672 (Linton PC)
Comments offering general support include: • I think this sounds good. • This sounds amazing, especially the boosted housing, public transport and access to green space in a currently enclosed Green Belt area. • Support your vision, development strategy and development specifics for the Local Plan. I understand that some of the specifics are dependent on adequate infrastructure including water, which is as it should be. • An incredibly large amount of work has clearly gone into the development of the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan, which residents really appreciate.	200990 (C Leach) 201000 (H Hale) 201004 (M Colville) 201161 (S Oliver) 201028 (A Harris)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The overall conclusions appear to be sensible and heading towards a valuable plan. I therefore agree with the majority of proposals, although, as ever, there is of course room for some improvements • Principles need to be adhered to - don't let developers wriggle out of provision of affordable housing, green space, contributions to infrastructure (e.g. schools, Addenbrooke's hospital, GPs); ensure developers build these things first not last. • All sounds very sensible, if can be delivered without compromising - especially around green spaces, provision of infrastructure, avoidance of reliance on cars and provision of water supplies. These are areas where corners are so often cut. • I support the goals of the plan. Wellbeing in communities is important to me. I have been active in campaigning for play spaces for children and teenagers. I see these squeezes out by the completing goals of land for housing and land for biodiversity and nature. I would like to see these specifically called out so they are not lost, and recognition that play is an appropriate activity within some green spaces. • The plan is largely broad principles/intentions, well evidenced and aligning with environmental, well-being and key planning concerns e.g. transport, housing, work and commercial. • Encourage you to find ways to discourage car use and eliminate parking on pavement. • Agree with the aims. Am concerned about university/town differences. • Congratulations to all involved for producing very good Local Plan. May the policies be implemented as clearly as stated. I particularly welcome the proposed balance of environmental and economic factors: GDP is an inadequate measure on its own. I support efforts for reduced climate change impact and development standards higher than national ones • I very much support the emphasis on environmental sustainability, especially recognising the need to ensure from the start the use of active and sustainable transport instead of reliance on cars. I support the net zero goals.	201422 (Residents Association of Old Newnham) 201817 (T McKeown) 202135 (H Lowe) 204351 (J Nelson) 203538 (P Blandford) 203861 (J Prince)

