GREATER CAMBRIDGE
SHARED PLANNING

Appendix 8 Greater Cambridge Local Plan Consultation Statement

Development Strategy Update (Regulation 18 Preferred Options)

January 2023

Contents

1. Introduction 4

2. What's in this version of the Consultation Statement? 4

3. Note about Duty to Cooperate 5

4. Consultation Statement approach 6

Approach overview to summarising representations and responding to main issues 6

Specific features within the approach to summarising representations and responding to main issues 6

Appendix A: Summaries of representations and responses – Development Strategy 8

Introduction 8

Greater Cambridge in 2041: consultation format and process 9

How much development and where? 13

S/JH: New Jobs and Homes 14

S/DS: Development Strategy 59

Appendix B: Summaries of representations and responses – North East Cambridge, Cambridge East, Cambridge Biomedical Campus 129

Introduction 129

Cambridge Urban Area 130

S/NEC: North East Cambridge 137

The edge of Cambridge 162

S/CE: Cambridge East 169

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) 183

New settlements 210

S/CB: Cambourne 216

S/NS: Existing new settlements 230

Appendix C: Summary of Representations on Strategy: Quick Questionnaire 242

Q1. Do you agree that we should plan for an extra 550 homes per year, so that new housing keeps up with the increase in jobs in our area? 243

Q2. Do you agree that new development should mainly focus on sites where car travel, and therefore carbon emissions, can be minimised? 244

Q3. We think a major new neighbourhood can be developed at Cambridge East, on the current airport site. What housing, jobs, facilities or open spaces do you think this site should provide? 245

Q4. We think that the area east of Milton Road in Northeast Cambridge (including the current waste water treatment plant) can be developed into a lively and dense city district, after the waste water treatment plant relocates. What housing, jobs, facilities or open spaces do you think this site should provide? 278

Q5. We feel that we should support the development of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Addenbrookes) with space for more healthcare facilities, research, and housing. What housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces should be created around the campus? 318

Q13. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about what Greater Cambridge should be like in 2041? 341

1. Introduction

1.1 The Greater Cambridge Local Plan Consultation Statement sets out at each stage of plan-making how Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have undertaken consultation, and propose to undertake consultation, in preparing the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The Consultation Statement is updated at each stage in the process to add information on consultations that have taken place since it was last published.

1.2 This Greater Cambridge Local Plan Consultation Statement: Development Strategy Update (Regulation 18 Preferred Options) relates specifically to representations relevant to decisions being taken in early 2023 with regard to the development strategy and key strategic sites as set out below. Representations relating to other topics will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan in due course.

1.3 This Consultation Statement builds on the content set out in, and should be read in conjunction with:

- GCLP First Proposals Consultation Statement (September 2021) – this reports on engagement and consultation held prior to the First Proposals consultation, and set out the approach to consulting on the First Proposals; and
- Report on First Proposals Consultation (June 2022) - this provides an overview of the First Proposals consultation, the activities undertaken to encourage participation, and how many people were reached.

1.4 This Consultation Statement cross-refers to, and can be read in conjunction with, the Strategy topic paper: Development Strategy Update (Regulation 18 Preferred Options) (January 2023).

2. What's in this version of the Consultation Statement?

2.1 This Consultation Statement: Development Strategy Update provides a summary of the main issues raised by representations to the First Proposals consultation, and how they have been taken into account in the development of the Plan, only insofar as they are relevant to the decisions being made in early 2023. These decisions address the following topics:

- Identification of updated objectively assessed needs for development;
- Consideration of issues affecting delivery of jobs and homes; and

- Identification of priority sites for development, within a potential wider development strategy yet to be determined.

2.2 As such, this Consultation Statement includes responses to representations on selected elements of the following policies, as follows:

- Appendix A: Summaries of Representations and Responses – Development Strategy
  - S/JH: New jobs and homes
  - S/DS: Development strategy
- Appendix B: Summaries of Representations – North East Cambridge, Cambridge East, Cambridge Biomedical Campus
  - S/NEC: North East Cambridge
  - S/CE: Cambridge East
  - S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus

2.3 In addition to the above:

- Within Appendix B, representation summaries are also included for S/CB Cambourne and S/NS New settlements as representations to these policies touch on strategy issues of housing delivery, with responses to main issues arising addressed under S/DS Development Strategy.
- Appendix C: Summary of Representations on Strategy: Quick Questionnaire is also included – responses to these representations are provided as relevant within the response to the policy they are associated with.

2.4 Representations on topics not addressed in this Consultation Statement are not relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time. A full Consultation Statement will be completed to support the draft plan consultation.

3. Note about Duty to Cooperate

3.1 The duty to cooperate is a legal test that requires cooperation between local planning authorities and other public bodies to maximise the effectiveness of policies for strategic matters in Local Plans. The Strategy topic paper: Development Strategy Update (Regulation 18 Preferred Options) addresses Duty to Cooperate matters so far as they relate to the decisions being taken in early 2023. A separate Greater Cambridge Local Plan Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground setting out an updated position regarding the main areas of common and uncommon ground with relevant partners on strategic cross-boundary matters will be completed to support the draft plan consultation.

4. Consultation Statement approach

Approach overview to summarising representations and responding to main issues

4.1 The approach taken to identifying the main issues raised by representations to the First Proposals consultation, and how they have been taken into account in the development of the Plan insofar as they are relevant to the decisions being made in early 2023, as set out in the appendices to this Consultation Statement, is as follows:

- Representations Executive Summary – provides a summary of main issues raised by representations to that policy
- Response to representations – provides a brief response to the main issues raised by representations to that policy (this response is consistent with the responses to representations set out in the Strategy Topic Paper: Development Strategy Update, which draw on the fuller narrative within that document)
- Table of representations – summarises issues raised in representations in more detail, with associated representation names and numbers

4.2 For the avoidance of doubt, the Councils have taken all representations to the First Proposals relevant to the decisions being made in early 2023 into account in developing this iteration of the Plan. The appendices which follow are not directed at specific representations but identify and address the main issues raised within representations.

Specific features within the approach to summarising representations and responding to main issues

4.3 Note that on several occasions representations were submitted to a section that were considered to be more relevant to another policy. For example, some responses attributed to ‘How much development and where’ and ‘New settlements’ were relevant to Policy S/JH Jobs and Homes. Such representations have been moved to the relevant policy’s table of representations within the appendices; main issues arising have also been responded to the relevant policy. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format: Representation number* (Name of respondent). Other representations were submitted to one policy but were more relevant to another policy. We have kept such representations where they were submitted, but have responded to the main issues arising in the most relevant policy.

4.4 Sub-sections reporting the number of representations for a policy show a figure representing the number of representations attributed to that section or policy within our consultation system. This figure does not take into account any representations moved in the way described above.

4.5 Abbreviations used in the appendices include:

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

Appendix A: Summaries of representations and responses – Development Strategy

Introduction

This appendix includes summaries, by policy, of the main issues raised in representations and provides a summary response; a fuller narrative is provided in the Strategy Topic Paper: Development Strategy Update.

Decisions being taken in early 2023 relate only to limited aspects of the development strategy and only those issues are addressed in the responses to representations below. Representations on topics not addressed in the responses below are not relevant to those decisions, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Greater Cambridge in 2041: consultation format and process

Consultation format and approach

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink- Greater Cambridge in 2041 > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 240 (albeit see note below)

Note

Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only the vision and aims, a significant proportion of comments attached to this webpage relate to the development strategy, consultation approach and plan process. Comments shown in this section relate only to consultation approach. Comments relating to Vision and Aims were published for the JLPAG meeting held on 4th October. Comments relating to development strategy have been moved to either S/JH or S/DS as relevant. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

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

Representations executive summary

Some representations commented on the format and approach to consultation. Regarding consultation format, a few comments by community organisations noted the complexity of information provided and requested simpler presentation; a few individuals noted challenges in responding via electronic means; Campaign for the Protection of Rural England argued that more hard copies should have been made available in accessible locations. Regarding consultation approach, a number of comments suggested that the

consultation was premature and should have waited for greater certainty, for example in relation to regional water planning processes, and that there should have been greater consideration of the interrelationship of this consultation with other related consultations including those run by Greater Cambridge Partnership. Other comments suggested specific amendments or corrections to diagrams or wording in the consultation.

Response to representations

Representations on this topic are not relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to these issues will be provided at that time.

Table of representations: Consultation format and approach

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Welcome opportunity to comment and largely support approach taken. Appreciate digitally presented and structured documentation to make it as accessible as possible to everyone. Use of maps and diagrams is effective. Ability to explore documentation through “themes” and “maps” is particularly helpful way of organising.	59705 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
Note the complexity of information. Not easy for people to understand the proposals sufficiently to meaningfully comment. Ask that future consultations use simpler language and format.	59717 (Swavesey PC)
Consultation Process - pleased with opportunity to engage to the extent it is able. But convoluted process, material is voluminous, 60 policies and maps difficult to interpret electronically, militates against inclusion of diverse age and socio-economic groups in a rural population. Further thought needed into reducing complexity but increasing inclusion, accessibility, and meaningfulness of consultation.	59858 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Economic and social consequences of pandemic and its aftermath could be significant, yet no assessment of any possible future changes is built into proposals. A delay to consultation would give time for some indications of impacts relating to local jobs and housing to emerge and be integrated.	60250* (T Orgee), 58896* (R Donald)
Questionable issues of timing. Premature plan because too many key facts which will inform it remain unavailable; Making Connections, Cambridge Eastern Access, LTCP consultation, Water Resources East Regional Water Plan, Ox-Cam Arc. Also, relationship to UK Innovation and Cambridge-Norwich Tech Corridors, driven by business interests but little public debate and not part of accepted national strategy.	59545 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Democratic deficit in process and evidence basis. Engagement events planned at too short notice.	60240 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Democratic deficit in process and evidence basis. Sewage in rivers and chalk streams is of national concern, not part of Water Resources East remit. Consultation on regional water plan summer 2022. Plan appears inordinately influenced by unelected Greater Cambridge Partnership, has business interests on its board. Consistent with self-appointed Arc Leaders Group promoting Ox-Cam Arc. Modelling used to inform CPIER, cited in Employment Land and Economic Development Study, does not take into account social and environmental issues.	60240* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Webpage wording discourages feedback whilst saying it welcomes it. Emailed response because couldn't see another way of responding that wasn't the quick questionnaire.	59436 (Anonymous)
Concerns regarding the consultation approach including: • Concern at length and complexity of information in technical documents; combined with over-simplification of consultation material, making it difficult to get a sense of the whole proposition. • Concern that the consultation was not easily accessible to those without computer and internet access; only very limited availability to the documents in hard copy at public	59540 (Campaign to Protect of Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
locations; information regarding location of available documents was not included in public notice. • Public events were not accessible to more rural areas of the district • Overlap in timing with related Greater Cambridge Partnership consultations • Overlap with consultation and development of Combined Authority's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan • Premature ahead of confirmation of water supply	
All offered response formats are inadequate. Consultation makes too many assumptions, and demands a formulaic response to a complex and interconnected series of issues.	59459 (Cambridge Labour Party Environment Forum)
Short tick-box 'survey' and your 'detailed response' mechanisms wholly unsatisfactory. Options to use phones, apps etc. are of zero benefit; I do not own a smart phone.	60209 (J V Neal)
Introduction should make the plan period more obvious	56872 (J Prince)
Graphic of tree is misleading as it suggests the proposals represent best way of achieving the benefits, whereas the benefits either already exist or can be achieved by other and less damaging means. Use of the image therefore indicates a significant flaw underlying the proposals.	59598 (M Lynch)
Misleading omission of housing proposed as part of Cambridge Biomedical Campus in Figure 4	56963* (Trumpington Residents Association)
Figure 33 not all of the annotations are correct. For example new allocations at Gt Shelford and Duxford should be purple.	59645 (Historic England)
Glossary - Please add Scheduled Monument and Registered Park and Garden, significance, and setting.	59688 (Historic England)
Glossary - Welcomes inclusion of 'waterways and bodies of water' (page 358) in definition of green infrastructure. Term blue and green infrastructure could equally be used. Welcome inclusion of water, waste, and green infrastructure in definition of infrastructure (page 360). Text for SuDS (page 366) requires editing.	60485 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

How much development and where?

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink- How much development and where?> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 92 (albeit see note below)

Note

Content in the webpage linked above provided a narrative overview of the proposed strategy. All comments responding to this page relate to the development levels and strategy. Within this document, these comments have been moved to either policy S/JH or policy S/DS as relevant. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format: Representation number* (Name of respondent).

S/JH: New Jobs and Homes

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy S/JH: New Jobs and Homes> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think'> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 189 (albeit see note below)

Note

A small number of representations attributed to 'How much development and where' and 'New settlements' were relevant to Policy S/JH and have therefore been included in the table below. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format: Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Representations executive summary

A number of comments, in particular those also promoting specific development sites, welcomed the decision to exceed the housing target derived from the national 'standard method' for calculating the number of new homes. However, they also stressed the economic strengths of Greater Cambridge and, therefore, wanted the higher jobs forecast to apply and for this to influence a higher housing target. Evidence cited to inform this view included the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) 2018, historic growth trends, housing affordability and the ongoing need to reduce in-commuting to Greater Cambridge. In many cases, references to this evidence were linked to the promotion of individual development sites not included in the Plan. Some respondents wanted to see the housing target regarded as a minimum, which should be reviewed regularly in relation to jobs growth. A considerable amount of detailed technical evidence was provided which challenged the methodology for and approach to calculating the jobs and homes targets. This included concerns about the approach not taking account of supressed demand in past trends, recognising that historically employment growth across the area has been higher than forecasted.

Conversely, a range comments, particularly from individuals, parish councils, residents' associations and other organisations, questioned the need for the levels of growth included in the Plan. Concerns raised included the effect on climate change; the availability of water supply and the associated impacts on our area's chalk streams; the effect of development on water quality; insufficient transport and healthcare infrastructure; a reduced quality of life for existing residents and a harmful impact on local character. Some respondents noted the challenges associated with accurately forecasting jobs and homes over the plan period, due particularly to the effects of Brexit, the Covid-19 pandemic and higher levels of homeworking. Reference was also made to the importance of taking account of the 2021 Census. A number of respondents expressed concern that housing targets for Neighbourhood Areas are likely to dissuade areas from preparing Neighbourhood Plans; others wanted to see more land allocated in sustainable rural settlements to support local services.

Response to representations

The Greater Cambridge Economic Development, Employment Land and Housing Relationships report (EDELHR) was completed in 2022 to update our understanding of employment and housing needs for the draft plan stage. This report comprises a proportionate check of the published Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Base 2020 (ELEDS) and the associated Housing and Employment Relationships Report 2020, drawing on latest jobs growth data, COVID-19 and home working trends, Census 2021, and accounting for substantive representations to the First Proposals.

The response to representations relevant to this policy includes:

- **Arguments to consider higher jobs/homes figures**: The EDELHR takes a robust approach to calculating the most likely employment outcome, allowing for future cycles and shocks. The EDELHR stated that the higher employment scenario is 'a less likely outcome as it overly relies on the continuation of recent high rates of overall growth'. As such, the 2022 maximum level of homes, associated with the higher employment scenario, is not considered to represent the objectively assessed need for homes in Greater Cambridge, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative.
- **Arguments to adopt Standard Method minimum homes**: Regarding comments questioning why we should plan for more than government's Standard Method minimum, the EDELHR found that planning for the Standard Method housing figure set by government would not support the number of jobs expected to arise between 2020 and 2041. It would also

be a substantially lower annual level of jobs provision than has been created over recent years. Planning for this housing figure would risk increasing further the amount of longer distance commuting into Greater Cambridge, with the resulting impacts on climate change and congestion. As such, 2022 Standard Method local housing need and the related number of jobs that that would support, are not considered to represent the objectively assessed need for homes and jobs in Greater Cambridge, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative. Responses to comments regarding the negative implications of growth are relevant to provision of homes and employment floorspace in response to identified needs. As such they are addressed in Policy S/DS: Development strategy.

- **Methodology and jobs forecasts challenges:** The EDELHR takes a robust approach to identifying the most likely jobs forecast, drawing upon latest available data in a way that is consistent with the approach taken in the published ELEDS**.** The approach to identifying the housing that would be needed to support this incorporates an assumption of providing opportunities for workers in those additional jobs to live close to where they work, thereby mitigating against additional longer distance commuting beyond that assumed by Standard Method. This approach would also help limit further affordability pressures associated with housing delivery lagging behind employment, in contrast to the alternative of identifying our need to be the Standard Method housing figure.
- **Need to account for COVID-19 and other changes:** The EDELHR approach takes account of latest jobs growth data, COVID-19 and home working trends and Census 2021 data and interviews with stakeholders.
- **Planning for industrial space:** The EDELHR considers updated property market data, supply trends and market signals as part of its recommended approach to identifying industrial/warehousing sector needs.

Table of representations: S/JH: New Jobs and Homes

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The higher job forecast across the Plan period should be used and thereby a greater number of homes are required as: • The lower figure does not take on board CPIER forecasts. • Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Economic Review (CPIER) 2018 has recognised that there has been a higher rate of economic growth than forecast, predicts this growth	**Other Organisations** 60518 (Cambridge Ahead) **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 56711 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57112 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 56894 (RWS Ltd), 56993 (Hastingwood

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
will continue and states that doubling economic output by 2040 is realistic. • The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Deal indicates that higher levels of growth should be planned for the Greater Cambridge • The lower figure does not reflect the anticipated growth aspirations of the Oxford to Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework and the key role of Greater Cambridge in achieving them • the lower figure does not reflect the fact that the economic success of Greater Cambridge and its sectors are of national and international importance. • The lower figure does not reflect previous trends - a historic reversion to the mean would show that the most acceptable Plan projection to be KS1 (2.1% p.a.) • The draft Plan, knowingly, focuses only on the 'most likely' of just two employment growth scenarios, with no weighting given to the scenario that is based on the most recent trends. Were weighting to be given to the scenario that is based on the most recent trends, it is likely that the associated housing requirement would increase by c. 9% to 48,300 homes. • Preferred option is based on an employment growth rate to 2041 for life sciences and other key sectors as the lower quartile between the EEFM baseline and the historic growth rate between 2001-17, therefore planning for reduced economic development in those sectors	Developments), 57050 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57081 (Shelford Investments), 57092 (RO Group Ltd), 57120 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57149 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57192 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 57196 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57329 (Clarendon Land and Development Ltd), 57341 (HD Planning Ltd), 57344 & 58496 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 57513 (R2 Developments Ltd), 57543, 57546, 57552, 57555 & 58476 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited), 57633 (Dudley Developments), 57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 57682 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 57892 & 58527 (Martin Grant Homes), 58002 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58151 (Hill Residential), 58185 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58189 (SmithsonHill), 58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58253 (Bletsoes), 58273 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58301 (University of Cambridge), 58360 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms Hardington LLP58367 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58424 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58454 & 58504 (Hill Residential Limited), 58529 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58542 (Artisan UK Projects Ltd), 58556, 58958, 59108, 59241, 59737 & 59738 (Endurance Estates), 58583 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site), 58637 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58659 & 58683 (Wates

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• There is a need to provide housing for employees and overcome existing severe difficulties recruiting talent for the knowledge-based jobs that are being created in the Cambridge area. • There is a need to improve housing affordability and to ensure that it does not become worse. • There is a need to reduce in-commuting. • There is an existing imbalance between rates of economic growth and housing delivery in Greater Cambridge. • If a correct balance between jobs and houses is not achieved, this runs the risk of further increasing house prices. • The significant momentum and political weight behind funding, infrastructure improvements and growth initiatives in Greater Cambridge. • Using the lower figure means Greater Cambridge would be planning for growth comparable to area's that do not have GC's unique life sciences cluster. This will undermine the 'Cambridge Phenomenon' that has been gathering pace since the 1960s, but is only now starting to convert the academic advances in life sciences into commercial success. • To provide flexibility to support the significant economic growth in the area. • The Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of all aspects of life science research. • Technical issues with the employment modelling used.	Developments Ltd), 58661 (The Church Commissioners for England), 58727 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58902 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance), 58909 (Clare College, Cambridge), 58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 58954 (Jesus College - working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings - a private landowner and St John's College), 59075 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 59142 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59319 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 59475 (Cheffins), 59832 (MCA Developments Ltd), 60147 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60185 (Home Builders Federation), 60218 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60244 (Bidwells), 60262 & 60266 (Gonville & Caius College), 60267 (The White Family and Pembroke College), 60270 (Commercial Estates Group), 60294 (Miller Homes - Fulbourn site), 60301 (Miller Homes - Melbourn site), 60309 (Gladman Developments), 60322 (Daniels Bros (Shefford) Ltd60509 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60540 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60546 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60562 (Countryside Properties), 60567 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60578 (Martin Grant Homes), 60608 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site), 60609 (CALA Group Ltd), 60623 (NIAB Trust – Girton site), 60631 (NIAB Trust), 60667 (Mill Stream Developments), 60758 (U+I Group PLC), 56480 (V Chapman), 56488 (D & B Searle), 56516 (RJ & JS