Comments on levels of development

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
I believe the whole plan's premise about the growth of Cambridge is wrong. Being more than familiar with Silicon Valley, I shudder at the phrase Silicon Fen. I also wonder what happened to levelling-up. Why should we continue to grow at the expense of northern areas? Cambridge has neither the resources (i.e. water) nor the infrastructure to support the envisioned growth. The City is already overcrowded. It's unrealistic to believe that all these new developments won't add to the overcrowding.	200991 (R Engler)
I have very mixed feelings about this plan and feel a lot of what you are saying you would like to do is an empty promise and you are not thinking of local people. You do not have the local communities in your thoughts just profit.	201353 (D Wood)
The Government has made a great mistake in defining this area as a priority for 'sustainable economic growth'. Growth is not sustainable in this area.	201421 (S Page)
Central Government wants this development, and individuals have little say	202650 (K Leslie)
Object, I find it frustrating that the plan means even more homes for Cambridge. Having lived here for 18 years I don't recognise the city and don't even bother going in shopping at weekend as its too busy and cant move for people. It is sad Cambridge is over crowed and now covered on graffiti and it feels sad where the City is heading. it is a small market town and having 1000s more people means more impact on infrastructure. I think they need to really think about the amount of houses are being built. The city cannot cope with more people.	202423 (R Larkum)
Object, too many of the massive housing developments are occupied by people not from Cambridge, not conforming to Cambridge standards (in business, culture, motoring, lifestyle, tax compliance etc) which causes problem for native Cambridge residents, lowering the quality of life and creating congestion, crime, pollution, services shortages etc. Too much bland and characterless housing is	202542 (C Turner)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
being put forward simply to create extra council tax revenue without proper (genuine) consideration about the negative effects on life in Cambridge. Over development is also causing problems for wildlife.	
The plan is unreasonable, incomprehensible, utter madness and will create social dysfunction making a mockery of what community is about. The plan needs to be completely revised and placed where local infrastructure could accommodate such an idea. All that is happening on top of all comments above are the landowners reaping even more wealth to accommodate their utter greed and their complete indifference to what a community is about and which is so important in the very difficult world we are now living in.	204432 (S Barron)
Object as Vision is fundamentally not Sound, due to 3 major omissions: 1) It fails to recognise and protect Cambridge's world heritage significance; 2) It totally fails to recognise and manage current conflicts between current growth, let alone the proposed, and the finite physical and environmental constraints of Cambridge and its hinterland; and 3) no evidence, let alone adequate evidence, is provided to show that the proposed levels of growth are "sustainable", and the claimed vision is even remotely feasible. It is shocking that tall buildings proposals are made with no visualisations to show the potential impacts of what is proposed.	203347 (J Preston)
The draft plan is a pipe dream. New housing thus far is ugly. For example, The Marque is beyond hideous. If there no funding for a new sewage works then there is no hope for a new reservoir in the Fens. By 2045, our pot holed roads will have disintegrated and diesel pick up trucks will be needed to traverse them not EVs.	201524 (S Biggin)
You should be working on travel-to-work areas not tight bureaucratic local government boundaries. You do not seem to take into account the government's latest ambitious targets for growth. Without close collaboration with the Mayor and the Cambridge Growth Company your planning exercise is already redundant. Your reliance on the Greater Cambridge Partnership to find solutions is risible.	201267 (A Duff)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Supports the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan, recognising the need for growth to maintain inclusivity, prosperity, and environmental responsibility. The proposed housing and employment growth is justified but advocate for a more ambitious approach to address the chronic housing shortage. Important to deliver urban regeneration, prioritising brownfield sites and high-density development near transport hubs to enhance sustainable housing delivery. Supports the plan's targeted approach to Green Belt release but suggest remaining open to further reviews to provide well-connected housing and green infrastructure.	201313 (E Munday)
Negative effects of ongoing housing development in village, including road closures and damage caused by heavy vehicles.	201932 (C Pillinger)
My main two failures of this plan are transportation and affordable (housing). Comments include public transport too expensive, developments like airport site will create gridlock. Putting labs in centre will exacerbate problems, with no decent transport proposal. Reopen Cherry Hinton station, upgrading rail links, and building manufacturing plants near railway lines to support future economic needs.	204505 (M Day)
Housing growth is too dispersed while employment remains concentrated around Cambridge.	203304 (J Day)
The plan does not achieve the government's clearly set ambitions for Greater Cambridge, in which the Greater Cambridge area is foremost in plans for national economic growth. It also misses the specific national policy to support the expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus with associated housing delivery. The Local Plan as currently drafted does not align with the ambitions set out in the Local Growth Plan which aims for a 15% increase in housing by 2035, increasing to a 54% increase by 2050. Government guidance on Local Growth Plans (July 2025) states that they should be the "guiding star" that provides direction for other relevant plans and strategies which should "align" with the Local Growth Plan.	208211 (Pigeon Land and LIH)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
City centre is too small and too crowded for this over expansion. Green transport is not encouraged by the state of the roads. New developments are not sympathetic in size and scale. The main arteries in and out of Cambridge are clogged already.	202560 (K Leslie)