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• No account is taken of reductions in floorspace, the demand for logistics and data centres, and the fact most of the supply is not available until post 2041.	Millard), 58627 (R Grain), 56498 (W Grain), 57061 (C Meadows), 57102 (J Francis), 57300 (AJ Johnson), 58145 (J Manning), 58363 (D Moore), 58789 (S Grain), 60385 (David Wright), 60477 (P,J & M Crow)
Questions/concerns whether sufficient upward adjustments to the housing requirement have been made to meet the requirements of Section Id.2a of the Planning Practice Guidance on Housing and economic needs assessment to take into account: • growth strategies • strategic infrastructure improvements • housing affordability	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 56993 (Hastingwood Developments), 57050 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57081 (Shelford Investments), 57092 (RO Group Ltd); 57112 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57120 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family); 57196 (MPM Properties TH Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57344 & 58496 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57633 (Dudley Developments), 57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 57682 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 58185 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58367 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58424 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58902 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance), 58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 60147 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 57061 (C Meadows), 57102 (J Francis), 57300 (AJ Johnson), 58145 (J Manning)
There is a recognition amongst national and local agencies that there is a need to substantially increase housing delivery in Greater Cambridge to support economic growth and address significant housing affordability issues.	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 58145 (J Manning), 56993 (Hastingwood Developments), 57050 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57081 (Shelford Investments), 57092 (RO Group Ltd); 57120 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family); 57196 (MPM Properties TH Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57300 (AJ Johnson), 57344 & 58496 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57633 (Dudley Developments), 57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	Site), 57682 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 58185 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58367 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58424 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58709 (TWI), 58902 (Ely Diocesan Board of Finance), 58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 60147 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 57061 (C Meadows), 57102 (J Francis)
The higher growth level option will require infrastructure funding, but there are existing transport improvements already planned for Greater Cambridge and further investment in infrastructure (e.g. water and electricity) will need to be secured as part of the Oxford to Cambridge Arc.	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 56993 (Hastingwood Developments), 57050 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57061 (C Meadows), 57081 (Shelford Investments), 57092 (RO Group Ltd); 57102 (J Francis); 57112 (Cambridge District Oddfellows); 57120 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family); 57196 (MPM Properties TH Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57344 & 58496 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57633 (Dudley Developments), 57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 57682 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 58145 (J Manning), 58185 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58367 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58424 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 60147 (U&I PLC and TOWN)
Marshall recognises the level of growth that has been put forward by the GCSP and the proposed delivery of a number of homes that exceeds the standard methodology calculations. Marshall encourages the GCSP to reconsider the opportunity to aspire for greater employment growth that captures the true economic potential of Greater Cambridge.	58349 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The SA should have tested the higher jobs forecast as a reasonable alternative, given it is a possible albeit not the most likely future scenario.	58851 (Scott Properties)
The SA fails to consider any alternative other than the level of need set out in the GCLP first proposals consultation. The SA should reflect the uncertainty about housing and employment needs. The SA fails to recognise that the greater in-commuting resulting from a higher employment need would be negated by increased housing. Its reasons for limiting the assessment of reasonable alternatives are self-defeating. The justification for discounting Option B however is clearly erroneous. If it was only necessary to assess the "most likely future scenario", there would be no assessment of alternatives of any kind. This is contrary to the entire purpose of SA and SEA.	60244 (Bidwells)
The 'Maximum continue existing patterns' scenario - 78,000 jobs and 53,500 homes, is not just possible but is what the evidence suggests is actually the most likely future scenario.	58529 (MacTaggart & Mickel)
It is requested that jobs requirements in Policy S/JH are based on delivering the higher growth level option	58709 (TWI)
The housing provision should be towards the top range of 2,900 homes per year as suggested by the CPIER report and 2,825 homes per year (56,500 homes over the plan period) as set out in the HERR report. It is imperative to ensure that the growth in employment is matched by housebuilding. If a correct balance between jobs and houses is not achieved, this runs the risk of further increasing house prices.	57329 (Clarendon Land and Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
OAN should be increased to at least 2,549dpa to align housing and economic growth and support the objectives of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc.	60322 (Daniels Bros (Shefford) Ltd)
An indicative calculation based on CPIER suggests that, if the jobs growth targets are to be achieved, around 2,900 homes a year would need to be built - an indicative total of 66,900 homes over 2020-2041.	60385 (David Wright)
44,000 new homes should be expressed as a minimum and that the policy should have flexibility to allow further homes to come forward in certain circumstances e.g. the planned supply of homes not coming forward during the currently anticipated timescales, or if growth in the number of jobs leads again to the current problems of higher house prices and higher in-commuting.	57249 (Deal Land LLP), 60270 (Commercial Estates Group)
Were a 2:1 weighting to be applied to the two ('central' and 'higher') scenarios, in favour of the 'most likely' but not dismissing the potential contribution of the most trends, one would arrive at a projected jobs growth of c. 65,200 and a consequential need for between c. 45,800 and 48,300 homes. Adopting the same approach that leads to the proposed housing requirement of 44,400 homes would result in a requirement for 48,300 homes – approximately 9% more than is proposed.	58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)
Housing target should be based on achieving a blended economic growth rate of 2.8% per annum and should be 4,400 dwellings per annum to meet this economic growth rate.	58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)
The additional 550 homes a year should be regarded as a minimum figure, which should be reviewed regularly in relation to the growth in jobs within the travel-to-work areas.	60043 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The Plan period should be extended to at least 2050 in order to align with the Plan period for the OxCam Arc's Strategic Framework. This would help facilitate for properly planned strategic growth across the wider region over the next 30 years.	58661 (The Church Commissioners for England), 60567 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
Issues with the employment modelling: • The EEFM model is constrained to the 2016 Sub National Population Projections at the regional level. • Many of the assumptions of the EEFM model are fixed at the 2011 Census results, such as in the commuting matrix that determines residence employment. • The dampening down of the exponential growth in recent historical average growth rates were applied is based on the EEFM baseline projection. This projection fails to adequately address growth in the key sectors in the first place. • No consideration appears to have been given to a scenario using the upper quartile. • There appears to be little analysis of which quartile (which are in themselves arbitrary) might be the most appropriate beyond the assertion that the Greater Cambridge economy is at a peak and over the longer-term growth will likely be lower than that seen in the past decade. This fails to recognise the unique narrative behind the exceptional growth seen in the past decade. • Up until 2018 development in Greater Cambridge had been constrained/dampened by County and regional planning, the Cambridge Green Belt and the 2008 recession. It was therefore only after 2018 that investment truly started to	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
reflect its full potential. Given that most of the data used in the ELEDES pre-dates 2018, prior to the adoption of the local plans, it is highly unlikely that it represents the peak in the Greater Cambridge economic cycle. • The mid-point or the upper quartile might be more appropriate, perhaps an even higher figure. • The analysis in the ELEDES does not seem to recognise the 'sticky' relationship between sectors. If one sector is being uplifted from the EEFM baseline, all other sectors should also be uplifted to some degree to balance the economy. • The lowest the GCLP should be planning for is 45,761 jobs, which is linked to the Local Housing Need Standard Method (LHNSM), rather than the EEFM 40,100 jobs. • Employment need is likely to be the average between the 2001-2017 annual average change and 2011-2017 annual average change, 90,250 jobs. This closely reflects the CPEIR proxy result of 92,100 jobs. This would seem to best fit the requirements of the NPPF by reflecting an unconstrained view of employment growth while recognising what is realistically deliverable.	
The methods for developing the employment projection scenarios deviate, markedly so, from the historic and recent growth rates in the area without any basis in evidence. The actual long run figures produced by GL Hearn appear substantially reduced in the Plan without any evidential basis, which has the effect of aligning projections on the same basis as the EEFM previously criticised by the CPIER.	60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
How GL Hearn's analysis of the historical data and projections to 2041 set out in Table 51 relate to the earlier Tables 43 and 48, and then proceed on the basis of this analysis to recommend the Plan's projected growth rates - KS3/1.1% and KS2/1.5% set out in Table 5227 - is entirely opaque yet is such a critical element of the overall analysis.	60518 (Cambridge Ahead)
Against this argument about growth in the period 2011-17 being extraordinary and should therefore be discounted in assessing the prospective Plan rates of growth, the BRES results for actual growth across 2017-20, let alone for the combined BRES/CBR data, entirely contradict the view that the underlying rate of growth is falling back.	60518 (Cambridge Ahead)
Question the jobs numbers, whether gross or net, forecasts or projections.	59764* (B Hunt)
Concerned about how required housing has been assessed.	59258* (Teversham PC)
There should be no more homes or businesses than are required by Government. The resources of the area cannot cope and there is not the capacity to increase those resources.	57221* (D Lott)
Approach to forecasting employment growth must also take into account suppressed demand and more accurately account for historic or current property market dynamics. Fundamental concerns in this regard, particularly in relation to industrial land which is highly constrained in the area and exhibits old stock. Additional factors need to be taken into account in estimating future need, including: • Typical levels of demand at other similar local authorities of up to 27,300 sqm (300,000 sqft) per annum; • National benchmarks of floorspace per dwelling of about 6.4 sqm per dwelling compared to Greater Cambridge's 3.5 sqm per dwelling;	57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58958, 59108 & 59241 (Endurance Estates), 60608 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Future demand generated by the 44,400 new dwellings to be delivered over the draft plan period; and • Footloose demand from national and international occupiers	
In terms of job growth target and employment floorspace requirement, the following comments are made: 1. In projecting past trends, the floorspace requirement will constrain jobs growth to levels below what has been forecast, particularly the level forecast by the Cambridge & Peterborough Independent Economic Review (2018) (CPIER); 2. Floorspace requirements do not take into account reductions in floorspace over the Plan period as older or lower quality employment land and buildings are redeveloped for alternative uses; 3. Implications of the growth in logistics arising from changes in the economy, including growth in online retailing, should be considered in light of the findings of the update to the Retail and Leisure Study; and, 4. Implications of the growth in Data Centres on the demand for employment floorspace over the Plan period should be considered.	58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
In terms of supply to meet the employment floorspace requirement, noted that a substantial proportion of the identified supply is not available until post 2041. It cannot therefore contribute to meeting the requirement and the jobs target. Additional supply is therefore required, in the form of new allocations.	58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Alternative figures provided for employment growth: • The lowest the GCLP should be planning for is 45,761 jobs, which is linked to the Local Housing Need Standard Method (LHNSM), rather than the EEFM 40,100 jobs.	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Realistically, employment need is likely to be the average between the 2001-2017 annual average change and 2011-2017 annual average change, 90,250 jobs. This closely reflects the CPEIR proxy result of 92,100 jobs. This would seem to best fit the requirements of the NPPF by reflecting an unconstrained view of employment growth while recognising what is realistically deliverable.	
Plan should provide flexibility to facilitate higher job growth. Historically the employment growth across Greater Cambridge has been higher than predicted. This is also notwithstanding the recent introduction of Use Class E, which may see greater movement between the previous Class B Uses and additional employment sites coming forward with the potential intensification of existing employment sites, thereby increasing the need for housing land.	58659 & 58683 (Wates Developments Ltd), 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)
To provide for appropriate flexibility for unforeseen economic growth, a range of additional contingency site allocations should be included within the housing trajectory.	58659 & 58683 (Wates Developments Ltd)
The 10% buffer proposed is not sufficient and additional sites should be allocated to provide flexibility. Further work will be required to identify the size of an increased buffer but this should be at least 15%	58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)
Whilst the Councils have nominally been able to show that they will be able to demonstrate a 5YHLS on adoption of the Plan, this projection is prone to challenge and is not robust	58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)
There is a housing supply of 5.15 years which is close to the minimum amount required. The uncertainty around the deliverability of sites means that there is reasonable potential for the council to	59068 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
not meet its housing targets if multiple developers fail to provide housing within the five year period. Therefore, the council should consider additional suitable housing sites through a more dispersed approach to development across settlements within the Plan area that could be delivered within the five year period to ensure that it can safely meet its housing target	
To meet its assessed need, the Council is only proposing a limited number of new allocations at urban extensions and new settlements and is seeking to realise additional capacity from existing allocated and committed sites as provided for in the existing strategy. In practice, the risks to delivery mean that the Council's stated provision for the 'medium' scenario plus a 10% buffer is unlikely to be achieved within the plan period utilising very limited additional sources of flexibility.	59737 & 59738 (Endurance Estates)
Policies S/JH and D/DS would not be sound on the basis because they would not be justified or effective. Our view is that for a housing delivery strategy to be effective, it will be required to take into account all reasonable alternatives to deliver the right amount of housing in the right place, including further small and medium sized additional housing sites.	60667 (Mill Stream Developments)
For the housing delivery strategy to be effective, it will be required to take into account all reasonable alternatives to deliver the right type and amount of rural housing, in the right place to meet local needs, including much-needed affordable homes. The absence of additional housing allocations within the rural southwestern part of South Cambridgeshire other than the two sites at Melbourn, means that	60667 (Mill Stream Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Plan is unlikely to meet the specific housing needs of this part of Greater Cambridge.	
Development should be focused towards existing employment clusters, such as Granta Park	58709 (TWI)
The HERR recommends a jobs target of 58,500-78,700. This range is vast given the importance of the issue and the need for planning policies to be flexible and respond to changing circumstances (NPPF para 33); as such: • The higher jobs growth should be planned for as a minimum or further work is required by the Councils to identify an appropriate point within this range for the GCLP to positively plan for. • an early review mechanism is included if employment growth continues to run substantially above anticipated levels, in order that sufficient sites can be brought forward more quickly to accommodate this growth.	58527 (Martin Grant Homes), 60274 (Commercial Estates Group), 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)
Our assessment of the proposed employment numbers over the Plan period shows that growth in the Plan area has been underestimated. Our assessment outlines what we consider to be more realistic job numbers which are higher than those in the emerging Plan [*NB Alternative job numbers apparently not specified in representations*]	57543, 57546, 57552 & 57555 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited)
The supply figures incorporate some large sites which will be built out well beyond the plan period, as such the identified unmet need within the plan period is potentially far greater than identified above.	58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Statements in paragraphs 6.37 and 6.38 of the ELR are contradictory, and it is not clear whether the ELR considers that the	58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
loss of B8 floorspace will continue in Cambridge City or not. Notwithstanding, we consider it prudent for the Councils to plan on the basis of the full identified need for B8 floorspace in South Cambridgeshire (i.e. 93,849 sq m).	
It is important that sites which are in locations capable of delivering B2/B8 employment uses or capable of accommodating existing businesses who wish to relocate are fully considered and identified through the Local plan process in order that the future demand can be met.	58556 (Endurance Estates)
In considering new employment growth consideration should be given through the plan making process to identify potential employment sites which are located on key transport corridors (A14; M11 or A10) to ensure this employment sector is catered for and suitable sites are identifies throughout the district.	58556 (Endurance Estates)
Draft Policy S/JH clearly underestimates and fails to meet the need for employment floorspace, particularly Class B8 logistics floorspace. This does not reflect NPPF para 83 that calls for planning policies to recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors, including storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations.	59076 & 59318 (Newlands Developments)
Changes Requested: • The evidence base supporting the draft Local Plan is updated to reflect recent market and economic trends, particularly in terms of e-commerce and the impact this has had on demand for logistics floorspace. • The scale of employment development envisaged within the evidence base and emerging Local Plan is significantly increased to	59076 (Newlands Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
align with economic trends and to take into account the wider ambitions for the region and the vision for the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. • The Brickyard Farm site is allocated to assist in meeting the employment needs of Greater Cambridge. • Ensuring policy sets the assessed land requirement as a minimum rather than a ceiling on employment-generating development in Greater Cambridge. • The proposed Policy restriction on large scale regional and national warehousing and distribution within the area in draft Policy J/NE be removed to align with national planning policy guidance.	
Despite the decision by the EELGA to discontinue updating the EEFM, it should not be automatically disregarded. It provides a good indicator of how the economy may develop within the context of the assumptions included in the model.	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)
Companies are being 'priced out' of Cambridge, not only reducing the range of businesses present but the range of job opportunities for the local population as a direct result. This does not appear to have been picked up in the Councils' evidence base and is an important reminder that the success of the Cambridge phenomenon cannot be taken for granted. Local Plan needs to address the knock-on impact of the phenomenon on other areas of the economy and ensure that these are also supported.	57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58958 & 59241 (Endurance Estates)
Greater Cambridge relies on other parts of the wider region to provide industrial premises, which is contrary to national guidance and planning policy. Whilst the Councils' study identifies an existing deficit in the supply of B2/B8 premises (reflecting anticipated losses)	57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58958, 59108 & 59241 (Endurance Estates), 60608 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
of 55,000 sqm, the study's three forecast methods generate weak to negative levels of need that do not account for the need to address the ongoing losses of industrial premises and the current highly limited options for industrial occupiers in Greater Cambridge	
Is there flexibility in the type and location of employment sites? Does the Council have a clear understanding of which sectors have been its key growth areas in recent years and what type of employment space and infrastructure would be needed (and where) if these sectors continue to grow?	60518 (Cambridge Ahead)
Economic growth must be sustainable and it would be inappropriate to determine a level of need that is undeliverable, as advocated by the NPPF.	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)
It is difficult to determine exactly how much employment need there is in the context of such a vibrant economy.	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)
It would be more appropriate, at least as a reasonable alternative, to reverse the analysis and instead consider the available capacity for growth in the area and determine how this sits with the various economic projections under consideration. This work will be essential to determining if any unmet housing and/or employment needs exist for the purposes of the Duty to Cooperate, determining the level of employment and housing need that is actually deliverable.	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)
The Councils should allocate additional employment land to meet the 'higher jobs' forecast or undertake further work to identify an appropriate jobs target within the range identified by the HERR.	57526 (H d'Abo)
There are issues with the conversion from homes: • the baseline resident population used:	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
○ ignores student housing entirely, which will have supported a considerable population. ○ where students are occupying market housing, they tend to do so at far greater densities (people per household) than families. • The Housing Land Supply report identifies that 1,112 dwellings were completed in Cambridge in 2017/18 and 868 dwellings in 2018/19. However, the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results suggests that the number of homes delivered, which includes communal establishments, was 1,145 and 1,098 respectively. This suggests 13% more homes than dwellings alone. • Rather than just blending the two sources of population data, it would be better to provide scenarios considering the implications of using the official estimates, the patient register and different blends of the two. This would allow the reader to understand the sensitivities involved. • Modelling should be revised to consider the implications of a 1:1 commuting scenario on all jobs to be delivered by the GCLP as: ○ LHNSM is purely a policy tool for determining the minimum number of homes LPAs should seek to plan for. Its inaccuracies are well documented and there is no valid reason to include it in any form in a more comprehensive analysis of housing need. • It would be appropriate to consider the implications of a further uplift in housing to remedy the rise in in-commuting as	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
a result of the adopted local plans failing to provide sufficient housing for the actual growth in employment. This has led to housing pressures in surrounding areas that were not planned for and would perpetuate a pattern of unsustainable commuting unless addressed. • There appears to be confusion by what is actually meant by 'homes' (referred to in the Topic Paper and GCLP first proposals) and 'dwellings' (referred to in the HER). • It is clear that a considerable number of homes in communal establishments were delivered in 2017/18 and 2018/19, and it is highly likely that similar numbers were delivered each year since 2011. Therefore the starting assumptions for the base date are likely to be incorrect and this is likely to have influenced the household formation rates used. • The housing requirement of 44,400 must be dwellings only because it does not include any consideration of communal establishments of any kind.	
The economic variables used that are considered acceptable include unemployment rates, economic activity rates and double-jobbing.	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)
The differing outputs of the two economic growth scenarios is too vast for the Councils to conclude at this early stage of the plan preparation process that the GCLP should plan for the lower figure. The HERR states that the GCLP should plan for economic growth within the range of the two scenarios and the Councils should undertake further work to establish a housing requirement within this range or plan for the higher figure.	56711 (KB Tebbit Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Likely that the ELEDES will require revision before the GCLP is adopted due to data from the 2021 Census becoming available as areas of substantial change such as Greater Cambridge are likely to see the greatest revision.	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)
The higher growth (i.e. recommended scenario) relates to an additional 78,700 jobs across the plan period (see 2020 ELEDES para 6.11, pg.97). Therefore, there is an internal inconsistency across the Local Plan and its supporting evidence, and it is not clear how the recommended higher growth scenario of 78,700 jobs has been translated into the Local Plan's lower provision of 58,500 jobs.	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
The labour demand scenario is used to inform the employment space requirements for office and R&D uses, while light industrial, general industrial and storage and distribution space requirements have been based on the past trends scenario, and particularly a projection of the annual net completions between the monitoring years of 2011/12 and 2017/18, which is considered a very short period of time to inform policy recommendations over the next 20 years.	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
According to 2020 ELEDES Table 10 (pg.94), the job growth associated with "2011-17 annual average change", which is understood to reflect the recommended scenario for the industrial/warehousing uses, equates to 125,200 jobs across all sectors for the 2020 to 2041 period. There is no available data provided in terms of how these jobs are distributed across the various employment segments. As a result, there is no transparent evidence of how the proposed jobs growth is distributed across the various	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
employment space types and on this basis, we consider that the evidence in relation to jobs growth estimation lacks transparency and robustness.	
The Plan needs to reflect the current and future needs of the logistic industry as that need is now manifesting itself, post Covid and post Brexit. While it is seeking to provide a range of new employment space this will not, together with the existing allocations, provide a good range in the type, size and location of sites that respond to the needs of businesses.	60398 (Tritax Symmetry)
The estimation of the office and R&D jobs growth is based on a series of forecasts highlighting a policy-on view on how those sectors (which are considered historically as the key drivers of the local economy) are expected to grow further. The emphasis on office-based segments appears to characterise the approach in the Local Plan as a whole, and which therefore does not acknowledge the importance of other economic sectors, including logistics and industrial-based activity.	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
With regard to paragraphs 6.36 to 6.37 of the ELEDES, the evidence demonstrates clearly that there are specific market signals showing 'market pressure' in Cambridge City together with demand for larger units as e-commerce increases and automation evolves, both the evidence and the emerging policies choose to ignore these signals and driven by policy choices to focus on the office-based economy. This is contrary to NPPF paras 81, 82 and 83	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
Various inconsistencies and deficiencies within the Councils' evidence that means the anticipated B8 and the combined Eg(iii)/B2/B8 requirements and jobs growth are significantly	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
underestimated. Both jobs scenarios of 58,400 or 78,700 additional jobs across the Plan period suggest that over the next 20 years B8 jobs will grow by 457 jobs or 21.7 jobs per annum, while the combined Eg(iii)/B2/B8 equivalent will decrease by 1,339 jobs or by -63.7 jobs per annum across the Plan period. This contradicts the market signals and recent activity that highlight pressures to identify additional employment land in Greater Cambridge to avoid losing businesses that want to either invest or expand in the area.	
Additional B8 job growth of around 3,100 jobs to 5,700 jobs should be anticipated across the Plan period, once the strategic logistics requirements are considered as identified by NPPF and PPG.	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
The emerging policy is not soundly-based. There is need for the supporting evidence to objectively and robustly identify employment requirements across office, industrial and storage and distribution uses rather than taking a policy-on view that largely focuses on office growth and does not adequately assess the needs arising for other segments of the economy.	59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
Agree that the Plan should formulate proposals based upon the forecast of the most likely level of new jobs	60441 (Westley Waterless Parish Council)
Principle of exceeding the standard method housing target is welcomed	56711 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 56894 (RWS Ltd), 57513 (R2 Developments Ltd), 58527 (Martin Grant Homes), 58659 & 58683 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58661 (The Church Commissioners for England), 58727 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58851 (Scott Properties), 58909 (Clare College, Cambridge), 59068 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd), 59142 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59319

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	(Bridgemere Land Plc), 59832 (MCA Developments Ltd), 60185 (Home Builders Federation) 60218 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60294 (Miller Homes - Fulbourn site), 60301 (Miller Homes - Melbourn site), 60385 (David Wright), 60477 (P,J & M Crow), 60509 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60546 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60567 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60578 (Martin Grant Homes)
Supports ambitions for 44,000 new homes and 58,500 new jobs across all employment sectors.	57199 (Abrdn), 57267 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 57249 (Deal Land LLP), 58202 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail), 58911 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 59147 (Cambourne TC), 59485 (Shepreth PC), 59692 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
Support for the identified requirement for 44,400 new homes	58601* (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58748* (Great Shelford -Ten Acres- Ltd)
The Medium Growth Scenario is a sensible approach and takes into account the need to reduce commuting to the economic hubs within the authorities' areas however further work is required to confirm whether this target could be achieved, especially in relation to water supply infrastructure.	57315 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Entire projection of housing needs seems to be based on two reports from a single external consultancy. Given the importance of these projections, there should be more than one professional opinion sought.	57888 (C Schofield)
Due to the disparity between the different approaches to calculating homes and jobs numbers the Councils should take seriously the	59597 (M Lynch)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
qualification expressed on employment levels and therefore housing need in the Hearn 2 report at para 5.5: “Although the above data sets have broadly similar views on the level of employment at 2017, the count and therefore the rate of change differed substantially, making future forecasting problematic.”	
Must be strong reservations about the advisability of basing the planning policy for 2021 -2041 entirely on the figures set out in Hearn 1. The Standard Method was introduced by the Government in 2017 in order to set an ‘ambitious target’ of providing 300,000 new homes across the whole of the UK. The only justification for the construction of more dwellings than the Standard Method requires is the need to foster and sustain the remarkable advances in life sciences and healthcare led by the particular strength of scientific and technical expertise in Cambridge and the surrounding area.	59597 (M Lynch)
The 2014-based household projection for 2020 for Greater Cambridge was 119,400 households. In the 2018 based projections the estimate for 2020 is 108,500, so in four years the 2014-based projections have over-projected by around 10,000 households.	60674 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Urgent need for the most rigorous measures to reduce Co2 emissions to a minimum following the Government’s undertakings at the Glasgow COP 21 conference. To help to achieve this: (i) the number of currently unoccupied dwellings in the Greater Cambridge area should be properly taken into account within the ‘in the pipeline’ figure; and (ii) the number of new dwellings in addition to that calculated according to the Standard Method should be as far as possible secured to the sole occupation of the families of employees	59597 (M Lynch)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
of scientific and technical undertakings in the fields of life sciences and health care.	
Minimum or Medium (but not Medium Plus) housing growth recommended and justified by sustainability, already significant growth proposed that needs to be delivered, changes in working practices due to COVID-19 reduces need for housing close to work	56851 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57635 (J Conroy)
Support growth and development in our region, but it needs to be delivered in a sustainable fashion. Keen to ensure that further growth plans do not negatively impact on a number of villages and residents in my constituency. Concerned about the level of growth that has been outlined and encourage the local authorities, especially South Cambridgeshire, not to seek to increase building levels beyond the government minimum target. Also, imperative that local leaders identify and support the infrastructure requirements that our regions' already higher than average housing growth demands.	59944 (L Frazer MP)
A moderated target would lessen the uncertainty of deliverability, ease of the identified water supply issue and give time to for water companies to decide and implement sound options, and reduce climate impacts. Could provide more reserve housing sites, providing flexibility to maintain a five year housing supply, reduce pressure on villages and start to slow the pace of change in an area.	60109 (C Blakely)
Support the allocation of 10% more housing than required by the standard test to avoid unplanned development as happened in Cottenham (an extra 500 houses now being built in unplanned locations as a result of speculative development) while waiting for the adoption of the 2018 South Cambridge District Plan.	59878 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Huntingdonshire District Council are not currently looking towards neighbouring authorities to assist in meeting their housing or jobs need.	57315 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Why do you need each house to only accommodate 1.3 workers?	56736 (Croydon PC)
The GCLP should be allocating a proportionate housing requirement to established sustainable settlements, particularly those which have a Neighbourhood Plan or are a designated NP Area.	58527 (Martin Grant Homes)
Proposed approach to Neighbourhood Plan housing targets does not comply with NPPF paras 66 & 67 as it states that NP housing requirements would be met using the Local Plan windfall housing numbers - exposes shortcomings in the proposed development strategy	56711 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57513 (R2 Developments Ltd), 58253 (Bletsoes), 58527 (Martin Grant Homes)
Widespread promotion of Neighbourhood Plans is likely to act as a constraint on development in rural area as conflict between aim of boosting housebuilding and local community NIMBYism. Housing targets for Neighbourhood Areas is likely to dissuade areas from preparing Neighbourhood Plans	57082 (C King), 57293 (C Sawyer Nutt), 59108 (Endurance Estates), 60335 & 60346 (FC Butler Trust), 60367 (HJ Molton Settlement), 60375 (S & J Graves), 60385 (David Wright), 60477 (P,J & M Crow)
The Councils should carry out up-to-date local housing need surveys for the whole area (e.g. at ward or parish level) to determine local needs. Used as robust evidence for the determination of planning applications, this would be a fairer system which would guide development to the right locations and deliver affordable housing	59108 (Endurance Estates)
Adoption of the GCLP should trigger the formal review of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that distributed growth to sustainable settlements is allocated at sustainable sites within the NP Area	57513 (R2 Developments Ltd), 58527 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support an approach which identifies new housing targets for future neighbourhood areas, which do not form part of the homes figures to be met by allocations.	58273 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)
The GCLP should proactively allocate a proportionate amount of housing growth to sustainable rural settlements, such as Group Villages, which would be consistent with NPPF para 79	57513 (R2 Developments Ltd)
The general approach to identifying new rural allocations for housing is supported	58881 (St John's College Cambridge)
To allow rural settlements to thrive and offer an increased housing opportunities (including affordable housing) the GCLP should seek to allocate sites for development in a broader variety of settlements.	58253 (Bletsoes), 58360 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms Hardington LLP), 58881 (St John's College Cambridge)
More small and medium sized sites should be allocated in the Rural Southern Cluster, provided the sites are very well served by sustainable transport, in order to: provide homes where the need is greatest; reduce the need for in-commuting by workers at the research parks, and reduce carbon emissions; improve access to labour in the life science sectors of south Cambridge; speed up housing delivery in the first half of the plan; reduce reliance on windfall sites; greatly improve housing choices for residents and sustain the villages.	58428 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
A more flexible approach towards the allocation and delivery of housing sites in Rural Areas is needed. The proposed approach is preventing obvious development opportunity sites such as farm buildings within/contiguous with settlements from being developed. Such sites would enable investment and regeneration in rural communities, whilst minimising the amount of greenfield land needed for housing.	59068 (A P Burlton Turkey’s Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There is a need to deliver student accommodation for the undergraduate and postgraduate population; note that the First Proposals document confirms that these units also contribute to the overall housing requirement.	58909 (Clare College, Cambridge)
Concerns about the notion of “Windfall Development”. Either we have a Development Plan or not – the notion of “unplanned” “windfall” or “opportunistic” development – especially if it were to be determined by officers as opposed to councillors – is not compatible with “plan-led development”. The opening the door to opportunistic applications that run counter to the direction of the Development Plan.	59850 (Barrington PC)
Scope of the plan inevitably creates tensions between the interests of the city and those of the surrounding, primarily rural areas. The First Proposals also seek to support both the Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework and the proposed East West Rail connection - both of which introduce additional development pressures and significant environmental impacts upon South Cambridgeshire. No longer a “Local” Development Plan, but in effect a Regional Development Plan where the local interests and concerns of villages such as Barrington lie at the bottom of the hierarchy of interest and control.	59850 & 59853 (Barrington PC)
Local government should not be planning more economic and population growth in this area or more housing than current government targets require, but prioritising social housing and new water infrastructure to reduce stress on our rivers and wildlife.	60032 (S Fenn), 60235 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Cambridge City Council has declared a climate emergency, which this plan simply doesn't reflect. Request that it be rejected, rewritten	60032 (S Fenn)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
and re-submitted for full public consultation	
Concern about jobs led growth without any restrictions other than the market	56964 (Trumpington Residents Association)
A greater variety of jobs (and possibly more of them), with a wide range of options including opportunities for those not wishing a desk flying career, to return to the 1:1 ratio of jobs in the village and village residents working from 2001. This would aid the sustainability search	57644 (Histon & Impington PC)
Greater Cambridge is dominated by high end tech and science jobs. Not enough diversity of opportunity. For climate change we need a higher level industrial strategy across the county. Some lost industries should be onshored, reducing global transport emissions and not relying on Chinese coal powered electricity for manufacturing.	57862 (Histon and Impington PC)
Green jobs should be prioritised over high-tech jobs in part because of the evidence that high-tech employment led growth is not beneficial to low-skilled workers	56527 (C Preston)
Predicting job growth is difficult and must be monitored throughout the plan period, due to: the impact of Brexit on the local economy is not yet known; some large employers are leaving Cambridge (Marshalls and the County Council); hybrid/home-working will change the dynamic between where people work and where they live; hot-desking will increase in offices meaning that individual office buildings will support larger numbers of workers/jobs, this could decrease the amount of floor space required; people will commute fewer days per week and therefore will tolerate longer commutes in order to take advantage of cheaper housing	58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Employment land in the new settlements must be safeguarded and not lost to other uses.	58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
GCSPS must work with other LAs to support the employment requirements of surrounding market towns.	58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Homes should include all types, sizes and tenures, and include self-build	56480 (V Chapman), 56488 (D & B Searle), 56498 (W Grain), 56516 (RJ & JS Millard), 58363 (D Moore), 58627 (R Grain), 58789 (S Grain),
The First Proposals as a whole fail to set a figure or a range for the number of specialist housing for older people needed across the plan area. The issues identified mean that, together with considering full housing needs, and the requirement for an increased supply buffer, consideration must be given to specifying the amount of homes to be provided for to meet the demand for Extra Care and other types of specialist accommodation, and then how these will be delivered, in accordance with NPPF para 60	59737 & 59738 (Endurance Estates)
Welcome the recognition within the plan for a policy to guide proposals for specialist housing and homes for older people through 'whole life housing' approaches.	60518 (Cambridge Ahead)
Need to consider impacts on Green Belt for this amount of growth	56511 (C Martin)
Cambridge Greenbelt has two purposes, to stop urban sprawl and to protect the setting of the City. Further major developments around it will put the Greenbelt under even greater pressure because of the major damage being done to the essentially rural landscapes beyond the Greenbelt.	59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Figure of 2,111 new homes per annum mentioned here. Using pre-covid data and rejecting the Government standard models for development.	59862 (Dry Drayton PC)
Need much higher standards for new developments	56511 (C Martin)
Key issue in Cambridge is unaffordable housing – the housing crisis is a matter of policy and the solution isn't necessarily building more homes. The housing crisis is a matter of policy and ownership rather than a question of the number of homes in existence. Priorities should include: building more council housing, a return to secured tenancies, introduction of a land value tax	56527 (C Preston)
New homes need to be affordable to: • allow people to live near their work • avoid external care requirements rather than a close family member living nearby providing basic care	56860 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57644 (Histon & Impington PC)
Important to reduce long distance commuting by car	56571 (Gamlingay PC)
Important to recognise different working patterns post covid – these need to be taken into account when projecting housing requirements and considering relationship between locations of housing and employment sites. Housing aspirations have changed; major conurbations are not now so attractive.	56571 (Gamlingay PC), 56680 (N Campbell), 56736 (Croydon PC), 56843 (S Vale), 56851 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57610 (J Pratt), 57888 (C Schofield), 57932 (F Goodwille)
The existing allocations for employment must be fully utilised before any further release of land (eg S/CBC/A) is permitted.	57932 (F Goodwille)
Too much unsustainable growth and development is being proposed, resulting in risk for: • Greater Cambridge and Vision & Aims of Local Plan; • completely changing the character of Cambridge;	56685 (A Kennedy), 56851 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57533 (A Martin), 57635 (J Conroy), 57835 (S Sinclair), 57785 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group), 59122 (C Martin), 59207 (D Fox), 59498 (Babraham PC), 59940 & 59943 (Fen Ditton PC), 60032 (S Fenn), 60035

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• a much less pleasant place to live, which does support the needs/mental health of existing residents; • no difference to the affordability crisis, people will continue to have to live further out and commute; • a lot of the apartments being purchased by investors which won't help housing crisis; • existing infrastructure, including water and roads/inadequate transport and effects on sewage system; • insufficient green space; • climate change and higher carbon emissions from construction and materials; • food security and ecosystems	(H Warnock), 60235 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60507 (R & K Whitaker), 60674 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Increase in population resulting from the additional homes target of 44,000 will have a negative impact on an already struggling traffic, school and healthcare infrastructure. Existing transport infrastructure at capacity or ineffective.	60076 (Guilden Morden PC)
Review required after COVID/Brexit	59122 (C Martin)
The policy related to employment needs is fundamentally flawed. It is developer and Cambridge University led for their own profit with no consideration of the wider implications of the impact on the housing needs of local Cambridge people and the environment of our City. The local plan should be resisting further commercial development which is driving further inroads into the green belt and the destruction of the unique nature of Cambridge	58368 (F Gawthrop)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Not clear how the base number accounts for actual completions in 2020 and 2021. A buffer of 10% should not be added to what has already been built.	59943 (Fen Ditton PC)
The 2021 census will give a more accurate base for the actual numbers of houses needed to meet the total need in 2041.	59943 (Fen Ditton PC)
Employment patterns appear to be changing rapidly. If numbers of persons employed have dropped in addition to the noted drop or low growth in economic output, the overall employment target for 2041 may be too optimistic. Therefore, necessary to either change the forecast housing need or remove/reduce the 10% buffer.	59943 (Fen Ditton PC)
Changes to the planning regulations governing change of use should be assessed and the amount of qualifying space should be estimated, and impact on the high value jobs underpinning the growth aspiration and potential for conversion of such spaces to housing should be assessed.	59943 (Fen Ditton PC)
The additional jobs, to be supported by housing, is not necessary: unemployment here is very low. It is being forced on the area by external actors, including international investors. Cambridge is being exploited for financial gain.	57785 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)
The Cambridge area has a very high level of employment so it's not as if we need more businesses, and hence housing developments, coming to this area	59498 (Babraham PC)
The Government's Standard Method is normally used as a default. In going beyond this method the Plan should also include the total of existing unoccupied dwellings in the 'already in the pipeline' figure in calculating the number of dwellings required, and to explore all possible means, by incentive, penalty or otherwise, to ensure that	57785 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
such dwellings are occupied within a reasonable time; and adopt a policy that of all new dwellings constructed above the 'Standard Method' number, at least 25% should be housing for social rent	
Other parts of the UK that may be better for growth than Cambridge – need to work with new department for levelling up	57034 (W Harrold), 57785 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group), 59207 (D Fox), 59498 (Babraham PC), 60032 (S Fenn), 60035 (H Warnock), 60235 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Do we have resources for more development? In particular, Water is in short supply with over-abstraction threatening aquifers and rivers. Suitable transport infrastructure, not car based, with homes close to work.	58351 (Linton PC)
Impact on carbon expenditure, water use and flood risk due to ground cover: assess in light of climate change and that Cambridge has extremely stretched water resources	57610 (J Pratt)
No further allocations should be permitted until water supplies have been secured.	57932 (F Goodwille), 60072 (R Evans)
Fully endorse that delivery of the water infrastructure required to prevent further deterioration of local chalk aquifers is potentially a "deal-breaker" within the timescales of the Local Plan.	59120 (M Berkson)
Controlling the level of housebuilding is the single most important step to save our chalk streams and secure a sustainable water supply. Therefore, need to : reduce its housebuilding target to (at most) the Government's standard method figure; and work with me and others to make the case to the Department for LHC for a downward adjustment of the standard method figure, until such time as a comprehensive plan to protect the chalk aquifer is delivered by Cambridge Water and the Government.	60248 (A Browne MP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The development proposed would damage our rivers, chalk streams, our ecology and our farming because we do not have sufficient water supplies at present, a point a previous Local Plan had made. Water supplies certainly will not support the proposed level of development and piping it in from an area that is also Water Stressed makes no sense.	59498 (Babraham PC), 60072 (R Evans), 60229 (H Warwick)
Our sewerage system is inadequate and further development will put additional strain on it, increasing the risk of sewerage outflows into rivers.	59498 (Babraham PC), 60035 (H Warnock)
Object to the scale of growth proposed due to the lack of available water supply without damaging the River Cam and its tributaries, including chalk streams. This includes impacts on water quality. Water industry plans may be delayed or not fully delivered. Policies or mechanisms should be included in the draft Plan that set out how development approvals will be aligned to improvements in water supply, and what will happen if those improvements are not achieved.	58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59716 (Swavesey PC), 60035 (H Warnock)
Note concerns relating to water supply necessary to accommodate a higher level of growth, however this could be addressed through a stepped requirement allowing for the necessary infrastructure to be delivered.	58273 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)
The consultation for the Regional Water Plan is not due until summer 2022 yet the public consultation for the Local Plan is going ahead when we have no idea if and how water and sewerage challenges can be met and what trade-offs have been proposed. Therefore you had insufficient information on which to base your	59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
draft Local Plan and responders have insufficient information to base responses on.	
Any further development around Cambridge, will necessarily take scarce grade 2 and 3a land out of production. Developments in Fen land will deprive us of grade 1 agricultural land. Grade 1 designation is reserved almost solely for the peat-based soils of the drained fens. Proposed developments around the Waterbeach area are therefore thought to be very unwise. This land is already needed for food production in a country which imports c. 60% of its food supply.	59498 (Babraham PC)
The draft Local Plan appears to be inordinately influenced by the unelected GCP which has business interests and ambitions represented on its board and no counteracting resident's interests. Much of the text of the draft Local Plan appears to be consistent with announcements made by the self-appointed Arc Leaders Group which promotes the Ox-Cam Arc.	59498 (Babraham PC)
We request that the Plan is rejected, rewritten, addressing the points made in our representations, then re-submitted for full public consultation.	59498 (Babraham PC), 60235 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
The impact that the scale of planned housing and economic growth will have on existing health infrastructure needs to be carefully reviewed, and where improvements and/or new facilities are required to meet the needs of this new population, this should be supported through appropriate developer contributions.	59128 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
The cross-boundary impacts of developments also need to be considered, where NHS services often span multiple Local Planning Authority Boundaries	59128 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Planning policy should support the need to deliver homes for NHS staff to meet need, particularly in areas where there is pressure on affordability which is impacting on the ability to attract and retain key staff	59128 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Major risk of developing too much and too fast, destabilising the Cambridge community. Be sure these dwellings will be occupied - many recently built are bought as investment by overseas purchasers looking to reduce the risk for their money and are standing empty.	57610 (J Pratt)
Especially wrong to overdevelop North East Cambridge. It is very attractive to put everything next to the new station, but this will generate a huge increase in traffic. It is naive to think that people living there will all work there. Commuting in and out will cause chaos. Many of the new homes will be bought by commuters to London or worse absent foreign investors, with no affordable housing	57533 (A Martin)
Green Belt status for the Mingle Lane development was granted because of exceptional circumstances. It preserves the nature of the parish and is a major reason to live here. There are not the exceptional circumstances to warrant removal of this status. The development would make traffic congestion and pollution worse.	56676 (A Phillips)
Care needs to be taken when summarising consultation responses as there is an inherent bias in who responds to these consultations	56802 (M Colville)
There appears to be a misinterpretation of consultation response evidence. 49% is not a majority of respondents	58814 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Making full responses to the Local Plan in the way you requested would be a highly labour intensive process because of the requirement to respond to sections and sub-sections of the Local Plan then to cut and paste responses into a further document.	59498 (Babraham PC)
We note the complexity of the information contained in the Local Plan and would observe that it is not easy for local people to understand the proposals sufficiently to meaningfully comment. We would ask that future consultations use simpler language and format. Testing readability of materials with non-planning people could help with this.	59716 (Swavesey PC), 59850 & 59853 (Barrington PC)
USS notes that the Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study recommends retaining the site allocation for the Clifton Road Industrial Estate.	57267 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)
The preferred allocation at Site Ref. S/RSC/HW (Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford) for 100 dwellings would be consistent with the commitments to support economic growth and increase housing delivery and the supply of affordable housing.	57300 (AJ Johnson)
As per letter 30 June 2021 titled ‘Greater Cambridge Local Plan – Green belt and the Duty to Cooperate’, it is urged that full consideration is given to all possible locational choices during the course of the preferred options consultation. Only if it is demonstrated that Greater Cambridge cannot meet its standard method (minimum) housing need, rather than any higher aspirational target would Huntingdonshire District Council give further consideration to this issue.	57315 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
ECDC will want to be satisfied that the evidence behind the balance between jobs and homes growth is sufficiently robust. ECDC may have concerns if, over the coming years, new homes considerably exceeded job growth, or job growth considerably exceeded new homes. Under such scenarios, there could be 'spill over' effects on East Cambridgeshire, hence the need for the plan to have mechanisms in place to actively 'plan, monitor and manage' for these potential eventualities.	59860 (East Cambs DC)
The delivery of 44,000 new homes and 19 new sites should be increased to cover the number of houses developable under site JDI number 40509; Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston which has been incorrectly omitted from the assessment.	57012 (KWA Architects)
Marshall is pleased that the significant contribution which its land can make to the future wellbeing of Cambridge has been recognised through its draft allocation. Marshall is committed to working positively and proactively with the Councils to ensure that Cambridge East comes forward to optimise its social, environmental and economic potential.	58349 (Marshall Group Properties)
Support emerging strategic policies S/JH (new jobs and homes), J/NE (new employment) and J/EP (supporting a range of facilities in employment parks), which the Cambridge Innovation Park West proposals would respond to. Substantial planned housing growth will generate additional employment land requirements. Furthermore, CIPW would contribute to the spatial distribution of employment land – providing significant and high-quality floorspace and shared	60260 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
campus-style facilities in a predominantly rural, yet sustainable location.	