Comments raising points around the strategy for villages

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Great Wilbraham Parish Council (GWPC) is concerned that the Local Plan disadvantages our residents and 60k residents in 'Group and Infill' villages in favour of those in new developments and larger, better-connected villages. SCDC is one of the most rural populations in the country, but when considering infrastructure to make communities viable and sustainable and fulfil key strategic themes we are being ignored. Great Wilbraham has close historic, social and geographic links with Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom. The two Parish Councils would like to work together informally and with the Council to develop a strategy for sustainability.	203329 (Great Wilbraham PC)
Support your vision but I don't think the policies and spatial allocation that you have laid out in this Plan are strong enough to deliver on it. I'd like to see more homes near to the jobs (e.g. within the city), more homes around South Cambridgeshire villages with rail stations and more mixed-use development.	205231 (A Williams)
The plan clearly treats South Cambridgeshire's towns, villages, and parishes as an inconvenience. Designed and shaped exclusively by and for Cambridge and Cambridge University interests, it marginalises South Cambs. Among thousands of lines, only a brief paragraph acknowledges South Cambridgeshire, effectively dismissing it as inconvenient for delivering infrastructure you have failed to provide over the past decade. Once again, over 120,000 residents are ignored and used as cash cows to support the Cambridge economy. Many people who live and work in Cambridge actually reside in	201302 (I Koutoudis)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
South Cambs, yet their needs for infrastructure, healthcare, leisure, and wellbeing spaces are repeatedly overlooked.	
Much more must be done to encourage businesses to establish offices / factories / workshops (perhaps as satellites of their HQ) in the larger villages in South Cambs (e.g. Gamlingay) to give the people who live there (and the nearby smaller villages / hamlets) the opportunity to work locally. This will enable them to walk, cycle or drive a short distance to work rather than commute to London or wherever with all the benefits that will bring to the environment and their health – as well as enabling more use of local shops and other facilities sustaining the local economy. What was the village's main industrial area has been turned into a giant housing estate with, seemingly, no thought given to local employment opportunities.	201555 (P Mann)
The attention given to the rural settlement is as vital as it is for new areas. I am supportive of the goals and strategies in the main, but the tactics needed to make sure the existing grows in concert with the new cannot be overlooked. We need the same visioning exercise to take place in say Elsworth as we do Cambourne North. What is the typology of say Elsworth by 2050.	204705 (M West)
“We want our rural villages to continue to thrive and sustain their local services, but we don’t want to encourage lots of new homes in places where car travel is the easiest or only way to get around.” This approach fails to conform with Paragraph 83 of the NPPF. It also fails to recognise the changing work patterns since Covid-19, with recent ONS studies confirming that 28% of working adults in Great Britain hybrid worked between January and March 2025, representing a rise since March 2022. ¹ Further, the UK Government’s commitment to zero emission vehicles by 2035, which falls within the draft Plan period, promoting the change to electric vehicles.	211582 (Mr & Mrs Smith)

Comments focusing on Environment and Climate change

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Object, should have less emphasis on climate change and biodiversity. • The plan has far too much on environmental issues and far too vague a commitment to providing the services needed for such an increase in the size of the community. • Object, Plan bends too much towards climate change, its theories, and its unpredictable and unproven solutions. the council has no business playing god or scientist on this issue and go back to its core duties.	205520 (P Zirngast) 202553 (S Pattinson) 202542 (C Turner)
• Object, Greenhouse gas emissions from constructing the planned 1.5m new homes will exceed interim targets for emissions, and future high emissions are built in which will break the 2050 net zero target without fixing the housing crisis as the distribution of property and its use short-term lets not homes are not dealt with. The Cambridge Plan is part of this. The vision and plan contain a lot of warm words about climate change and biodiversity, but actually in Cambridge isn't in line with these aspirations. Scale and nature of development does not support green building methods. Redeveloping Cambridge market not compatible with climate aspiration. Plan is out of line with national climate and biodiversity targets. • Summary doesn't mention the extreme water stress that Cambridge and the surrounding area suffers from. Climate change will make this worse. No development should be allowed that increases the area's need for water.	203642 (A Copping) 204762 (R Randall)
My confidence is not enhanced by a statement that a 'climate emergency' has been virtuously declared. My take-home from all this is that lots of homes are going to be built in various places whether existing residents like it or not.	201029 (C Pillinger)