Sites submitted to the consultation not included in the First Proposals

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land west of Long Lane, Fowlmere (HELAA site 40327)	57329 (Clarendon Land and Development Ltd)
Land to the north east of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40383) / Land to the south west of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40378)	55711 (K.B. Tebbit Ltd)
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston (HELAA site 40509)	57012 (KWA Architects)
Land east of Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote (HELAA site 51599)	57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)
Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham (HELAA site 40295)	56894 (RWS Ltd)
West Wratting Estate (HELAA site 56213)	57526 (H d'Abo)
Hall Farm, West Wratting Estate (new site 59388)	57526 (H d'Abo)
Land adjacent to Babraham (HELAA site 40297)	57543, 57546, 57552, 57555 & 58476 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited)
Land south of Old House Road, Balsham (HELAA site 40438)	57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site)
Land off The Causeway, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40228) & Land off Poplar Farm Close, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40230)	57682 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites)
Land north of Cambourne (HELAA site 40114)	57892 (Martin Grant Homes)

Scotland Farm (East & West), Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 56252), Land to the west of Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 40317) & Land to the east of Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 40318)	58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Land off High Street, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40211), Land off Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40212) & Land west of Comberton (HELAA site 40152)	58253 (Bletsoes)
Land east of Cambridge Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40414)	58360 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms Hardington LLP)
Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (HELAA site 40061)	58504 (Hill Residential Limited)
Land west of London Road, Fowlmere (HELAA site 40116)	58659 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Land to the east of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 47757)	58683 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Land south of High Street, Hauxton (HELAA site 40283)	58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)
Land north of Barton Road and Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge (HELAA site 52643)	58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)
Land south of Addenbrooke's Road and east of M11, Cambridge South (HELAA site 40064)	58954 (Jesus College working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings, a private landowner and St John’s College)
Land to the north, east and south of Six Mile Bottom (HELAA site 40078)	59075 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth (HELAA site 47353)	59076 & 59318 (Newlands Developments)

Cambridge Science Park, North East Cambridge (HELAA site 59390)	60147 (U&I PLC and TOWN)
Land to the north of St Neots Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40224) & Land between A428 and St Neots Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40550)	60260 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)
Land at Rectory Farm, Milton (HELAA site 54906)	60262 (Gonville & Caius College)
Land at Rectory Farm, Milton (HELAA site 54096)	60266 (Gonville & Caius College)
Land south of Fulbourn Road and north of Worts Causeway, known as Cambridge South East (HELAA site 40058)	60270 & 60274 (Commercial Estates Group)
Land off Shelford Road, Fulbourn (HELAA site 51610)	60294 (Miller Homes - Fulbourn site)
Land off Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 47903)	60301 (Miller Homes - Melbourn site)
Land east of Long Road, Comberton (HELAA site 40497)	60546 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)
Land to north west of Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA site 40411)	60562 (Countryside Properties)
East of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 47647) & West of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 40516)	60567 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
Land to rear of Fisher's Lane, Orwell (HELAA site 40496)	60608 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site)
Land east of Redgate Road, Girton (HELAA site 40241)	60623 (NIAB Trust – Girton site)
Whaddon Road, Meldreth (west of The Burtons) (HELAA site 55082)	60667 (Mill Stream Developments)

Land South Of Milton, North of A14 (HELAA site 47943)	60758 (U+I Group PLC)

S/DS: Development Strategy

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink- S/DS: Development Strategy> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’> click the magnifying glass symbol.

Number of Representations for this section: 245 (albeit see note below)

Note

A large number of representations attached to the Greater Cambridge in 2041 and How much development and where webpages have been moved to the tables below to ensure relevant strategy comments are considered together. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Representations executive summary

Regarding plan-wide development levels, representors (including a number promoting specific sites) proposed that the strategy should plan for more employment and housing, in order to support economic growth, reduce in-commuting, deliver more affordable housing, and to provide a more flexible supply of homes. A number of individuals, parish councils and community groups commented that the strategy should plan for less development, noting: the circular nature of planning for more and more growth, climate and nature impacts, harm to quality of life and the character of the area, that development will compound affordable housing challenges and existing inequality, or that the proposal is higher than government’s standard minimum housing need. The Environment Agency and Natural England stated that they were concerned about whether the growth proposed can be sustainable without causing further deterioration to the water environment. These bodies, together with Cambridge Water and Anglian Water, expressed their intention to work collaboratively with the Councils to explore the issue further. Other comments noted the need to reconsider the strategy in the light of COVID-19. The quick questionnaire included a related question (Quick question 1) which

asked whether respondents supported the proposed housing level. Of 580 responses, 31% either strongly agreed or agreed; 16% were neutral, and 54% either strongly disagreed or disagreed.

There was wide ranging in principle support for the climate focused development strategy, including focusing development in locations which reduce need to travel, and in locations with existing and committed transport links. On the other hand, around 100 individuals supported the Friends of the River Cam letter objecting to the plan on the grounds of inadequate water supply, effect on national food supply, failure to minimise climate change, likely irreparable damage to ecosystems, carbon emissions from construction, lack of integrated public transport, undermining the Levelling Up agenda, democratic deficit in process and evidence base. The quick questionnaire included a related question (Quick question 2) which asked whether respondents agreed that new development should mainly focus on sites where car travel, and therefore carbon emissions, can be minimised. Of 572 responses, 68% either strongly agreed or agreed; 16% were neutral, and 16% either strongly disagreed or disagreed.

A number of comments, particularly from those promoting specific developments, argued that the plan was too heavily focused on strategic sites and too restrictive of village development. Regarding directions of growth, a limited number of individuals and developers argued that given previous plans had focused housing development to the north of Cambridge, future development should be focused to the south, close to the area of ongoing employment growth. Others proposed greater levels of development in the rural southern cluster and A428 corridor than was currently proposed in the plan. Regarding the economy, a number of landowners and developers argued that more sites should be provided to meet specific sector needs.

A large number of landowners and developers argued that that the strategy relied too much on large urban extensions to Cambridge City and new settlements in South Cambridgeshire, which had infrastructure dependencies which therefore presented a risk to the deliverability of the plan. Comments expressed concern about the accelerated delivery rates assumed at the strategic sites included in the First Proposals. The same respondents proposed that the plan should include a greater number of smaller sites, particularly in the rural area, to allow a sufficient amount and variety of land to come forward to support the objective of significantly boosting supply of homes, and to support rural communities.

A small number of individuals expressed concern at the plan's reliance on East West Rail and/or objected to the East West Rail project. Equally a small number of individuals and parish councils expressed concern about whether transport and other infrastructure would cope with the pressure generated by the development proposed in the plan.

Regarding the approach to Cambridge urban area, comments were mixed, including support for densification from some individuals, concern from individuals regarding the impact of densification on quality of life, and comments from developers or landowners (or their agents) promoting village sites that brownfield sites can be challenging to deliver. Regarding the edge of Cambridge and in the Green Belt, comments included those from promoters of sites not included in the plan stating that exceptional circumstances existed to release their site from the Green Belt, and individuals and community groups objecting to the releases included in the First Proposals. Affected parish councils urged greater separation between proposed development - at Cambridge East and at Mingle Lane, Great Shelford - and their villages. Regarding new settlements, support was expressed by a limited number of individuals, East West Rail Company, and Cambridgeshire County Council, for Cambourne as a location for expanded development. A number of site promoters for other locations highlighted the reliance of this site on the uncertain delivery of East West Rail. Regarding the rural area, individuals and parish councils supported the limits on rural development proposed in the plan.

The quick questionnaire included four related questions (quick questions 7 to 10) which were relevant to this policy. These questions asked respondents' views about development focused on the rural southern cluster, village development and provided the opportunity to identify additional sites. Responses to these questions broadly reflected the comments attributed to policy S/DS summarised above.

Response to representations

The response to representations relevant to this policy includes:

- **Arguments for more development**: Our in principle approach to planning for employment and housing is to meet our objectively assessed needs, which, drawing on the methodology to calculate these, would support economic growth, mitigate against additional longer term commuting, and help limit further affordability pressures associated with housing delivery lagging behind employment growth. Planning for employment and housing beyond this level is unlikely to be achievable, noting the findings of our Housing Delivery Study – Addendum (2022), and that the higher employment scenario is described

as ‘less likely’ by our consultants, and would have additional environmental impacts. Beyond this in principle position we are not yet able to confirm how much employment and housing we can plan for that can be delivered in a sustainable way.

- **Arguments for less development**: Planning for less than our objectively assessed needs would not meet national policy requirements to meet objectively assessed needs and support economic growth, and could result in social and equalities impacts such as potential increasing affordability issues and less affordable housing being provided in the area, and climate impacts arising from more longer distance commuting. Beyond this in principle position we are not yet able to confirm how much employment and housing we can plan for that can be delivered in a sustainable way.
- **Providing flexibility**: We propose to plan positively to provide new land for the identified undersupply in particular types of employment, unless evidence identifies an insurmountable problem with achieving that in a sustainable way. This positive approach would ensure a flexible supply over the plan period and beyond, recognising the particular needs of the Greater Cambridge economy. For homes we plan to provide a flexible supply of homes to meet our needs, again subject to evidence not identifying an insurmountable problem with achieving that in a sustainable way. Further to this we have flexibility to respond to change from our policy approaches via future plan reviews.
- **Housing delivery challenges**: Our consultants have developed recommendations in terms of a windfall allowance, and lead-in time and build out rates for strategic and non-strategic sites that vary depending on the location and / or anticipated housing mix for the site. We propose to continue to use these recommendations when preparing the housing trajectory for inclusion in the Local Plan, as they have been developed having undertaken a detailed analysis of housing delivery in Greater Cambridge (including comparing the data to other areas and national research), following a literature review (including Inspectors Reports), and having considered whether past trends will continue into the future. Our consultants have confirmed that their recommendations continue to be realistic and reliable for use in plan-making in the Greater Cambridge area having considered the issues raised in representations on the First Proposals.
- **Need for supporting infrastructure**: We recognise the importance of ensuring infrastructure is delivered to support development. We will produce a full infrastructure delivery plan to support the draft plan consultation.
- **Need to consider water supply**: We are working with relevant partners (Environment Agency and Natural England) to understand the implications of water supply on the draft local plan targets for jobs and homes, to inform a conclusion regarding the most appropriate targets for jobs and homes to include in the draft Local Plan, as well as to consider site specific sustainability implications of potential solutions to the additional growth.

- **Need to account for COVID-19**: Our Authority Monitoring Report monitors key indicators relating to the adopted Local Plans. Our 2022 updated employment and housing evidence accounts for COVID-19 impacts. We will keep our evidence up to date as appropriate to inform later stages of plan-making, and we have flexibility to respond to change via future plan reviews.
- **Overarching development strategy challenges:** We note strong support for the First Proposals overarching strategy approach. No new evidence submitted to the First Proposals has affected these principles. Our transport evidence supporting the First Proposals demonstrated that North East Cambridge and Cambridge East are the best performing new strategic scale sites available for development within Greater Cambridge, and are in broad locations that best align with the First Proposals strategy principles. There are no alternative strategic scale sites available for development in these broad locations. We are not proposing a full development strategy at this point, but propose to retain these principles in identifying sites to meet our needs, subject to the water and housing delivery constraints. Further issues relevant to specific strategic sites are addressed in their respective policies.
- **Scale of development challenges:** Our transport evidence informing the First Proposals showed that larger developments accommodating a wide mix of uses allow for more 'internalisation' of trips within the site, support viable delivery of infrastructure including green infrastructure and can provide a steady supply of development across a large number of years to support overall supply. As such we consider there is a strong rationale for the inclusion of strategic scale sites within our development strategy. Further issues relevant to specific strategic sites are addressed in their respective policies.
- **Need to consider transport and other infrastructure, including East West Rail:** We are not currently proposing a full development strategy at this point such that this issue is not relevant to decisions being taken in early 2023. We will respond to this issue for the draft plan consultation.
- **Spatial directions/broad locations challenges:**
    - Our evidence and Sustainability Appraisal supporting the First Proposals consultation identified that locating development within Cambridge urban area forms a highly sustainable development option, primarily relating to the accessibility to existing facilities and services of sites within this broad location, and that the edge of Cambridge can be a sustainable location for homes and jobs (setting aside issues relating to Green Belt), being accessible to existing jobs and services, particularly where development is planned at sufficient scale to support new infrastructure. No new evidence was submitted to the First Proposals that would change our understanding of this. Impacts and delivery issues beyond this are site specific, and as such are addressed in their respective policies.

- We are not currently proposing a full development strategy at this point such that issues beyond the above are not relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Tables of representations: S/DS: Development Strategy

Plan-wide development levels

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Comment that the strategy should plan for more employment and housing, including for the following reasons: • the Councils' preferred option forecasts of jobs and homes are low • to reflect the Councils' higher growth scenario • embrace the maximum economic benefits that can sustainably be accommodated within the Greater Cambridge area • Experiencing unprecedented levels of economic growth; 32% jobs increase over plan period and jobs growth has outstripped homes • Provide substantial increase in housing, at least 15% above proposed • to fully meet the housing requirement + 10% buffer • to ensure delivery of the required annualised housing supply • to ensure choice, affordability and diversity of housing	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 57340 (HD Planning Ltd), 57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58309 (University of Cambridge), 58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58600 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58676 (The Church Commissioners for England), 58805 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58815 (Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd), 58879 (Scott Properties), 58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58963 (Endurance Estates), 59048 (Emmanuel College), 59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 60541 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60580 (Martin Grant Homes), 60668 (Mill Stream Developments), 60685 (Trinity College), 58335* (Marshall Group Properties), 57148* (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57191* (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57212* (Deal Land LLP), 58265* (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58356* (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms -Hardington- LLP), 58948*

• Reduce in-commuting • reverse commuting patterns and meet full affordable housing need. • to address under-delivery of affordable housing at new settlements • to provide flexibility should allocated sites not come forward as anticipated • to ensure that allocated sites don't have a monopoly position whereby the LPA is under pressure to grant permission even where it has concerns about the proposal • Approach to faster delivery at Edge of Cambridge, Northstowe and Waterbeach is not supported by evidence • Shortfall of 44 dwellings – only account for 11,596 of the 11,640 to be planned • To accommodate additional growth from Ox-Cam Arc • Does not demonstrate how can meet future jobs targets or needs, particularly mid tech	(Endurance Estates), 59032* (L&Q Estates Limited & Hill Residential Ltd)
Comment that the strategy should plan for less growth, for the following reasons: • concern that the model of planning for growth inevitably leads to more growth – suggested to consider when the current model may be forced to change • worsening conditions and finite capacity for growth with limited resources • Overoptimistic and unrealistic vision of growth • Predict and provide approach is flawed	**Individuals** 57592 (M Jump), 60188 (J Preston), 57582* (C Maynard), 59777* (M Bijok Hone), 57850 & 57854* (T Harrold), 57980* (E Osimo), 57831* (S Sinclair), 58057* (B Marshall), 59764* (B Hunt), 58165* (S Kennedy), 57929* (F Goodwille), 56801* (M Colville), 57632* (J Conroy), 57033* (W Harrold), 57129* (D Lott), 57777* (C Harding), 57886* (C Schofield), 59456* (A Alderson), 60108* (C Blakeley), 60187* (J Preston), 57886* (C Schofield),

• Downward revision needed to reflect covid and home/hybrid working, less need for homes close to jobs, some demand can be met outside Greater Cambridge. • Challenge the need for growth in an area of over-rapid expansion, cannot continue indefinitely • planning for 44,000 homes is incompatible with the aim of decreasing carbon impacts, nature recovery, and improving quality of life • Failure to minimise climate change, existing development already outstrips CO2 emissions; • Over ambitious and high risk to Vision and Aims. • Minimum / Medium options can be justified with limitations of sustainability • economic growth encourages inward migration from other areas which is unsustainable • The plan's proposals to support carbon neutrality will themselves consume carbon. There is no environmental capacity for additional homes and people. • No more development allocations until environmental and transport capacity assumptions, in line with the principles of Doughnut Economics have been holistically assessed. • Cambridge has reached maximum; more growth will impair quality of life • Increase of nearly 40% is character changing • Effect on national food security; • Likely irreparable damage to ecosystems;	**Public bodies** 56737 (Croydon PC), 59258* (Teversham PC), 59258* (Teversham PC), 57801* (Coton PC), 59030* (Great Shelford PC), 58325* (Linton PC) **Third Sector Organisations** 58097 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group), 56965 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57548* (Save Honey Hill Group), 57767* (Cambridge Doughnut Economic Action Group), 57786* (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58103* (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group), 60738* (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

• Lack of integrated public transport, increased congestion (and pollution); • Growth in Cambridge outstrips infrastructure. • concern that the plan will not achieve affordable housing, given the primary driving force of external investment • Growth in jobs will compound existing problems of affordable housing; • concern that the support of capital growth will increase inequality • Drive for growth comes from landowners and businesses, residents see the impacts; • Move away from formulae to find ways to accentuate the positives and eliminate negatives; • The proposed level is higher than the government advises • The standard government calculation may itself be questioned • Support only the absolute minimum number of new homes, around 37,400, already in the planning pipeline. • No justification for an increase in houses • Priority should be on Levelling Up other areas – there are plenty of brownfield sites elsewhere in the country • Focus on improving transport links from outside Greater Cambridge • concern at the inclusion of a 10% buffer when that is accounted for by planning for more than the Standard Method	

• concern at the inclusion of a 10% buffer which accounts for 40% of the total number of additional homes • Puts economic growth as primary objective, which is incompatible with climate and nature recovery objectives. The plan should be scrapped; homes and jobs should be supported in locations elsewhere in the country which are in need of regeneration, and which have environmental capacity. • Existing housing stock will take available carbon budget and water supply. Growth is irresponsible without solution to these problems • What models does the Planning Service have to determine likely limits to growth of the Cambridge economy?	
We remain genuinely concerned about whether the growth proposed (48,800 new homes inclusive of 10% buffer and 37,200 from previous plans) can be sustainable without causing further deterioration to the water environment. We understand the regional and water company water resource planning is still ongoing and the next version of the IWMS Detailed WCS will be updated as these plans come to fruition. We offer our support to work collaboratively with all the parties involved. Support the idea of development limited to levels that can be supported by a sustainable water supply (phased delivery) until the time the strategic infrastructure is in place, though we are mindful this may lead to heavily back loaded delivery.	59719 (Environment Agency)
Major concerns with scale of development and 2041 timeframe for delivery, given damage already being inflicted on natural environment and lengthy lead-in time for identification and	59964* (Natural England)

delivery of measures to address water resource issue and implement strategic green infrastructure.	
Welcome recognition water supply is significant issue for deliverability. Support preparation of Integrated Water Management Study. Demonstrate appropriate deliverable mitigation measures can support sustainable growth until new strategic water supply infrastructure operational. Consider extended timeframe for delivery.	59969* (Natural England)
Support the environmental objectives of the Plan and would want to have continued joint working with other stakeholders such as the Environment Agency to agree matters such as a joint approach to calculating growth. Anglian Water proposes that a Statement of Common Ground approach is taken as part of Duty to Cooperate to reach agreement on evidence and methodology with the two Councils and the EA.	60457 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
We would welcome regular and continued engagement and collaboration to ensure that planned growth can be supplied in a sustainable way. The timing and location of individual developments is critical to our planning.	60496* (Cambridge Water)
Committed to reduction of abstraction from chalk aquifers. Increased collaboration vital to ensure growth can be supplied sustainably. Strongly support ambitious targets for water efficient home building and any new development.	58915 (Cambridge Water)
This talks of 'creating space' but admits that water supply cannot just be created quickly. With so many problems* (air quality, transport, water, high housing costs, strained services) how can we cope with more?	58094* (Hills Road Residents' Association)

No assessment of current growth and its cumulative impact or the success or failure of current Local Plan policies	60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
The 2018 Local Plan requires a rework due to the impact of the global pandemic.	58062* (Horningsea PC)
A regular review of the quantum, composition and location of job growth is needed to allow flexible adjustments across the full range of topics covered by the Local Plan.	57819* (W Wicksteed)
Contingency sites should be included to ensure the plan is effective (deliverable over the plan period) as required by the NPPF.	58693 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Support for the level of employment and homes, if it is carefully located and is sustainable.	59141* (Cambourne TC)
The overarching strategy should plan for more homes with the plan period spread across the settlement hierarchy.	57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57195 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Further consideration of sites suitable for potential development of specialist housing for older people (including Extra Care development) in sustainable locations should be undertaken	58333 (Simons Developments Ltd), 59740 (Endurance Estates)
Concern that further employment growth will continue to put pressure on housing. Suggestion to limit commercial development.	57938 (North Newnham Residents Association)
The policy stifles the role of Neighbourhood Planning in Greater Cambridge by not allocating specific levels of growth to guide the review of or preparation of Plans in designated Neighbourhood Plan Areas which possess an established sustainable settlement. The approach to guide Neighbourhood Plans by identifying indicative levels of growth from Windfall numbers is not a sound or robust way to proceed	58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd)

Objections to the approach to windfalls including: • Over-reliance on windfalls • Comment that the new Windfall figure is artificially high due to the extended period in the previous decade where a large number of speculative development proposals were approved, and that an increase is not necessary • Suggestion that the windfall allowance should be lowered and more sites explicitly allocated • Evidence suggests previous development has been higher than estimates but finite supply of sites so fewer will come forward in future • Need to consider future trends and reliability of sources of supply, including impact of proposed development strategy and limits on levels of growth in villages • First Proposals defines windfall development with reference to previously developed land, and so windfall allowance seems particularly high if anticipated these sites will be mostly previously developed sites • Resist inappropriate development of gardens (contrary to NPPF para 71) and inclusion in windfall allowance will perpetuate trend • Heavy reliance on as yet unidentified sites (20%), and significantly more than in adopted Local Plans (8%) which were found sound	58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60181 (Home Builders Federation), 60272 (Commercial Estates Group), 60323 (Daniels Bros – Shefford – Ltd)
2041 is an appropriate plan period, given uncertainty over major transport infrastructure projects including East-West Rail and Oxford to Cambridge expressway.	57314* (Huntingdonshire DC)

Suggestion that there could be a case for a longer plan period to 2050 to be advanced to: • allow time to plan the necessary infrastructure • align with the OxCam Spatial Framework plan period	58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)
Proposal to increase the homes buffer above 10% and further sites allocated to: • ensure a robust strategy to account for both the current heavy reliance on existing allocations and planning permissions, as well as to accommodate any additional jobs growth • provide greater certainty over the delivery of housing • offset the potential risks that development will not come forward as planned • Housing Delivery Study recommends at least 10% to ensure over-allocation given strong economic growth. Facilitate houses close to local employment • 20% buffer would increase robustness of supply position	58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58805 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 60180 (Home Builders Federation), 60273 (Commercial Estates Group), 60323 (Daniels Bros – Shefford – Ltd), 60541 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 58265* (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)
Concern raised that the First Proposals does not demonstrate a 5 year land supply, noting: • The annual requirement should be derived from the 44,400 plan period figure • Delivery added to the early trajectory has not been properly tested	58805 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 60541 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd)
Expected five-year housing land supply on adoption in 2025 will be 5.15 years. This is marginal and could easily fall should sites not come forward as expected. Consider allocating small sites of	60182 (Home Builders Federation)

less than one hectare to bolster supply in the first five years following adoption.	
Assumption that all 44,000 houses have to be allocated within Greater Cambridge to minimise carbon footprint of travel and congestion is too simplistic and unsound. Reality is people will continue to travel to/from outside area for variety of reasons. Potential for more rail commuting from Fenland and East Cambridge and Levelling Up in the County. NEC will attract out-commuters.	59942 (Fen Ditton PC)
Support for the identified requirement for 44,400 new homes; 10% flexibility allowance; additional land for a minimum 11,640 homes is appropriate.	58601* (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58748* (Great Shelford -Ten Acres- Ltd)
Recognising the housing needs requirements Anglian Water supports the approach taken on the quantum of growth planned with additional 10% allowance for flexibility. Note Anglian Water considers the Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) and Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) with their 25-year time horizon, direction on sustainability requirements and demand management, enable appropriate and timely investment to support growth, also proposes enter into a Memorandum of Understanding.	60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Spatial strategy thematic topics

Overarching

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Broad support for the overarching strategy	**Individuals** 57035 (W Harrold), 60110 (C Blakeley) **Public bodies** 57110* (D Ogilvy – Bartlow Parish Meeting), 56861 (Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth PC), 58358 (Linton PC), 59877 (Cottenham PC), 60440 (Late representation: Westley Waterless PC), **Other Organisations** 58003 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 60243 (Bidwells), 60256 (Jesus College),
Support in principle for the strategy's approach of directing development to locations that have the least climate impact, where active and public transport is the natural choice, and where green infrastructure can be delivered alongside new development.	**Individuals** 58183 (Cllr N Gough)

	Public bodies 57110* (D Ogilvy – Bartlow Parish Meeting), 56572 (Gamlingay PC), 59691 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 59966 (Natural England), 57477 (ESFA - Department for Education), 57314* (Huntingdonshire District Council), 59250* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority), **Third Sector Organisations** 60677 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), **Other Organisations** 58309 (University of Cambridge), 60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 57310 (Deal Land LLP), 58096 (Jesus College), 58195 (Terence O'Rourke Ltd), 58196 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 58240 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58359 (Marshall Group Properties), 58488 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners (Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell), 58647 (Deal Land LLP), 58657 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen), 58731 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company ('TMLC') a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland (GBI) and Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS)), 58743 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	and a private family trust), 58257 (Pembroke College), 58900 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58952 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59020 (Peterhouse), 59048 (Emmanuel College), 59100 (Pace Investments), 59252 (Croudace Homes), 59403 (Pace Investments), 60263 (Gonville & Caius College), 60610 (CALA Group Ltd), 60612 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site), 60624 (NIAB Trust – Girton site), 60629 (NIAB Trust), 60633 (NIAB Trust)
Support strategy focused on strategic sites with better transport links, and with limited level of development proposed for villages	56801* (M Colville), 57110* (D Ogilvy – Bartlow Parish Meeting), 59995 (Steeple Morden PC), 60077 (Guilden Morden PC), 56907* (West Wickham PC), 59470* (Shepreth PC), 58350 (Toft PC), 58241 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future),
Support continued development of committed sites	57316 (Huntingdonshire DC),
Support for focus on brownfield sites	60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd),
Support for a blended strategy including a range of locations	58359 (Marshall Group Properties),
Support for emphasis on dense settlements, including supporting new towns to be vibrant self-sustaining communities with good facilities.	57709 (J Pavey),
Support for strategy which important issues, including needs, climate change, making use of existing sites.	56791* (J Kirkbride),
Support for focusing development in locations where infrastructure already exists.	56861 (Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth PC),
Support for focusing development in locations with existing and committed transport links.	56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council),
Support weighted distribution towards most sustainable locations and key employment hubs.	60219 (Thakeham Homes Ltd),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Areas around Cambridge are good, logical sites	58039 & 58041* (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Support new homes that do not destroy the county and its waterways. Brownfield sites to be prioritised for development. Greenbelt to be fully protected.	59810* (Dry Drayton PC)
Support a GCLP strategy that supports and plans for continuing economic growth and innovation hubs, as well as the homes needed to reduce commuting into the area in a way that minimises environmental impacts and improves the wellbeing of communities.	58001* (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58703* (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)
Comments regarding the overarching strategy, including: • there is a vital need for the strategy to protect green spaces, and protect the qualities that makes Cambridge City a great and unique place to live • The need to locate jobs close to homes to reduce the need to travel • New development should have solar hot water and high levels of insulation • emphasis should be given to placemaking and ensuring the character of existing communities is not harmed but rather enhanced • Consider further evidence as part of Sustainability Appraisal on whole lifecycle carbon benefits of selected approach. • Ensure the distinctive character of the City, towns and villages are not adversely affected through new development	56572 (Gamlingay PC), 56737 (Croydon PC), 57709 (J Pavey), 59966 (Natural England), 60188 (J Preston), 60234 (P Blythe), 60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60640 (TTP Campus Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Strategy needs to tackle commuting patterns from outlying villages into City. With the presence of Green Belt, opportunities for development within the City are limited. The strategy therefore relies on areas beyond the Green Belt developing and consolidating their employment offer.	60641 (Bruntwood SciTech)
Note locations for development, with limited housing adjacent to Trumpington	56963* (Trumpington Residents Association)
Many of committed developments also unlikely to deliver sufficient level of accessible high quality green infrastructure to meet the needs of new residents without adverse recreational pressure impacts to the existing ecological network including statutorily designated sites. These issues need to be addressed urgently through further stages of Plan preparation.	59966 (Natural England),
Emphasis should be given to placemaking and ensuring the character of existing communities is not harmed but rather enhanced	57709 (J Pavey),
Need to locate jobs close to homes to reduce the need to travel.	56572 (Gamlingay PC),
Further evidence should be produced by the Councils as part of the Sustainability Appraisal on the whole lifecycle carbon benefits of the selected approach and reasonable alternatives to guide consideration of a policy on the phasing of developments sites and supporting infrastructure including biodiversity opportunities and infrastructure option carbon benefits.	60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd),
Ensure the distinctive character of the City, towns and villages are not adversely affected through new development, by exploiting opportunities to use brownfield land	60640 (TTP Campus Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Development Strategy doesn't appear to include a balanced option on delivery of local housing needs for comparison, with an aligned transport strategy, which excludes the over densification and corresponding penalties of the S/NEC proposal.	58106 (M Asplin),
Growth should be dispersed across the settlement hierarchy.	60310 (Gladman Developments),
Emphasise the importance of a variety of growth locations and sizes to support housing growth. New settlements, strategic extensions and development in rural locations all form a key part in meeting varying housing needs and ensuring a consistent supply of housing delivery.	60547 (Thakeham Homes Ltd),
Wrong Plan at wrong time with climate, biodiversity and water emergency. Prioritise social housing, environmental matters and protect Green Belt not economic development at any cost. Undermines Government Levelling Up and brownfield first agenda.	59500 (Babraham PC)
Breaches obligations for sustainable development; does not consider embodied carbon and car borne emissions. Inadequate water supply and sewage system.	59945 (O Harwood)
Forward thinking Vision is not matched by development strategy, predicated on growth, which will increase carbon. Inconsistent with Governments Levelling Up agenda.	59548 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
With the climate crisis the starting point should be to plan for truly sustainable neighbourhoods, meeting needs locally, and building resilient communities.	56524* (C Preston)
Better to have larger settlements less dependent on cars and close to employment	56735* (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the vision, aims and the amount of development, but not the distribution and proposed allocations.	58387* (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Councils discourage new homes in places where car travel is the easiest way to get around and yet villages with stations (e.g. Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton) are not allocated any growth. Yet with only the prospect of a station in Cambourne, it is considered sufficient for a c.2,000 home allocation.	58672* (Artisan* (UK) Projects Ltd)
Too much farmland allocated for development in the Plan which is unsustainable and physically impossible. The plan does not address the fundamental problems of food and water security. Destroying the countries best farmland Cambridge Area is not simply a bad idea, it would dangerously damage the UKs food security.	59492* (D Seilly)
Please note the “Place Standard” Survey by Cllr Sam Davies in Queen Edith’s, Feb. 2020. GB1 & GB2 should not become an isolated community. Windfall proposals for residential development in Cambridge, and elsewhere, being subject to no limit on individual scheme size, will encourage developers to maximise profit at the expense of quality of life for residents. Specific sites should have their capacity limits stated from the outset.	59770* (B Hunt)
Comment proposing revisions to the strategy to ensure the plan meets its aims, including: • greater focus on bringing sustainable transport initiatives from outside the Greater Cambridge area • evaluate progress of adopted strategy before adding to it	57551 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• objecting to allocation of North East Cambridge and associated relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant • applying minimum growth option and focusing development at Cambridge East and potentially Cambridge Biomedical Campus.	
• The plan fails to consider the overall environmental capacity and climate change impact and the effect on the historic environment in a holistic way. • Where is the overall vision of what Cambridge will be like in the future? Who is the city for? This plan does not make clear.	60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Essential all policies are rigorously enforced and not just window dressing. Many organisations are proposing short and long term developments. Plan must take account of each proposal and ensure full co-ordination.	59061* (M Berkson)
Agree with policy direction and Figure 6. Support the fact that no new settlement is proposed around Six Mile Bottom and agree with comment (page 39) that further new settlements should not be allocated.	60442 (Late representation: Westley Waterless PC)
Notes expansion of Cambourne, continuing to develop Bourn Airfield. Mansel Farm, Oakington (20 homes near Beck Brook). Notes mention of 10% extra buffer for homebuilding, and 1,000 more homes on the Eddington site (M11 side).	59863 (Dry Drayton PC)
The plan includes many welcome similarities with CA's Suggested Spatial Vision, including supporting the need for	60519 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
higher density development, five strategic sites, agglomeration supported by transport corridors, creation of a connected nature network.	
Need to act on the recommendations of the Climate Commission.	60519 (Cambridge Ahead)
New development should have solar hot water and high levels of insulation.	56737 (Croydon PC),
2nd & 4th paragraphs should recognise the importance of access to excellent education provision and areas can/should be improved through regeneration or enhancement.	58502* (ARU)
The proposed house expansion would change the nature of Cambridge from a small town to a large city. Please focus on connecting the biomedical campus to other residential areas outside of Cambridge city.	57984* (F Seregni)
Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council lies outside the defined coalfield. No specific comments to make.	59736* (The Coal Authority)
Non-substantive comment	57852* (T Harrold), 57860* (T Harrold)

Strategic influences and Duty to Cooperate

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Welcome consideration of how Plan fits with other plans and strategies, including Ox Cam Arc, and prepared within wider regional context, noting duty to cooperate. Pleased to engage in preparation and development of a draft Statement of Common Ground.	59970* (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
To ensure compliance with NPPF para. 16 of the NPPF, the Councils should seek to identify or establish a suitable forum for engaging with the Government for the OxCam Arc.	58655* (The Church Commissioners for England)
Welcome the approach to preparing the preferred development strategy / draft allocations and green infrastructure initiatives in parallel. Consideration has been given, through the Sustainability Appraisal, to the best locations to restore the area's habitat networks and provide more green spaces for people providing health and wellbeing benefits. Support identification of 14 Strategic Green Infrastructure initiatives.	59968 (Natural England)
No objection in principle to the existing and new allocations, areas of major change or opportunity areas being taken forward subject to: • identification of strategic water supply infrastructure and/or feasible interim solutions • establishment of a robust plan to deliver the 14 Strategic Green Infrastructure initiatives ahead of development • need robust requirements to deliver biodiversity net gain and on-site green infrastructure	59971 (Natural England)
Pleased to note the assessment in relation to historic environment, especially HELAA Appendix 4. Welcome commitment to preparation of Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment for site allocations.	59601 (Historic England)
Important that site allocation policies include sufficient clarity (NPPF para 16d). Policy should identify assets on site/nearby, mitigation measures, reference HIA. Suggested wording.	59602 (Historic England)
Combined Authority is consulting on its Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement; considers good growth in context of six 'capitals'. Reflection of six capitals in Plan policies and Sustainability Appraisal is supported.	59313* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority)
The location and form of new development should fully consider the principles of creating healthy environments.	59114* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
ECDC has no objections at this stage. Notes there are no additional major development proposals close to the border and no obvious significant 'cross-border' implications of relevance to East Cambridgeshire.	59859 (East Cambridgeshire DC)
Wide range of spatial options have been tested. Chosen option aids achieving net zero carbon ambitions, particularly relating to transport, by locating homes, employment and services near to one another. Support this approach. Focusing development largely in close proximity to Cambridge City, is also least likely to impact on infrastructure within Suffolk.	59953 (Suffolk Council)
Want to produce a joint evidence base to set out the most up to date position and for this to be further updated as the Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) progresses.	60460 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
The area is too complicatedly organised by local government divisions with no satisfactory overview. We need to work on many existing problems before we fall for Government's hopeful plans for South East and Arc that are not regarding the complications realistically.	60233* (H Warwick)
Supportive of Councils working jointly, aligns with commitment in existing Plans and allows strategic matters to be considered comprehensively in a joined-up manner. Critical to work alongside Cambridgeshire authorities to ensure wider cross boundary issues are addressed. If a Council fails to satisfactorily discharge its Duty to Cooperate a Planning Inspector must recommend non-adoption.	60307* (Gladman Developments)
Be clear how it will deliver on ambitions of Oxford-Cambridge Arc. Support strategic spatial planning approach being applied to Ox-Cam Arc but it appears a substantial amount of housing may be planned for and delivered at an earlier stage due to conflicting timescales.	58640* (National Trust)
Plan assumes coordination with OxCam Arc project, which is now under review by government.	59540* (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Plan assumes influence by UK Innovation Corridor and Cambridge-Norwich Tech Corridor, which are projects driven by unelected business interests.	59540* (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Opposition to Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework and East West Rail southern route. Concerns these may lead to central government-imposed rather than locally-agreed development which will be highly detrimental to the area.	59851 (Barrington PC)
The planning authorities should engage with their neighbours under the Duty to Cooperate to ensure they respond to the footprint of the Cambridge economy, including its travel to work area.	60519 (Cambridge Ahead)

Spatial directions for development

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Proposal that the plan should reflect more strongly the benefits of the Public Transport Corridors Spatial Option	59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Comment that new housing should be focused on the south of Greater Cambridge, and limited in the north, given the existing imbalance of jobs with homes.	56803 (M Colville), 58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Note that in previous plans large developments were located to north and jobs to the south of city. This requires increased traffic to work through and around Cambridge City. Expect policies to counter negative effects by putting more stringent requirements on developers for sustainability criteria.	57639* (Histon & Impington PC)
Developments are concentrated on the North side of Cambridge due to 'better' transport links, but it would be easy to improve bus services on the South side of Cambridge.	58896* (R Donald)
Comment that the level of development focused in the southern cluster should be increased, to:	58195 (Terence O'Rourke Ltd), 58503 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58561 (Grosvenor

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• support the continuing growth of the economic cluster in life sciences and technology related activities, and • provide homes well related to jobs • reduce long distance commuting	Britain & Ireland), 58188* (Smithson Hill), 60561 (W Garfit),
South West sustainable transport corridor should be given greater weight than relying on corridors where infrastructure projects are to be decided / proven deliverable.	57343* (HD Planning Ltd)
Comment that the plan should capitalise further on the committed key sustainable transport infrastructure along the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor, and that further development should be proposed here.	58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Comment that the strategy should review other sustainable corridors in the same way as the Rural Southern Cluster approach, including • the southwest corridor, which benefits from the railway and GCP Melbourn Greenway project. • the A428/E-W Rail/OxCam Arc corridor	57340 (HD Planning Ltd), 58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel)
Comment that the development strategy should revise its focus away from the western A428 corridor of Cambridge to the east where strategic growth locations like Six Mile Bottom can create a more sustainable pattern of development linked to good transport links, supporting the southern cluster.	59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Economy

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for focus on employment uses such as Life Sciences (including healthcare, biotechnology and biomedical activities) associated research and development laboratory space and life science related advanced manufacturing	57316 (Huntingdonshire DC),
It is right for the strategy to be realistic around the locational limits of some new jobs floorspace which is centred upon national and global economic clusters.	58195 (Terence O'Rourke Ltd),
Should be governed by local need. Local jobs to reduce travel to work and be more sustainable.	57639* (Histon & Impington PC)
Plan for a new era of flexible work and location choices, including build to rent as part of diverse housing needs. Failing to manage pressure of future employment flows will result in escalating house occupancies, rents, expanding travel to work areas, and rising congestion levels.	60519 (Cambridge Ahead)
Concern about the lack of clear information about where employment land is located and to categorise this land into different potential uses	58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 60276 (Commercial Estates Group)
Cambridge needs more quality office buildings within Cambridge Prime Central submarket with most severe supply pressures in Greater Cambridge. Supply/demand imbalance is acute and getting worse. Whilst there is need for housing, Grade A commercial floor area should be encouraged, incentivised and make best use of brownfield site. No constraints to development, only what quantum can be accommodated. Allocation should not be prescriptive. Site specific matters will determine what impacts and benefits arise.	58646* (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
Comment that the plan should provide allocations to meet demand for warehouse and distribution centres for the following reasons:	58585 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• the evidence base for the emerging GCLP underestimates the need for Class B2 and B8 uses, and does not reflect the market demand for these uses in Greater Cambridge	
Address logistics needs and locational requirements (NPPF); good connectivity to strategic road network, on large flat sites.	60215 (Tritax Symmetry)
Plan does not demonstrate how it can meet future jobs targets or needs, particularly for mid tech.	60685 (Trinity College)