Comments on specific sites

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambourne North • Question whether it will result in a genuinely well-planned town with appropriate infrastructure, services, and amenities, or whether it will simply extend an already vast housing estate with only a handful of shops and limited community facilities. • Proposed site for the EWR station and North Cambourne is located on valuable arable land, woodland, and hedgerows, could negate conservation efforts, such as those by the RSPB at Hope Farm • Tranquillity of our village, our home, will be shattered by the huge volume of traffic coursing through the narrow roads • Plans for a multi story car park and link from Cambourne adjacent to designated heritage assets are not enhancing and protecting the fragile barns and house. • Routes from Cambourne should be moved away from existing dwellings. All crossings should include NMU access (including equestrians) to link and extend the bridleway around Cambourne. A new perimeter bridleway should be made as has been in Cambourne.	203722 (G Chamberlain) 203922, 203926 (T Hegan) 201638 (C Doel)
Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm Comments raising objections with points including: • A1307 is a dangerous road with a history of serious and fatal accidents, The road is severely congested so unless there is a serious transport solution this is not the right location. Access from A11 have been overlooked. • Before any additional development occurs in this area a serious review of schooling • GP practices and local services overburdened. Increased pressure on Addenbrookes and the NHS.	204947, 205621 (M Munns) 205676, 201925, 205677 (M Miles) 204109, 208515, 208516, 208517 (Z Luscombe) 203574 (J Graham) 202072 (M Barry)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Despite reassurances, indicated boundaries have been exceeded and sewage treatment plant is on opposite side of A1307 plus a transport link to the site is via Comfort Cafe land and adjoining field before crossing A1307. • On the flight path to Duxford so any housing could be at risk. • The original HELAA assessment, before the December 2025 update scored the site as RED on suitability grounds. • Damage to the Chalk Stream / aquifer, creation of flood risk • Adverse effects on the Roman Road Site of Special Scientific Interest, stopping irreparable damage. • Archaeological sites there require significant protection, • Impact on character and views, overwhelm nearby villages. • Loss of agricultural land • Other sites would be better.	203416 (D Barkataki) 207553 (C Tjen)
North East Cambridge No reliance should be placed on the council's ability to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP) and the residential component of Hartree should not be included in prediction of housing numbers.	201314 (E Green)
Kingsway Solar and Forest City I am very concerned about the proposed Kingsway solar farm destroying the countryside. There is also the proposed Forest City how does this match with Cambridges expansion and policies? It appears here in south east Cambridgeshire we are under siege and no one is showing any concerns	201491 (S Jaques)
I strongly support withdrawal of West Fields as potential development site (a Trojan horse).	203538 (P Blandford)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Sites are described as “proposed sites” when several developments are clearly already underway. Deeply concerning.	203722 (G Chamberlain)
Site reference 115524 Site would be a disaster for this community. Site 115524 was given an Overall Score of 'Red'. The exclusion of Site 115524 must be permanently enforced. That will protect our vital, extremely limited and increasingly pressurised local amenity space - noting St Matthew's Piece (Cambridge) as the only public park in North Petersfield.	201488 (E Guild)
Object, I am most worried about the traffic and Road capacity through Boxworth and the surrounding villages. There are no clear plans for additional road capacity. The character of the village setting will be completely spoilt. The access to any of the sites along the A14 should not be from Boxworth Road.	201729 (I Negus)
Walled Garden, Whittlesford Object, site should be put back in the plan.	204319 (C Forbes-Cable)
Sites ECC notes that the Plan seeks to help the Genome Campus “employment park evolve into a place, supporting delivery of local services and facilities and helping it to find its place in the network of towns and villages” (page 21). Furthermore at Granta Park the Local Plan is seeking to support its continued success. For both locations, 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 connectivity to similar businesses within Essex – Chesterford Research Park within Uttlesford and industries within Harlow; as well as connections to London Stansted Airport. Attention is also drawn to ECC’s role as a neighbouring infrastructure and service provider with statutory roles and responsibilities.	210460 (Essex County Council)

Comments on Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
References to strategic infrastructure should include, "fire and rescue, police, ambulance".	207472 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary) 207505 (Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service)
Highlights importance of adequate healthcare infrastructure for sustainable development and recommends ongoing engagement with the NHS, specifically the ICB, during the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Healthcare costs should be included in the Local Plan Viability Assessment for relevant development typologies to ensure developers are aware in advance of potential contributions towards healthcare infrastructure.	205178 (NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board)
ECC notes and welcomes that this section of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan states “development will only be allowed if it is accompanied by the right infrastructure that will deliver the range of supporting services, facilities and infrastructure that workers, visitors and residents need that deliver the goal of making it a world class campus (page 19 of summary for development strategy).	210459 (Essex County Council)
Section 106 must cover adult skills for career switchers	202356 (A Carpen)
Requests a transparent assessment of the costs associated with proposed changes and clarity on who will bear these costs.	201933 (C Pillinger)
Harston PC highlight the need for enhanced local services, such as healthcare and community spaces, to support future growth in the village. Sustainable Energy: The Parish Council supports the inclusion of local sustainable energy solutions but not at the expense of the surrounding farm land/amenity areas or the other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.	201612 (Harston PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Facilities provided in new developments have arrived too little too late. e.g. pupils in Darwin Green are having to go outside Cambridge and Northstowe is woeful. There is no sign that lessons have been learnt. There need to be integrated care centres that do more than just gp services. Too much development, e.g. Cambridge North area is bland, soulless, corporate and mediocre. There is no sign of this being addressed.	201722 (A Milbourn)
Build communities. Do not discriminate against one group because it isn't all of the groups. E.g., why can't my church hire the community centre regularly? Why isn't there space for a church building on site? Allow community building.	207152 (R Forder)
Food Growing • Young, passionate growers are dissuaded by the denial of access to good land; huge initial capital outlays; prohibitive planning procedures; logistical problems of parking and distribution opportunities. Missed a section on market gardening of fruit and vegetables for people to actually eat, I only saw one mention of environmentally friendly farming. • Cambridge cannot achieve its net zero ambition without a strategy to transition to a more sustainable food system. Resilience in the food supply chain also needs serious consideration. For these reasons I feel the Local Plan should do more to encourage and support a healthy and sustainable local food system.	205183 (Y Dignon) 205452 (The Cambridge Organic Food Company)

Comments on Cultural Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support Cambridge Junction in asking that (supported by Theatres Trust): temporary provision for all cultural functions must be secured before any demolition or displacement reprovion is delivered as an early phase; no gap in provision any future Junction is at least equivalent in standard and capacity, including audience, back-of-house, technical capability, servicing long-term operational/financial viability assessed alongside spatial design delivery governed through a structured process (CJ/Council governance, RIBA stages, shared brief before developer engagement).	202799 (Cambridge Junction) 203841 (N Yeni) 204348 (J Capon) 205262 (N Oakley)
Support the recognition of the cultural and creative industries in driving employment and tourism, highlighting the role of local institutions like University Cambridge Museums, Kettle's Yard, The Junction and Cambridge Arts Theatre. They advocate for the inclusion of arts and culture in communities facilities in new settlements to help to establish and develop communities.	205037 (Arts Council England)
Wysing Arts Centre asks that Cultural Infrastructure is protected and enhanced, as a strategic civic asset; Create Cambridge is embedded in delivery, governance and phasing; artists are involved in masterplanning (RIBA Stage 2-3); Culture is treated as core infrastructure; genuinely affordable cultural production space is required (e.g. peppercorn, with rental charges well-below market rates and established based on evidence, ie Wysing Arts Centre's research on affordable artist studios); rehearsal, making and sole-use studios are prioritised over generic co-working, and that a minimum requirement (e.g., 10% in schemes over 1,000 sqm) is introduced.	204867 (Wysing Arts Centre)