Strategic and smaller scale development

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for development at strategic sites for the following reasons: • Development can be located close to existing infrastructure • They perform better in transport terms and result in greater internalisation of trips • They can provide large numbers of new homes • They provide long term certainty of delivery • They are at locations which make best use of land while creating well-designed, characterful places	56861 (Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth PC), 56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57316 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58309 (University of Cambridge), 58359 (Marshall Group Properties), 58523 (Phase 2 Planning), 58808 (R Mervart), 58923 (Clare College, Cambridge)
Comment that all strategic sites need to: • provide sufficient land for educational purposes, taking into account Cambridgeshire County Council's agreed school site sizes	56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• ensure that schools are centrally located and easily accessible to families living within the catchment area by walking or cycling, to support 'healthy schools' objectives	
Comments regarding strategic sites including new settlements, including the following points: • require carefully considered design incorporating suitable levels of facilities and open spaces • locate jobs in these locations to minimise travel and maximise their attractiveness to new residents • Generally, the larger the development the greater the chance of trips being internalised, and the settlement is likely to have a greater chance at being able to provide key services and facilities. • Any development in the Cambourne / Bourn Airfield area needs to have good links to the existing community to enable greater access to services and to reduce the potential transport impacts of any new development	56803 (M Colville), 56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Spatial strategy should focus the larger development sites in locations which offer public transport options to reach major employment centres. Development in rural locations of an appropriate scale should not be deterred as and when more sustainable personal transport options are available, eg electric vehicles using renewable energy.	60044 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
Concern that the strategy relies too much on large urban extensions to Cambridge City and new settlements in South Cambridgeshire, for the following reasons:	**Individuals** 56956 (J Swannell)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Strategic sites are often complex to bring forward and implement with significant investment in infrastructure often required before dwellings can be delivered • Risk to deliverability of the plan • Does not represent a flexible and balanced approach capable of responding to changing circumstances or providing a mix and variety of sites • Will significantly limit the supply of new housing sites being delivered by smaller and mid-sized (SME) housebuilders • Specific infrastructure challenges noted including relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant at North East Cambridge, East West Rail, and relocation of Cambridge Airport • Strategic sites often do not deliver policy-compliant levels of affordable housing	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 57301 (AJ Johnson), 58146 (J Manning), 60369 (Critchley Family), 58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 60458 (P, J & M Crow), 60394 (D Wright), 56557 (Bonnel Homes Ltd), 56713 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 56895 (RWS Ltd), 56902 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited), 56995 (Hastingwood Developments), 57056 (Endurance Estates), 57083 (Shelford Investments), 57094 (RO Group Ltd), 57104 (J Francis), 57113 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57121 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57195 (European Property Ventures (Cambridgeshire)), 57202 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57346 (Clarendon Land), 57348 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57502 (Cambridgeshire County Council (as landowner)), 57636 (Dudley Developments), 57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 57684 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 58187 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58255 (Bletsoes), 58401 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58433 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58488 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners (Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell), 58503 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58600 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58356* (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms -Hardington- LLP), 58629 (Hill Residential), 58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58694 (LVA), 58879 (Scott Properties), 58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58923 (Clare

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	College, Cambridge), 58929 (Carter Jonas), 58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 58963 (Endurance Estates), 59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 59148 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59252 (Croudace Homes), 60580 (Martin Grant Homes), 60625 (NIAB Trust – Girton site), 60632 (NIAB Trust), 58948* (Endurance Estates), 59032* (L&Q Estates Limited & Hill Residential Ltd), 60323 (Daniels Bros – Shefford – Ltd), 60329 (Steeplefield), 60345 (FC Butler Trust), 60356 (FC Butler Trust), 60383 (S & J Graves), 60668 (Mill Stream Developments), 57063 (C Meadows)
Objection to short lead in times assumed for the largest sites include in First Proposals, noting that: • these conflict with those recommended in the Housing Delivery Study, and in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options for Testing – Methodology November 2020 – Appendix 6. • Adopting these would not provide sufficient time for post-adoption supplementary plans or guidance	58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Objection to assumptions regarding housing delivery at strategic sites, for the following reasons: • Should take into account delivery evidence from other locations • No justification for how Waterbeach will achieve the anticipated increase in delivery	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 57301 (AJ Johnson), 58146 (J Manning), 56489 (D & B Searle), 56517 (RJ & RS Millard), 56995 (Hastingwood Developments), 57051 (Cemex UK Properties Ltd), 57083 (Shelford Investments), 57094 (RO Group Ltd), 57113 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57202 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57348 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57502 (Cambridgeshire County Council (as

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Lack of detail to demonstrate intensified rates of development at both Waterbeach New Town and Northstowe is achievable • Proposed delivery rates and timings for Bourn Airfield do not appear reliable / robust • Proposed delivery rates at North East Cambridge by 2041 appear ambitious • Redevelopment of North East Cambridge and Cambridge East are complex and involve the relocation of existing uses, therefore realistic assumptions on delivery are needed • Predicted housing delivery rates for extension to Cambourne are challenging • Evidence for faster delivery at Northstowe and Waterbeach is based solely on use of Modern Methods of Construction • Delivery of significant up-front infrastructure can often impact / delay delivery of strategic sites. • Lead-in times and build out rates for North East Cambridge, Cambourne, Cambridge East and North West Cambridge are in conflict with recommendations from Housing Delivery Study	landowner)), 57636 (Dudley Developments), 57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 57684 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 57893 (Martin Grant Homes), 58187 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58401 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58433 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58503 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58629 (Hill Residential), 58644 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58805 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58815 (Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd), 58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60580 (Martin Grant Homes), 57121 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 56481 (V Chapman), 58639 (R Grain), 57063 (C Meadows), 56499 (W Grain), 57104 (J Francis), 60541 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd)
Concern about in delivery rate assumptions for strategic sites: • Disparity between sites of similar scale. • Inconsistent and contrary to Housing Delivery Study.	60271 (Commercial Estates Group), 60323 (Daniels Bros – Shefford – Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• More realistic to lower average build-out rate to 250dpa, with peak of 300dpa in one or two years if it can be evidenced. • Inconsistent with Lichfields Start to Finish evidence and past delivery.	
First Proposals plan is heavily reliant on the delivery of a handful of strategic developments, particularly large and complex sites. To ensure that the delivery of industrial space does not stall, and the supply-demand gap for employment space widens as a result, a pipeline of smaller developments which can deliver commercial sites quickly will be needed in the short-to-medium term.	60357 (H. J. Molton Settlement)
Comment that more development should be directed to small and medium sized sites on the edge of Cambridge and in the rural area, for the following reasons: • support sustainable rural development • enhance vitality of rural settlements including supporting the existing services and facilities, as per NPPF para 79 • meet increasing demand for housing away from larger settlements arising from the COVID pandemic • NPPF para 60 notes the need to allow sufficient amount and variety of land to come forward to support the objective of significantly boosting supply of homes • support stated aim of supporting rural communities • Risk to five year supply and resulting potential impact of speculative development by limiting such sites	**Individuals** 56956 (J Swannell) **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 57301 (AJ Johnson), 56961 (S & D Jevon and Raven), 58771* (S Grain), 60263 (Gonville & Caius College), 57121 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family),58355 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 56489 (D & B Searle), 56517 (RJ & RS Millard), 56557 (Bonnel Homes Ltd), 56713 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 56895 (RWS Ltd), 56995 (Hastingwood Developments), 57051 (Cemex UK Properties Ltd), 57056 (Endurance Estates), 57083 (Shelford Investments), 57094 (RO Group Ltd), 57113 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57195 (European Property Ventures (Cambridgeshire)), 57202 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57310 (Deal Land LLP), 57346

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The plan should positively plan for development at established rural settlements, including Group Villages • There are a number of sustainable villages including being accessible by sustainable modes of transport, and where development in one village may support services in a village nearby • Such sites can deliver policy-compliant levels of affordable housing • provide a flexible, diverse supply of housing sites • facilitate greater space for people • provide opportunities to connect with the surrounding countryside to improve mental and physical health • provide local, smaller housebuilders the opportunity to acquire sites • address NPPF para 62 requirement for housing types and sizes to reflect the needs of the community • NPPF para 105 regarding minimising the need to travel notes that the opportunities will be different in urban and rural areas • Limiting such development conflicts with the Plan's aim of enhancing existing places • Public transport infrastructure investment should be directed to villages to make them more sustainable • Village employment sites can enhance the sustainability of such settlements by reducing the need to travel	(Clarendon Land), 57348 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57374 (Colegrove Estates), 57502 (Cambridgeshire County Council (as landowner)), 57516 (R2 Developments Ltd), 57527 (Mr Henry d'Abo), 57636 (Dudley Developments), 57636 (Dudley Developments), 57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 57684 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 58146 (J Manning), 58187 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58255 (Bletsoes), 58285 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58333 (Simons Developments Ltd, 58370 (D Moore), 58401 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58433 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58488 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners (Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell), 58503 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58512 (Hill Residential Limited), 58523 (Phase 2 Planning), 58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58600 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58629 (Hill Residential), 58644 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58694 (LVA), 58805 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58815 (Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd), 58879 (Scott Properties), 58900 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58923 (Clare College, Cambridge), 58929 (Carter Jonas), 58952 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58963 (Endurance Estates), 59020 (Peterhouse), 59080 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd), 59148 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59252 (Croudace Homes), 59307 (Countryside Properties),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Changes in working patterns arising from COVID have enhanced the sustainability of rural living. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Local Plan does not adequately account for this change in sustainable characteristics. • Can support provision of needed community infrastructure • To maintain smooth delivery of housing throughout plan period • At villages, tightly drawn framework boundaries limit infill opportunities	59740 (Endurance Estates), 59048 (Emmanuel College), 58613* (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58265* (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 56497* 57148* (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57191* (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57342* (HD Planning Ltd), 58483* (D Moore), 58564* (Croudace Homes), 58635* (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58652* (Wates Developments Ltd), 58672* (Artisan* (UK) Projects Ltd), 58875* (St John's College Cambridge), 60217* (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60545* (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60295 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn Site), 60302 (Miller Homes – Melbourn Site), 60323 (Daniels Bros – Shefford – Ltd), 60329 (Steeplefield), 60345 (FC Butler Trust), 60356 (FC Butler Trust), 60383 (S & J Graves), 60510 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60541 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60563 (Countryside Properties), 60580 (Martin Grant Homes), 60610 (CALA Group Ltd), 60612 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site), 60624 (NIAB Trust – Girton site), 60629 (NIAB Trust), 60633 (NIAB Trust), 60668 (Mill Stream Developments), 60284 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 56481 (V Chapman), 56479* (V Chapman), 56487* (D & B Searle), 56499 (W Grain), 56515* (RJ & JS Millard), 58639 (R Grain), 58624* (R Grain), 57063 (C Meadows), 57014 (J Francis)
Support for the Councils' response to NPPF para 69 - that plans should accommodate at least 10% of their housing on sites no larger than 1 hectare	57316 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Objection to the Councils' response to NPPF para 69 - that plans should accommodate at least 10% of their housing on sites no larger than 1 hectare, for the following reasons: • there are a number of available sites for residential development, located outside of the Green Belt, at sustainable settlements such as Group Villages • all sites relevant to para 69 should be identified within the plan	56557 (Bonnel Homes Ltd), 56713 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 56961 (S & D Jevon and Raven), 57340 (HD Planning Ltd), 57346 (Clarendon Land), 58355 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 60284 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60561 (W Garfit)
Need to show meeting NPPF para 69. The plan states that the requirement will be exceeded but includes windfall sites which are unidentified. Must be able to demonstrate it can meet the requirements through allocations or on sites identified on the Brownfield register.	60183 (Home Builders Federation)
Comment that directing self-build to strategic sites will limit this form of development meeting local needs.	57374 (Colegrove Estates)

Water supply and drainage

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support recognition that water supply challenge is a serious issue to be resolved.	59970* (Natural England)
Object on grounds of inadequate water supply, effect on national food supply, failure to minimise climate change, likely irreparable damage to ecosystems, carbon emissions from construction, lack of integrated public transport, undermining Levelling Up	**Individuals** 59467* (H Alder), 59480* (Jo Ashman), 59501* (Babraham PC), 59503* (J Ayton), 59505* (A Barry), 59509* (L Benedetto), 59511* (N Ashman), 59513* (V Estellers Casas), 59516* (C Fisher), 59518* (S Fisher), 59520* (M Forbes),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
agenda, democratic deficit in process and evidence base. Support Friends of River Cam objection.	59521* (V Fowkes Bolt), 59522* (A Fraser), 59523* (R Fredman), 59524* (C Friend), 59525* (L Garnier), 59526* (Z Gilbertson), 59538* (F Goodwille), 59539* (C Goodwille), 59552* (R Hegde), 59557* (E Hewitt), 59560* (J Holden), 59561* (G Holland), 59562* (K Hulme), 59564* (J Johnson), 59746* (A Jones), 59748* (T Jones), 59749* (J Kavanagh), 59750* (P Kenrick), 59751* (M Kivlen), 59752* (Anonymous), 59753* (T Knight), 59754, 59756, 59757* (Anonymous), 59758* (R Lambert), 59760* (D Langley), 59763* (J Langley), 59766* (T Levanti-Rowe), 59769* (J Lucas), 59772* (M Majidi), 59777* (M Bijok Hone), 59778* (S Marelli), 59784* (C Martin), 59789* (P Carney), 59790* (A McAllister), 59791* (B Bolt), 59792* (S Mercer), 59793* (C McKay), 59794* (R Meyer), 59795* (I Fourcade), 59796* (B Bruun), 59798* (S Burch), 59800* (M Cassidy), 59802* (B Basheer), 59804* (J Clarke), 59807* (G Offley), 59808* (M Cooper), 59809* (I Page), 59811* (M Patten), 59815* (P Pettitt), 59820* (H Pike), 59822* (M Presa), 59829* (H Price), 59844* (S Ramaiya), 59848* (R Edwards), 59865* (C Wilson), 59873* (J Winterkorn), 59874* (S Worzencraft), 59875* (J Nilsson-Wright), 59876* (M Zmija), 59884* (J Waterfield), 59885* (P Waterfield), 59887* (E Wayne), 59888* (N Willis), 59889* (L Ramakrishnan), 59890* (E Reid), 89891* (K Rennie), 59892* (F Crawford), 59893* (K Reti), 59894* (R Savage), 59895* (A Sharpe), 59897* (R Cushing), 59958* (N Deja), 59959* (LC Driver), 59960* (S Sharples), 59961* (S Sinclair), 59962* (R Sorkin), 59963* (F Spalding), 59967* (D Stoughton), 59990* (J

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	Tanner), 59993* (M Taylor), 59994* (H Thomas), 60000* (C Todd), 60039* (A Wilson), 60041* (M Farrington), 60500* (R Doyon), 60501* (J Pratt), 60617* (J Toynbee), 60618* (S Loveday), 60621* (I Fowler), 60622* (C A Holloway), 60636* (K Smyth), 60637* (C Redfern), 60638* (D Murrell), 60670* (Anonymous), 60671* (Anonymous), L Whitebread), 60824* (R Bienzobas), 60210 (J V Neal) 60505* (Late representation: C Candeloro), 60820* (Late representation: L Whitebread) **Third Sector Organisations** 59594* (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 60037* (Friends of the Cam Steering Group)
Has the water provision been planned for all these developments? What will be their water source? How will the health of the Cam and its associated chalk streams be maintained?	57833* (S Sinclair)
Plan does not satisfactorily address inadequate water supply	60234 (P Blythe)
Support for the approach taken to addressing water supply issues	58882 (A Sykes), 59133 (M Berkson)
Further development needs to be phased in line with public water supply availability, if the plan is to meet its environmental objectives.	58970* (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Comment that the plan's approach to water supply issues should also be taken to permissions and s106 agreements. Queried whether proposed infrastructure projects take into account water demand from construction.	58882 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the need for the delivery of new strategic water supply infrastructure	58731 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
The plan does not satisfactorily address issue of inadequate water supply; need to identify strategic water supply solutions and / or interim measures	60188 (J Preston)
There is insufficient capacity for utilities delivery (supply of water and waste water disposal);	59258* (Teversham PC)
• Need to await the findings of the Regional Water Plan. Greater Cambridge already has an unsustainable supply of potable water. • The local sewage system is currently inadequate.	60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Comment that water resources should not be seen as a constraint to growth, noting that: • the onus is on Water Resources East and the water companies, through their obligations in the Water Industries Act 1991, to plan for and provide water to meet the requirements • Water Resources East have stated that water supply should not curtail development and that the regional plan will offer up a number of solutions to address short-long term needs. • Developments will need to implement integrated water management regimes • If infrastructure is not in place a stepped requirement may be necessary (last resort). Ensure planned housing	57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58359 (Marshall Group Properties), 58963 (Endurance Estates), 60171 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
requirements can still be met within plan period and does not become continually delayed (PPG para 68-021)	
Comment that work needs to be undertaken to further identify and programme practical interim solutions to a specific timescale to overcome the potential constraint to growth in the area posed by water supply constraints.	58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd)
Need to consider how water will be provided for this amount of growth - the chalk aquifer is already being over abstracted	56511 (C Martin)
Concern about water supply impacts of the plan, including the potential carbon impacts of any required water transfer.	56523 (C Martin)
Comment regarding the strategy, noting its dependence on uncertain infrastructure issues, including water supply, East West Rail and relocation of Cambridge airport. Comment that water supply is likely to affect surrounding districts to varying degrees, and that if the issue was not resolved it would be difficult to justify the proposed level and speed of delivery. Suggestion that a stepped trajectory and phased delivery of development might be the best way to respond to these issues.	57316 (Huntingdonshire DC)
The Plan should consider whether there are strategic site allocations elsewhere in the plan area that will benefit from new planned investment in water infrastructure. Provision is currently being made for a new pipeline connecting water supplies from the north of Lincolnshire to the Colchester area of Essex, which includes supply to the eastern part of Greater Cambridge near Six Mile Bottom. This £500 million	59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
scheme will be delivered by 2025 (early on in the Local Plan period) and will allow water to be moved from areas where it is more plentiful to areas of scarcity across the region.	