Comments focused on transport

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Bus comments: - Concern about the lack of reliable public transport in Harston, especially to Cambridge and surrounding areas. We request that the Local Plan includes improvements to bus services. - As the population of the City grows not least with housing the role of the Bus is enhanced – some areas of the city have limited services. Bus infrastructure at Addenbrookes not suitable for disabled people. - Presently from north west Cambridge A14 corridor it takes up to TWO HOURS to get to the Biomedical Campus by bus. No direct links, you have to go into the city and change buses. If the Campus is earmarked as a location for jobs, and there is housing development planned for north west Cambridge, it is imperative that the bus service is vastly improved.	209972 (G Heathcook) 201612 (Harston PC) 201037 (P Spowart)
Light Rail comments: - The new towns need to be linked to Cambridge and each other by a new light-rail network Any light rail network needs to have light rail stops that have medium-high density housing *and* essential services/conveniences in the vicinity - Private vehicles belong the 20th Century and that public transport requires its own Vision to shape development in a strategic way with huge benefits to the quality of life which underpins true prosperity. I don't see such vision in the Plan. The answer is light rail. - There's no transit system in place once in Cambridge, we need metro, trams and other mass transit that is significantly faster and not congestion bound. - Civic welfare as well as economic growth depends on the installation of a mass rapid transit system based on light rail.	202356 (A Carpen) 204647 (P Pope) 201293 (T Roberts) 201267 (A Duff)
Active Travel comments:	202187 (R Forder)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Put it at the centre your treatment of active travel needs goals, metrics, and design intent. Give people better lives. Can they travel shorter distances? Can they travel more healthily, with less environmental impact? Can they leave the ICEV or EV at home? • "minimising...reliance on the private car" should be achieved with a focus on improving accessibility, functionality, availability, and affordability of other sustainable means of transport, rather than disincentivising private car use through financial penalties or absolute access restriction. • There are some good examples of cycle infrastructure, but there is a failure to understand that it has to be good for all journeys, not just parts of some. Despite the rhetoric there is too much car centricity in developments. The scale of development is going to add to the already massive congestion problems. • Transport is a major source of emissions and needs priority when planning and budgeting developments. Electric vehicles are not a helpful solution to congestion, and contribute to sprawling developments that put more pressure on existing road networks. Higher density development must come with much lower levels of car ownership, and parking should be an optional cost. Dense development needs strong walking, cycling and public transport to succeed. Walking and cycling connections should be required in all development designs. • Walkability, including for wheelchair and buggy users, should be a core spatial principle in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Supports the Plan's overall direction but walkability is not yet embedded strongly enough across the Vision, spatial strategy, design policies, transport policies, and health objectives	203558 (D Lever) 201722 (A Milbourn) 203304 (J Day) 201474 (M Reader)
Please stop making ordinary people lives difficult, stop creating congestion provide affordable housing. & don't/can't cycle 8+ miles all weathers & don't enjoy 1 1/2 hr bus journeys as opposed to 15 mins by car non peak, 25 mins peak times. leave Coton Orchard alone.	201027 (J Masterson)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
City centre is too small and too crowded for this over expansion. Green transport is not encouraged by the state of the roads. New developments are not sympathetic in size and scale. The main arteries in and out of Cambridge are clogged already.	202650 (K Leslie)
Current road infrastructure around Cambridge is inadequate for the existing traffic volume, leading to dangerous conditions. Public transport options have diminished, resulting in increased reliance on cars and further strain on the road network. The roads are poorly maintained, with deep potholes creating hazardous driving conditions, exemplified by the route from Elsworth to Dry Drayton. There is a pressing need to prioritise infrastructure improvements for residents before considering population growth in the area.	203919 (T Hegan)
As an east Cambridge resident I would like to emphasise attention to: Critical traffic management issues along Maids Causeway given the development of ARU. Critical need of improved cycle pathways and access.	202135 (H Lowe)
Fen Road Rail Crossing Traffic on Fen Road is heavily impacted by the extremely frequent closure of the level crossing, leading to dangerous speeding by vehicles. There are major safety concerns; someone may easily be killed by speeding traffic. To alleviate these traffic issues close the level crossing and either a) create an entry/exit to the A14 or b) build a road bridge across the railway.	202132 (R Meyer)