Transport and other infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Comment that the preferred strategy performs well in transport terms as demonstrated by the Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Transport Evidence Report October 2021, noting that not all transport mitigation has been tested.	56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Comment that any unresolved issues regarding transport might have impacts on neighbouring districts.	57316 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Support for co-ordinated working. As details of EWR Co's proposals are not yet confirmed, there is a risk of overlap in location of potential development options between EWR Co and Local Plan. Liaise on development proposals at and around Cambourne and Cambridge Stations.	59872* (East West Rail)
Objection to the plan's perceived implicit support for East West Rail, for the following reasons: • Very expensive • City Deal proposals can enhance connectivity between Cambourne and Cambridge • Will cause environmental harm and planning blight • Very low benefit cost ratio	57035 (W Harrold)
Concern regarding East West Rail including: • Will cause environmental harm and planning blight • Protect and enhance Green Belt;	57851* (T Harrold), 57853* (T Harrold), 57854* (T Harrold), 57857* (T Harrold),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Very expensive • Adverse impact on and need to protect communities; • Will obliterate most objectives including climate objectives; • Our area being sacrificed for Arc but will receive no benefit; • Destroy valuable agricultural land.	57858* (T Harrold), 58256* (Little & Great Eversden PC)
East West Rail is beneficial only if the route approaches Cambridge from the North and connects with the East Coast. Looping South after Cambourne contradicts the policy of limiting development in the Southern Fringe.	59103* (M Berkson)
East West Rail has potential to transform the area, maximising sustainable opportunities for growth. Transport impact assessments / modelling should consider cumulative impacts of existing and proposed development at Cambourne, and implications for wider area, including on strategic and local road network within Central Bedfordshire.	59691 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
Moving forward without clear idea how extra housing will impact wider area. Need models showing impact of traffic and public transport use. Proceed as slowly as Government allows until information is available, do not accelerate approved projects. Agree most important factors are environmental impacts and on local traffic. Building near workplaces will only mitigate extra travel. Public transport system will need to be transformed. Without details of impacts of developments my response will be no to them all.	59436* (Anonymous)
Comment noting: • Lack of information on transport links required, ensure they are brought forward concurrently • Insufficient provision of public transport	60188 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Comment regarding potential transport impacts of existing employment sites and the proposed strategy, including the following: • employment sites at Duxford, Granta Park, the Wellcome Genome Campus and the Babraham Institute draw car trips from North Hertfordshire • Expansion of Cambridge Biomedical Campus will draw more car trips onto the A10, negatively impacting on Royston • Creation of Cambridge South Station will relieve some pressure on the A10, but stations in North Herts will need enhancement to address additional pressures here, including requiring data from Greater Cambridge to help quantify these • Role of Royston as a local centre for communities in the south of South Cambridgeshire should be recognised and responded to, were any development to be proposed in this area	58650 (North Hertfordshire DC)
Transport links in Cambridge cannot cope with existing demand, leading to congestion, making it dangerous for active travel. Transport proposals do not adequately address this.	56791* (J Kirkbride)
Support for the committed infrastructure proposals that are being progressed by the transport bodies and the objective of seeking to achieve a modal shift away from the use of the private car	58359 (Marshall Group Properties)
Comment that coordination with every organisation involved in transport strategy is absolutely essential	59133 (M Berkson)
Current transport links and proposals are inadequate. Promoting a strategic and sustainable approach to public transport in Cambridgeshire, including a detailed proposition for light rail on two main routes: Cambourne-Cambridge city centre-Addenbrooke's-Granta Park-Haverhill; Cambridge Science Park-Trumpington.	60051 (Cambridge Connect)
The plan should focus on public transport and cycle connections	57980* (E Osimo)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concern that all new development will generate vehicle traffic, noting that most people will still want a car, and that even car free development will require servicing by vehicles. Concern at the lack of a fully integrated transport policy	59258* (Teversham PC)
Applaud aim to encourage development in locations not reliant on cars. Also aim to reduce environmental impact of transport; significantly improve public transport to villages. Cars likely to remain mainstay so ensure electric charging infrastructure is provided.	57583* (R Pargeter)
Relying on planned public transport links will leave the Plan vulnerable to challenge if projects are delayed. Focus more on existing infrastructure.	57342* (HD Planning Ltd)
National Highways have been collaboratively engaging regarding the effect of the emerging GCLP on the Strategic Road Network; seeking to ensure the impact of allocated sites are identified and suitably mitigated. Detailed technical modelling validation queries relating to the Transport Evidence Report.	60073 (National Highways)
Ox Cam Arc; creating low carbon transport links between important centres is good but should minimise impacts on natural environment and ecology. Will create a corridor of 'soul-less dormitories'. The only winners are developers not local people.	60075 (C de Blois)
Comments on the transport evidence report, including: • Supporting its conclusions • Noting the significant additional traffic generated by the various strategic spatial options previously tested • Welcoming requirement for implementation of trip budgets at strategic sites	60255 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Comment on the need to deliver timely infrastructure including public transport, broadband, social facilities, retail in new developments,	57645 (Histon & Impington Parish Council)
Comment that Transport Evidence assumes a massive increase in Park & Ride spaces, which could harm landscape and Green Belt.	58241 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Ensure faster delivery of existing new settlements does not impact infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas.	57314* (Huntingdonshire DC)
Green Infrastructure must be delivered before, or alongside new development	56572 (Gamlingay PC)
No new cultural or provision for other ‘city-scale’ needs which will put the city centre under even greater pressure.	60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Such a large increase in house building in the city requires a significant investment in community facilities and infrastructure to be a benefit to current local communities, not a further strain on resources. Investment in public transport should come before extra housing.	57834* (D Lister)
The plan does not meet the infrastructure needs of new residents	59030* (Great Shelford PC)
In areas of significant housing growth, developer contributions for health and care services must be sought to meet growing demand. Planning obligations should address strategic and local priorities.	59114* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
The cumulative impacts of residential developments on healthcare infrastructure in the area should be recognised. Planning policies must help finance improved healthcare services and facilities through effective estate management.	59134 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
The plan should consider education and hospital needs in greater detail.	58882 (A Sykes)
There is insufficient infrastructure (roads, schools and hospitals in particular) to support delivery of the strategy.	59258* (Teversham PC)
For a plan to be sound the cumulative impact of policies should not undermine its deliverability. Viability assessment must consider all policy costs and benchmark land values accurately. Land values for brownfield sites appear low, should be reconsidered and increased to reflect higher existing use values.	60175* (Home Builders Federation)

Justification for/presentation of the development strategy

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The plan is not clear what is meant by development having “the least climate impact”, the term is not defined, leading to ambiguity for developers as to what proposals should be seeking to achieve	58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)
Comment that the policy should include greater clarity about the full list of allocations including for employment, and their relationship with adopted allocations.	57340 (HD Planning Ltd)
Comment that the plan does not include a trajectory setting out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites.	58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)
Comment that there isn’t an overarching spatial strategy that explains the rationale behind the distribution of future development, and why the areas and locations identified will help achieve the Vision and Aims. The strategy should be more strongly presented in the context of proposed connectivity enhancements such as East West Rail and Cambourne to Cambridge.	58237 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Comment that the reasons for selecting the preferred strategy are not clearly set out: • the Preferred Option (Spatial Option 9), along with the alternative blended strategy (Spatial Option 10), appear as standalone options without reference to the previous options • Appendix E to the Sustainability Appraisal ostensibly provides the justification for the preferred spatial strategy, however this also does not explain why the preferred spatial strategy is considered to be the best performing option when compared to other spatial options, nor does it give reasons for why other spatial options have been discounted • The Councils fail to demonstrate that the conclusions of assessment of the 10 spatial options have led the determination of the best performing	58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
strategy for the First Proposals document. Instead, there is the very strong suspicion that a spatial strategy has instead been retrofitted to suit a series of pre-chosen sites no clear explanation as to why transport corridors option was discounted • there are no SA Objectives where Spatial Option 9: Preferred Option Spatial Strategy clearly performs better than the other Spatial Options • The Sustainability Assessment appraisal only of sites that fitted with the emerging spatial strategy has prevented the allocation of suitable sites that could be included in a more appropriate development strategy • Assessment of site options on 'Public Transport Corridors' source of supply was combined with Villages to create a category of 'Dispersal: Villages / Transport Corridors' for which no clear • explanation is provided. In combining the two options, many of the benefits of aligning major development sites (200+ units) to a Public Transport Corridor location are neutralised by the disbenefits of Dispersal Villages.	
Comment that the plan does not justify why Cambourne is identified for development when the Development Strategy Options – Summary Report noted that the relevant Spatial Option to Cambourne performed 'relatively poorly within the plan period, as it is unlikely that the full infrastructure to support development will be provided'.	58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Comment that the plan lacks clarity as to how the overall figure for future development at Cambourne during the Plan period accords with the Councils' development strategy	58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Comment that more distinction needs to be given as between consideration of rural settlements as opposed to rural areas, noting that interrelationship with surrounding areas is material and that it is accepted that residents in village locations must rely upon services and facilities outside of their particular settlement to meet all of their needs.	58694 (LVA)
Concern that the rationale for proposing some allocations in in the rural area and for rejecting other available and suitable villages sites is not evidenced robustly, for the following reasons: • Suggestion that the approach to rural allocations was site-led rather than being led by an objective process which compares the sustainability credentials of sustainable rural settlements. • Other sites with more positive Housing & Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) assessments were not allocated. • Concern how the strategy has been interpreted into the allocations proposed.	56713 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57346 (Clarendon Land), 58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 59252 (Croudace Homes), 60568 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
Lack of information how extra housing will impact the city/wider area. Proceed slowly until more information is available.	60673 (Anonymous)
Comment that the plan should show for reference the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP)	58106 (M Asplin)

Spatial strategy sources of supply

Cambridge urban area, including brownfield sites

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for focus on densification, including: • in existing urban areas in locations well served by public transport • making effective use of land • within Cambridge as a sustainable location for development	58053 (Trinity Hall), 58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58808 (R Mervart), 59048 (Emmanuel College), 57709 (J Pavey),
Support for smaller sites where well-integrated with existing neighbourhoods, including on previously developed sites in the urban area, including for windfall development, especially in such locations	58922 (Metro Property Unit Trust)
Brownfield development should be prioritised	58325* (Linton PC)
Agree that brownfield development should be prioritised and in locally-agreed not nationally targeted locations. Development “around” villages is not considered sustainable.	59851 (Barrington PC)
Plan does not follow ‘brownfield first’ approach; it should encourage urban intensification.	59945 (O Harwood)
Take opportunities to reuse brownfield land to ensure protection of other more sensitive locations in the countryside.	60640 (TTP Campus Limited)
Support for the proposed approach however this should focus sustainable development on under-utilised previously developed sites	58907* (Metro Property Unit Trust)
Existing buildings should be re-used wherever possible before new building is considered.	60677 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Objection to focus on densification, noting • potential harm to quality of life and that is not in keeping with the objectives of Wellbeing & Social inclusion” and ˜Great Places”	57798 (M Starkie), 57638 (J Conroy), 57766* (T Elliott); 57582* (C Maynard)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• harm to quality of life and economic growth • Cambridge has reached maximum; more growth will impair quality of life; • Other urban centres should be developed with adequate transport links to avoid permanent gridlock in Cambridge;	
Comment on the potential challenges of developing on brownfield sites, including that they: • can be blighted by contamination, • have complex ownership issues that affect delivery • be too small or inadequately accessed • are usually associated with higher abnormal costs which can sometimes put pressure on viability and the ability to deliver higher standard, sustainable developments	57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57195 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58676 (The Church Commissioners for England), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Comment that the setting of the historic centre, and its relationship with the countryside with a network of green spaces complementing the built environment, must be preserved	57938 (North Newnham Residents Association)
Comment in relation to densification, that thought also needs to be given to development of new communities on sites that: facilitate greater space for people; provide a greater variety of housing; increase affordability for those unable to afford urban prices; and provide opportunities to connect with the surrounding countryside to improve mental and physical health	58963 (Endurance Estates), 59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Question raised whether sites within Cambridge brought forward from the 2018 Local Plan and some of which were previously allocated in the 2006 Local Plan are likely to deliver within the plan period.	58923 (Clare College, Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No mention of Covid and city centre opportunities from potential radical changes in retail and office working.	60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Support identification of North East Cambridge for the creation of a compact city district on brownfield land. Concerned by homes target (page 32); trajectory at odds with that agreed with Homes England as pre-requisite for relocating WWTW. Policy should include 5,600 homes on Core Site by 2041.	60148 (U&I PLC and TOWN)
Anglian Water agrees that North East Cambridge should be listed first in the strategy given it is ‘a compact city district on brownfield land already identified for development, including a mix of jobs and homes’.	60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for NEC but object to lack of consideration for accommodating displaced commercial uses	60762 (U&I Group PLC)
Objection to inclusion of North East Cambridge for the following reasons: • it is premature to include it ahead of Development Consent Order outcome for relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP) • Unnecessary and too large. • Relocated WWTW will be insufficient for needs of further growth. • Oversupply of homes within City. • Tall buildings 4 stories max. • 300dph too dense. • Nearest local shops Newmarket Rd • Huge impact Milton Rd, Elizabeth Way, A10 north • next to two of more deprived LSOAs and requires sewage works to relocate to Green Belt rather than upgrading. • No mention of retired for balanced community • Scale and density not supported • Plan and NEC AAP do not require relocation of WWTW • S/NEC reliant on relocation of WWTW in Green Belt • No justification or operational need for WWTW to relocate to Green Belt • Housing development is not supported, focus on employment with public transport • development at the proposed location, on Green belt would result in 'Very High Harm' contrary to the substantial weight.	57798 (M Starkie), 58106 (M Asplin), 57129* (D Lott), 57548* (Save Honey Hill Group), 57632* (J Conroy), 58105* (M Asplin), 59883 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Objection to inclusion of North East Cambridge as presented and correspondent lack of draft allocation at Cambridge Science Park, as it conflates the delivery of new homes reliant on the DCO with the ongoing growth of employment associated with the existing Cambridge Science Park cluster.	58400 (Trinity College)
Objection to assumed trajectory for North East Cambridge, noting • Likely challenges to the build out rate generated by the requirement for a trip budget • expected DCO outcome timings	59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Objection to the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP) to enable development at North East Cambridge, for the following reasons: • Loss of Green Belt • Development of green spaces • Carbon impact • The current WWTP is still operational • Harm to the current open landscape • Relatively small number of homes enabled by the relocation	56523 (C Martin), 58106 (M Asplin)
Objection to S/C/SMS Garages between 20 St. Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge on basis that loss of off-street parking provision at the garages will harm residents' amenity.	58381 (F Gawthrop)

The edge of Cambridge, and Green Belt

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the approach of limiting development on the edge of Cambridge beyond already approved sites.	56965 (Trumpington Residents Association), 58241 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Support the delivery of sites on edge of Cambridge given they are sustainable locations to existing jobs, services, infrastructure, and transportation	58731 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)
Urge greater protection of village separation, noting example of inadequate separation between proposed Cambridge Airport (Land North of Cherry Hinton) site between the settlement and new development.	59258* (Teversham PC)
Support for limited release of Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge	57502 (Cambridgeshire County Council - as landowner)
Support for conclusion that housing needs alone do not provide the 'exceptional circumstances' to justify removing land from the Green Belt on the edge of the city	56965 (Trumpington Residents Association)
The additional 11,640 dwellings required to cover a 10% buffer have already been provided for elsewhere, so the high level of need that should be demonstrated before considering any additional Green Belt land release has not been met.	58166* (Dr S Kennedy)
Comment that edge of Cambridge greenfield sites can deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing	58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)
Comment that exceptional circumstances exist to justify release land from the Green Belt in all parts of Greater Cambridge affected by the designation, for the following reasons:	57063 (C Meadows), 57083 (Shelford Investments), 57121 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57636 (Dudley Developments), 58433 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• the significant need for housing and affordable housing in Greater Cambridge and the need to support economic growth • opportunities exist in the Green Belt to promote sustainable patterns of development	Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58629 (Hill Residential), 58731 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58929 (Carter Jonas), 58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)
Comment regarding the reasonable options needing to be explored before considering whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, including the following: • In Cambridge increasing densities and reusing previously developed land is not straightforward and may be inappropriate because of heritage assets and the difficulty of finding alternative sites for existing uses • previously developed land opportunities that are deliverable have already been identified within and on the edge of Cambridge	57063 (C Meadows), 57083 (Shelford Investments), 57121 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57636 (Dudley Developments), 58629 (Hill Residential), 58929 (Carter Jonas), 58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)
Development on GB is not generally acceptable, but to release a small site from the GB which in parallel secures greatly enhanced bio-diversity, and some informal rural public access, is a factor that weighs heavily in favour of the release	60561 (W Garfit)
Support for releasing Green Belt land in Shelford.	58815 (Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for releasing Green Belt land in Sawston	57376 (Deal Land LLP)
Support for releasing Green Belt land in Coton	60580 (Martin Grant Homes)
Don't build on Green Belt	57980* (E Osimo),
Comment that the plan should include even less focus on the Green Belt and villages	58808 (R Mervart)
Objection to proposed development in the Green Belt, in particular at villages. Place greater focus on new settlements/communities and expansion of existing sites.	56803 (M Colville)
Objection to proposed busways to new settlements as they would harm Green Belt, landscape, ecology and heritage.	58241 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Do not oppose development around Cambridge outside Green Belt provided new green spaces delivered to North East to reduce pressure on Wicken Fen. Any changes to Green Belt must be fully evidenced and justified.	59273 (National Trust)
Oppose proposals to remove further land from Green Belt, particularly Babraham and Hinxton. Inconsistent with purposes of Green Belt in Great Places Aim.	59595 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
No exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt land in excess of meeting Cambridge's needs, particularly around villages when there are other non-Green Belt suitable and sustainable sites.	60310 (Gladman Developments)
Concern about the amount of Green Belt land likely to be destroyed, in particular through relocating WWTW to Honey Hill.	60677 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Support the provision of additional housing on existing allocated land at Eddington.	58297* (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge East represents the largest and most sustainable opportunity to realise this potential.	58335* (Marshall Group Properties)
Comment that development at Cambridge East can support cross-city connectivity through the provision of a transformational transport strategy.	58359 (Marshall Group Properties)
Support for inclusion of Cambridge Biomedical Campus for additional development, noting that the scale of floorspace requirements justifies the full scale development of the district set out in Vision 2050, west as well as east of the West Anglia mainline.	58961 (Jesus College (working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings), a private landowner and St John's College)
Support proposed allocation for Campus. CBC Limited will support landowners deliver a Vision 2050 compatible scheme.	58247* (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
Support the need for growth and to concentrate that growth in sustainable locations. Cambridge Biomedical Campus is one of the best locations to sustainability address future needs.	58251* (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
Spatial Strategy refers to the desirability of locating homes close to existing and proposed jobs at the cluster of research parks to the south of Cambridge. Strongly support, a similar approach should be adopted at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, with the provision that this is offered as tied accommodation to create genuine affordable housing.	59770* (B Hunt)
Objection to inclusion of S/CBC/A area for housing.	57933 (F Goodwille)
Objection to proposed Green Belt release at Cambridge Biomedical Campus, for the following reasons: • Scale of proposal	56965 (Trumpington Residents Association), 58090 (D Lister), 58167 (Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Harm to the Green Belt • Loss of high quality agricultural land • Objection to inclusion of housing within the allocation • Employment needs could be met by densification of the existing campus or at off-site research locations • Creates urban sprawl • Harm to biodiversity	
Comments about growing the Cambridge Biomedical campus; • Impact on quality of life of residents; • Unclear whether infrastructure to support; • Impacts on green belt and biodiversity, including Ninewells nature reserve; • Accessibility and congestion; • Better, frequent low emission public transport could spread population growth; • Only justification for Green Belt release is affordable housing for hospital workers to reduce commuting, but must remain affordable.	57628* (M Polichroniadis), 58307 & 58322* (D Lynch)
Releasing Greenbelt land next to Babraham Road: Green Belt land protects countryside. Only justification for releasing it is affordable housing for hospital workers to reduce commuting, but must remain affordable.	59028* (R Stone)

New settlements

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for development at new settlements for the following reasons: • They can be designed with excellent transport links • They offer a blank canvas with which to design climate friendly and enjoyable living spaces within suitable locations • They do not burden existing villages • They can be sited outside of the Green Belt	56803 (M Colville), 56965 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Support for continuing development at the new settlements of Northstowe, Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield allocated in previous plans	56481 (V Chapman), 56489 (D & B Searle), 56499 (W Grain), 56517 (RJ & RS Millard), 58639 (R Grain)
Northstowe, Waterbeach, Bourn and Cambourne are unproven employment markets with demand remaining in and on edge of Cambridge, and encourage unsustainable travel patterns.	60281 (Commercial Estates Group)
Support for expanding Cambourne, for the following reasons: • the new East West Rail station will make it a well-connected area • Cambourne was the best performing in transport terms of the free-standing new settlements of those tested at stage one- with the Cambourne to Cambridge public transport scheme and East West Rail included • Opportunity to co-locate homes and jobs, in close proximity to major public transport routes	56481 (V Chapman), 56489 (D & B Searle), 56499 (W Grain), 56517 (RJ & RS Millard), 56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57893 (Martin Grant Homes), 58585 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site), 58639 (R Grain), 58676 (The Church Commissioners for England), 59833 (MCA Developments Ltd), 59866 (East West Rail)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• It is a location capable of higher levels of self-containment and where the options to reduce reliance on private cars is highest • Further develops and enhances a new settlement where the groundwork has already been laid, providing access to services and facilities within Cambourne and likely provision of new services and facilities • One of largest and most sustainable settlements in Greater Cambridge • EWR will provide a sustainable new travel option contributing towards achieving net zero carbon	
Comment that the delivery of additional employment land at Cambourne must be part of any strategy to make it more vibrant	58585 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site)
Comment that there is little evidence that travel behaviour in Cambourne will shift significantly with the delivery of a railway station given the small take up of employment units in its business park and limited high street offer.	59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Comment that the Councils should be planning for a significant extension or new settlement within the Cambourne area	58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)
Comment that no decision on development at Cambourne should be taken until there is confirmation regarding East West Rail	59153 (Cambourne TC)
Comment that the policy for Cambourne should state that planning permission will not be granted until work commences on a Cambourne Station and no new homes will be allowed to	59153 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
be occupied until the station and East West Rail services are operational	
Comment that Cambourne was the best performing in transport terms of the free-standing new settlements of those tested at stage one- with the Cambourne to Cambridge public transport scheme and East West Rail included. Any development in the Cambourne / Bourn Airfield area needs to have good links to the existing community to enable greater access to services and to reduce the potential transport impacts of any new development.	56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Suggestion that the plan should provide greater clarity about the location of growth at Cambourne, and that development can come forward here ahead of East West Rail, supported by Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambourne to Cambridge Public Transport Scheme	57893 (Martin Grant Homes)
Concern raised about assumed trajectory at Cambourne given uncertainty over East West Rail delivery and timing	58879 (Scott Properties)
Proposal for additional new settlements, to support the aim of significantly boosting housing supply.	58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Rural area

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for limits on rural development proposed in the plan, for the following reasons: • Protecting existing villages • Protecting rural nature of the area	56789 (Shudy Camps PC), 56803 (M Colville), 58345 (Caxton PC), 58350 (Toft PC), 58808 (R Mervart), 59957 (Little Abington PC), 59995 (Steeple Morden PC), 60077