Comments on the Consultation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Consultation format issues included: • Consultation platform is overly complicated and will put a lot of people off before they can comment suggesting that you do not really want feedback and are hiding behind IT to limit access/response. • The level of technical detail, volume of material, and time required create a significant barrier for ordinary residents. The average person will struggle to engage meaningfully, and many will simply give up. That is not inclusive engagement. • The relevance of field is not clear • The "Instructions" for the consultation on the GCSP website refer only to the use of the "OpusConsult" platform. This requires a registration process before any input. Although GCSP will accept input by post or by email, these options have been effectively concealed by failing to make this clear on the consultation website. Input from the public, particularly older people or other less "internet savvy", has been hindered and discouraged	201024 (P Zirngast) 208881 (D Smith) 201162 (D Quinn) 208634 (G Jones)
Consultation legitimacy points included: • Concern that housing developments will proceed regardless of local opposition, with insufficient attention given to the impact on existing residents and infrastructure. • Last Local Plan draft "consultation"--ZERO changes made despite 25'000+ researched comments received. Yet again, you are simply wasting taxpayers' money with this PRETENCE of democracy: yet another mere box-ticking exercise, with zero intention or legal obligation to implement changes based on public consultation. • Consultations are generally biased, on very limited predetermined options. They are generating apathy and disengagement with public affairs, they're a disgrace and waste of money.	201931 (C Pillinger) 203642 (A Copping) 202542 (C Turner) 203764 (A Wilson) 201030 (A Lindsey)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
- The plan is presented with deliberately obstructive questions and detours. For example, how is a citizen to know if the plan is legally correct? But the council blocks comments unless the citizen agrees with the council that it is - Process unduly prioritised those of set demographics. As a younger person in full time work I was obliged to miss work in order to attend local meetings.	

Other General Comments

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
ECC acknowledges the national and international significance of the high tech industries, research and development and life sciences within the area. The economies of scale for such industries is also noted in their presence within West Essex, and in particular Uttlesford District and Harlow Town. In developing and shaping the existing and future economic clusters, ECC would welcome further engagement to ensure there is full consideration to the inter-relationship and importance of the industries and employment growth within western Essex. Furthermore in the identification of development needs, it is important to appreciate the role that London Stansted airport plays and will continue to play in supporting the growth and development within these key industries.	210458 (Essex County Council)
New research on neurodiversity & building facades *must* be incorporated e.g. requirement that Health Impact Assessments cover this Require post-occupancy evaluations on all large sites Poor contemporary design should not be used as a reason to repeat poor designs	202356 (A Carpen)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Biodiversity and green spaces should be retitled Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green spaces and reference should be included to geodiversity conservation and sites of geological importance.	203458 (Cambridgeshire Geological Society)
Conversion of “barns”, constructed on Green Belt, then converted to industrial buildings, should be expressly excluded.	205484 (P Meyer)
As an east Cambridge resident I would like to emphasise attention to: additional HMOs, hotels, expansion of retail eg Beehive, Newmarket Road/Elizabeth Way roundabout changes. Placing of additional HMOs to take account of other possible locations e.g. south /north Cambridge and HMO types to be reviewed.	202135 (H Lowe)
More council housing is needed, as is encouragement for downsizing. Water abstraction must be reduced. Tourism needs managing, as does the power of university colleges, to maintain the quality of Cambridge life.	203538 (P Blandford)
We are a very nature-deprived county and enhancing green spaces and biodiversity is very important, but wildlife benefits most in an area not shared with hordes of people so it is important to provide areas for outdoor recreation separately from areas supporting nature as well as places which aim to do both.	203861 (J Prince)
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)