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Other locations have equal or better public transport connections • Maintain the character of Cambridgeshire • Particularly protect villages in the Green Belt • Improve public transport using existing road network • Villages have already absorbed significant growth.	(Guilden Morden PC), 60110 (C Blakeley), 59710 (Caldecote PC), 56521* (R Smith)
Villages have endured significant development recently with no infrastructure and facilities.	58039 & 58041* (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Enabling infill development within smaller villages is supported as this will support rural services, the vitality and viability of villages, and their shops and services contributing to overall sustainability.	59691 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
Support for inclusion of allocations for housing and employment in the rest of the rural area as part of the proposed development strategy	58196 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 58255 (Bletsoes), 58952 (Varrier Jones Foundation)
Support for recognition in the policy DS recognises that appropriate development in the rest of the rural area includes “new employment sites in the countryside meeting specific business needs”	
Comment that the strategy should be more flexible to allow greater scales of development at Group and higher tier villages.	57374 (Colegrove Estates), 59056* (A P Burlton Turkey’s Ltd)
Comment that the strategy for the rural area should also reflect on the merits of planned public transport provision, as this further strengthens the sustainability of villages.	57310 (Deal Land LLP), 57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58647 (Deal Land LLP)
Comment that affordable housing in locations requiring car ownership is not affordable.	58183 (Cllr N Gough)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
More housing in rural areas should be allowed with the redevelopment of windfall sites.	59056* (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)
Comment that Foxton is a more sustainable village given its rail station	57516 (R2 Developments Ltd)
Comment noting the planned improvements to sustainable transport connections that will enhance the sustainability of Papworth, including: East West Rail; GCP proposed bus service enhancements, A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet project, cycle and pedestrian links to Cambourne.	57348 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58900 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58952 (Varrier Jones Foundation)
Note the improvement to connectivity in Caxton Village created by the proposed Cambourne East West Rail station.	56481 (V Chapman), 56489 (D & B Searle), 56499 (W Grain), 56517 (RJ & RS Millard)
Objection to statement on page 30 of the First Proposals document "Using less land for development reduces our carbon emissions, and allows more space for nature and wildlife". High quality development can also, at suitable lower densities, achieve carbon neutrality and provide enhancements for nature and wildlife, along with a wealth of other benefits.	58668 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Objection to the limits placed on small new housing sites in, and around smaller settlements	56557 (Bonnel Homes Ltd), 58600 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58644 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58694 (LVA), 58899 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Request that the development strategy increases its provision of housing for rural areas where redundant farm buildings exist	59080 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)
The list of permitted categories in the rural area should be amended to include 'horticulture and garden centres.'	58852 (Dobbies Garden Centres Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support settlement hierarchy policy as a means of directing development towards most suitable and sustainable locations. Concerned about impact of speculative applications. Suggest the word ‘indicative’ be removed to strengthen and add clarity. Support the reclassification of Cottenham and Babraham villages.	6011 (C Blakeley)
Support for inclusion of Babraham Research Campus in the Plan, to provide additional space for life science businesses to cluster and grow	58087 (Babraham Research Campus Ltd)
Provisos needed for Babraham Institute being released from Green Belt. “How Many Homes” by CPRE Devon, demonstrates ONS population projections seriously flawed, 40% overestimation of housing needs. Anthony Browne MP survey found very high proportion of residents did not want further housing developments. Green Belt under pressure and been nibbled away. Very high employment so no need for more, and associated housing.	59501* (Babraham PC)
Support for inclusion of Mingle Lane, Great Shelford within the plan, for the following reasons: • close proximity to employment opportunities and the good accessibility by sustainable modes of transport • good range of services and facilities within the village • exceptional circumstances relating to housing need justifies Green Belt release • supports vitality of rural communities • supports a range of housing types and sizes • Opportunity to address identified local housing needs including for affordable housing which won’t be met by other means	57301 (Mrs Ann Josephine Johnson)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Objection to site S/RRA/MF in Oakington, for the following reasons: • Removal of Green Belt is not justified in relation to harm to separation between Oakington and Northstowe • Harm to heritage and landscape • Floodrisk in the vicinity	56873 (J Prince)
Concern that development at village sites such as Melbourn will exacerbate existing problems, noting that this village has seen significant development in recent years with no infrastructure and facilities, putting pressure on both schools and roads.	58041* (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Support for approach taken to meeting logistics sector needs along the A14, including the following points: • Locating logistics facilities close to urban centres enables the use of electric fleet and cargo bikes for last mile deliveries • The area has high accessibility to the strategic network • The area along the A14 is served by large scale residential development providing a labour pool at short commuting distances	59053 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
Support for Policy S/RRA identifying two manufacturing and warehousing allocations around the Swavesey junction of the A14	59053 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
Support the proposals which exclude any development in Little Linton and the land between Little Linton and Linton. The settlements of Linton and Little Linton have historically had distinct identities. New development in the area would disrupt the historic open landscape, destroying the separation and damaging the individual character of each settlement. Land in this area is a valuable environmental resource, which should be protected.	57914* (H Lawrence-Foulds), 59432* (J Pearson)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The direction of future development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate and will ensure that Little Linton and Linton retain their identity.	

Sites not included in the First Proposals

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for a range of reasons including: • It accords with the strategy of the plan • Opportunity for development at a sustainable village • Opportunity to address identified local housing needs including for affordable housing which won't be met by other means • Support development of underutilised land and buildings • Limited contribution to Cambridge Green Belt purposes • Contributions that development will make to local infrastructure and facilities • Will be supported by planned Public Transport provision • Can meet identified employment sector needs	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 58146 (J Manning), 56713 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 56848 (Gonville and Caius College), 56902 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited), 56995 (Hastingwood Developments), 57051 (Cemex UK Properties Ltd), 57056 (Endurance Estates), 57083 (Shelford Investments), 57094 (RO Group Ltd), 57113 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57121 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57195 (European Property Ventures (Cambridgeshire)), 57202 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57310 (Deal Land LLP), 57346 (Clarendon Land), 57348 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57376 (Deal Land LLP), 57427 (Mission Street Ltd), 57502 (Cambridgeshire County Council (as landowner)), 57557 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited), 57558 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited), 57559 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited) 57565, (Cheveley Park Farms Limited), 57636 (Dudley Developments), 57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 57684 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites), 57893 (Martin Grant Homes), 58003 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58187 (Enterprise Property Group Limited), 58195 (Terence O'Rourke Ltd), 58196 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 58237 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58257 (Pembroke College), 58333

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• To maintain smooth delivery of housing throughout plan period • Support A10 Cambridge to Waterbeach corridor as a focus for growth • Contribute to NPPF paras 69 & 79 • Performs equitably or better than allocated sites • Provide as much choice as possible in terms of the location, size, type and tenure of housing that the plan can offer • Meets evidenced need for logistics land	(Simons Developments Ltd), 58355 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58400 (Trinity College), 58401 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58433 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58471 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited), 58488 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners (Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell), 58503 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58512 (Hill Residential Limited), 58523 (Phase 2 Plannning), 58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58585 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site), 58600 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58629 (Hill Residential), 58647 (Deal Land LLP), 58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58676 (The Church Commissioners for England), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58704 (Grange Farm Partnership), 58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58900 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58922 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 58923 (Clare College, Cambridge), 58929 (Carter Jonas), 58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 58952 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59020 (Peterhouse), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships), 59048 (Emmanuel College), 59053 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 59100 (Pace Investments), 59148 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59252 (Croudace Homes), 59307 (Countryside Properties), 60263 (Gonville & Caius College), 60284 Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60295 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn Site), 60302 (Miller Homes – Melbourn Site), 60709 (Vistry Group – Linden Homes), 60819 (Gonville & Caius College), 57009* (KWA Architects), 60545* (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 58188* (Smithson Hill), 58297* (University of Cambridge), 58613* (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58652* (Wates Developments Ltd), 57891* (Martin Grant Homes), 58265* (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 59053 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59131* (Lolworth

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	Developments Ltd), 58651* (Wates Developments Ltd), 60561 (W Garfit), 57063 (C Meadows), 57014 (J Francis)
Support for the rejection of specific sites promoted to the plan, for the following reasons: • Strain on local infrastructure • Traffic • Worsening flooding	56789 (Shudy Camps PC), 56965 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Objection to perceived incorrect assessment of site within the Strategy topic paper and HELAA	57015 (KWA Architects)
Request for clarity regarding inclusion or not of a specific site within the housing commitments identified in the First Proposals.	57076 (R Wilson)
Comment identifying the need to proactively plan for educational facilities when sites are actively being sought, and most specifically to provide a site for Cambridge Maths School.	57477 (ESFA (Department for Education)), 57494 (ESFA - Department for Education)
Objection to the proposed reclassification of Cottenham to Minor Rural Centre, due to its good services and facilities.	57114 (Cambridge District Oddfellows)

Appendix B: Summaries of representations and responses – North East Cambridge, Cambridge East, Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Introduction

This appendix includes summaries, by policy, of the main issues raised in representations and provides a summary response; a fuller narrative is provided in the Strategy Topic Paper: Development Strategy Update.

Decisions being taken in early 2023 relate only to limited aspects of the development strategy and only those issues are addressed in the responses to representations below. Representations on topics not addressed in the responses below are not relevant to those decisions, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Cambridge Urban Area

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Cambridge urban area > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

28 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development in the urban area of Cambridge, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites within the urban area. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/NEC: North East Cambridge and S/C/SCL: Land south of Coldham’s Lane.

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

General support for developing in the Cambridge urban area, with particular support from Parish Councils, Huntingdonshire District Council and the University of Cambridge for: protection of the historic core, appropriate design for new developments, regeneration of areas that are not fulfilling their potential, re-use of brownfield sites (particularly existing buildings) and enabling a decrease in climate impacts. Concerns from Teversham PC about the benefits of redeveloping particular sites if these facilities are lost or relocated to rural areas, and about the loss of green spaces for wildlife and quality of life. Concerns from Cambridge Past, Present & Future and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties about the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the scale

of the proposed growth. Comments from Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council and University of Cambridge about private car use, and use of alternative forms of transport. Site promoters' comments highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. Comments that no reference has been made to the pandemic and its implications for future development. Support for protection of historic core, however, Historic England and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight need to consider wider setting and views, and need for more detailed considerations and evidence.

Response to representations

Responses to the representations regarding Cambridge Urban Area relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023 are addressed in Appendix A S/DS Development Strategy, and within this appendix the issues which are relevant to specific sites. Representations regarding topics beyond those addressed in the locations referred to above are not relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Table of representations: Cambridge urban area

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Generally and broadly support these developments.	58043 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 58364 (Linton PC)
Support ambition for historic core to be protected and enhanced by appropriate new development of highest design quality and for regeneration of areas that are not fulfilling their potential.	58314 (University of Cambridge)
General support for development of sustainable brownfield sites in and around north east Cambridge, on the basis these will have the necessary infrastructure and a lower carbon footprint.	59469 (Shepreth PC)
Support for proposals making use of brownfield sites, as this will reduce pressure on rural areas. However, need to ensure have	59247 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
character and are not just blocks of flats that do not match the surrounding area.	
Agree new neighbourhoods should be delivered on brownfield sites such as North East Cambridge.	57320 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Question benefits of redevelopment of retail parks and football ground, as will have a detrimental effect on local facilities and will potentially result in current occupiers looking for new sites in rural areas.	59247 (Teversham PC)
Huge challenge to balance wildlife vs people in the urban area. More gardens (rather than relying on parks) are needed to support wildlife.	59247 (Teversham PC)
Loss of grassland has a negative impact on the environment and quality of life. Also results in concerns about flooding as loss of green areas for water to soakaway.	59247 (Teversham PC)
Support any potential for change of use of existing buildings.	59899 (Fen Ditton PC)
Support for good designed, active compact new developments, reuse of brownfield land, and continued development of larger neighbourhoods where possible.	60113 (C Blakeley)
Cambridge urban area needs to be sympathetically developed before considering greenfield sites in South Cambridgeshire.	56722 (Croydon PC)
The urban area should be the focus for new homes (alongside new settlements).	56805 (M Colville)
Agree urban area should be focus for new developments, as this will enable the Councils to achieve their vision of a big decrease in climate impacts, minimising carbon emissions, and reduce reliance on the private car. Will have a positive impact on surrounding areas.	57320 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concerned about the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the scale of the proposed growth – particularly inadequate space in historic streets and city centre for people to move about.	58252 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60189 (J Preston), 60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Adopted Local Plan includes a requirement for a Supplementary Planning Document to address capacity issues within city, but so far limited progress on its preparation.	58252 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Capacity issues need to be tackled, and only if they can be resolved should additional growth be allowed.	60189 (J Preston), 60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Over reliance on proposed development in urban area and to north east of Cambridge to support the housing needs arising from employment areas to south of the city.	58716 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Concerns that transport projects are being led by separate bodies and do not appear to be co-ordinated. Particularly concerned that many of the projects are designed to benefit Cambridge city alone, to the detriment of surrounding villages.	59041 (Great Shelford PC)
Unconvinced that realistic traffic modelling has been used – main roads into Cambridge already have high volumes and are gridlocked in the rush hour and at weekends. Additional development will have a big impact on these roads and the volume of traffic, even with wish to minimise car use.	59247 (Teversham PC)
The term ‘unnecessary private car use’ is very subjective, would recommend a clearer definition.	56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Need to link to Cambourne and East West Rail to maximise the benefits.	56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Need to recognise that some private car use will still be needed. Need to recognise the difference between car ownership and car	57648 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
usage. Try to discourage car usage, but accept there will be car ownership.	
Lack of secure parking will lead to on-street parking creating issues for emergency vehicles and inconveniencing those with restricted mobility or vision. Needs to be parking for trades people and to make deliveries.	57648 (Histon & Impington PC)
Agree Cambridge should be a place where walking, cycling and public transport is the natural choice and where unnecessary private car use is discouraged to help achieve net zero carbon.	58314 (University of Cambridge)
Welcome engagement with Network Rail to ensure that Cambridge South Station maximises use of active travel, provides sufficient drop-off/collection points, and does not cause a negative impact on surrounding area.	56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Recognise that locating development within Cambridge is sustainable, however too much emphasis on this location in the Local Plan as the focus on providing large sites could lead to problems with infrastructure provision and housing delivery.	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities.	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
More focus on home working since the pandemic, therefore less reliance on needing to be located close to urban areas and less need/desire to be located there.	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
No reference to the pandemic and opportunities for city centre residential and other uses resulting from changes in retail.	60189 (J Preston)
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure	59140 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	
Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.	59140 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Essential that all development is synchronised with the relevant infrastructure.	59150 (M Berkson)
The following should be used as principles for selecting areas for sustainable development: • taking opportunities to regenerate areas that are not yet reaching their potential • development carefully designed to respect the historic character of the city	57928 (E Davies)
Welcome the reference to the protection and enhancement of the historic core, but need to consider that the setting of Cambridge is broader than that and includes views into and across the historic city.	59599 (Historic England)
Agree that development must be carefully designed to respect the historic character of the city but this aspiration is not backed up by detailed plans or evidence.	60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment claim that “future growth in Cambridge has the potential to strengthen and reinforce these characteristics, enabling the City to meet contemporary	60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
environmental, economic and social drivers without undermining its economic identity" is not supported by evidence.	
Green Belt assessment ignores historic environment designations.	60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Essential to consider transport issues in Cambridge, and to ensure that disabled individuals have the ability to access the city centre including parking for adapted vehicles.	58091 (R Wallach)
No new cultural provision included, or other city scale uses, therefore greater pressure on existing uses.	60189 (J Preston)
The map in Figure 14 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.	58110 (M Asplin), 58112 (M Asplin)
Should refer to ‘regenerating or enhancing’ rather than just ‘regenerating’ parts of the city that are not fulfilling their potential.	58346 (ARU)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons: • should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities • over reliance on proposed development in urban area and to north east of Cambridge to support the housing needs arising from employment areas to south of the city	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58716 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

S/NEC: North East Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

64 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the Cambridge urban area or edge of Cambridge headings as the comments were specific to North East Cambridge. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

The majority of comments received were in objection to development at North East Cambridge due to reliance on relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) and concerns for the environmental and wellbeing impacts of the relocation of the WWTP to a Green Belt site. Comments raised concern that the relocation of the WWTP was contrary to the protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt, with the demolition of an operational sewage plant, and relocation causing the destruction of Honey Hill. Concerns for the Development Consent Order (DCO) process were also raised, particularly the deliverability of 4,000 homes being

expected to be built in the plan period, given the dependence on a successful DCO, and viability concerns with potential impact on affordable housing and infrastructure delivery. Comments questioned whether the relocation of the WWTP was a 'requirement' of the plan or not, and due to these concerns thought that the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and this policy should be reconsidered. Some comments suggested that the Cambridge East site at the existing Marshall airport site, presented a realistic alternative for development on brownfield land.

Other comments were in objection to development at North East Cambridge, for reasons including: unsustainability of the location, lack of green open space provision, concern for over-reliance on existing provision such as Milton Country Park and Wicken Fen. Concerns were raised by The Wildlife Trust, Parish Councils, Cambridge Past, Present & Future, National Trust, Campaign to Protect Rural England, Save Honey Hill Group, Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations, Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties, some developers, and other individuals.

There was particular concern for the high density of the development, and heights that are unprecedented in the Cambridge area. However, Historic England were keen to continue to work alongside GCSP on areas that will need to be addressed, including heights, densities, mass, views, light, treatment of heritage sensitivities, including through recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment.

There was some support for the policy, with particular support from Historic England, Gonville & Caius College, Anglian Water Services Ltd, some Parish Councils and a number of developers for the following reasons: delivery in a sustainable location, good accessibility along the transport corridor, the exciting opportunity for regeneration, and delivery of a sustainable neighbourhood.

In addition to these representations, question 4 of the questionnaire was also related to the provision of housing, jobs, facilities and open spaces at North East Cambridge. Many responses voiced similar concerns that appeared in the representations to the policy, particularly in relation to the potential impact upon the environment and biodiversity due to the relocation of the WWTP onto a Green Belt site. Additionally, comments thought that the development should be built at lower density, with affordable homes to accommodate families, and provision of retail and leisure facilities within a 15-minute radius to support the local community without having to travel elsewhere.

Response to representations

The response to representations relevant to this policy includes:

- **Objections relating to objection to relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant**:
    - The impact of the proposed development at North East Cambridge has been carefully considered across a range of issues. The impact of the relocation of the WWTP to an off-site location, including the impact on the Green Belt, the environment and water discharge into the River Cam, will be considered as part of the separate WWTP DCO process being undertaken by Anglian Water. The outcome of the DCO process will inform the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal in terms of its in-combination effects with other plans and projects, as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the First Proposals.
    - Pursuing a medium growth approach to NEC that does not require the relocation of the WWTP would not be achievable in terms of the cost of reconfiguring the existing WWTP, and would not make best use of brownfield land. Allocating the site for a significant amount of employment uses with little or no housing provision would require the Councils to meet our jobs and housing need for the area at alternative, less sustainable, sites, and would also worsen the existing issue of significant amounts of in-commuting into the area.
    - North East Cambridge and Cambridge East are the most sustainable new strategic scale locations available to meet our objectively assessed needs for development; not including development at North East Cambridge would require the Councils to meet our jobs and housing need for the area at alternative, less sustainable, sites.
- **Support for development**: North East Cambridge forms a highly sustainable development option, including being the best performing new strategic scale location available for development within Greater Cambridge in transport terms. In accordance with the NPPF, by promoting the effective use of land on previously development or brownfield land, including supporting the development of under-utilised land and buildings, the proposed policy approach at North East Cambridge seeks to make the best use of land by placing homes, jobs and other supporting services and facilities within the existing urban area of Cambridge.
- **Deliverability challenges**: Information regarding the expected submission of the DCO for the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant provides confidence that we can expect the full site to be available for redevelopment by the middle of the plan period, enabling significant delivery of jobs and homes by 2041. Infrastructure and viability evidence

supporting the AAP confirm that development at North East Cambridge is viable, robust and that a policy compliant provision of affordable housing as well as necessary infrastructure can be delivered.

- **Concern for impacts:** Representations on this topic are not relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023 relating to the principle of development at North East Cambridge, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the site allocation policy for inclusion in the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Table of representations: S/NEC – North East Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
General support for the policy, including for the following reasons: • Exciting opportunity for regeneration • Highly accessible site • Delivery of homes • Good public and active transport • A sustainable neighbourhood and location • Waterbeach and NEC transport corridor is a focus for growth • This brownfield site is in accordance with the NPPF approach to sustainable development.	56567 (Croydon PC), 56806 (M Colville), 56864 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen), 59603 (Historic England), 59870 (East West Rail), 60114 (C Blakeley), 60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60264 (Gonville & Caius College), 60447 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60763 (U+I Group PLC), 58565 (Brockton Everlast)
Development in this location in unsustainable, and therefore the policy is not supported, for the following reasons: • the number of new houses already committed in the adopted Local Plans is sufficient to meet objectively assessed need • contrary to climate change policies • contrary to biodiversity and green spaces policies	59282 (National Trust), 60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), 57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin), 57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 57471 (C Martin), 57649 (Histon & Impington PC), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58967 (Endurance Estates), 57643* (J Conroy), 57499 (A Martin), 59551 (CPRE), 60190 (J Preston), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited) 60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College), (59055 (Axis Land

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• contrary to wellbeing and social inclusion policies • contrary to great places policy, particularly GP/GB: Protection and Enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt (due to relocation of WWTP) • no operational need to relocate the plant • lack of green infrastructure and open space provision • Site is too high in density • Do not support delivery of homes • Questionable deliverability and viability of homes in the plan period • Concern for relocation of the WWTP and impacts, including on the environment and wellbeing • Concern for DCO process and likely impacts, including on affordable housing delivery.	Partnerships), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60503 (A de Burgh), 56474 (M Starkie), 56478 (P Halford), 57664 (J Conroy), 60036 (T Warnock), 58417 (F Gawthrop), 59159 (M Berkson), 58063 (Horningsea PC), 56469 (A Martin),
Development at the Marshall airfield site should be built up before NEC. Marshall will be vacant by 2030, supposedly the construction of NEC will start in 2028. This would be a better option as at Marshall airfield there is one owner and no existing infrastructure, allowing it to be developed with real green spaces.	58353 (C Lindley), 57499 (A Martin), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
St John's College has welcomed the opportunity to engage throughout this process and looks forward to continuing engagement. It is important that developments that will not prejudice the ambitions of the plan continue to be considered on their own merits whilst the specific policies are evolving.	58891 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The exclusion of a draft allocation for Cambridge Science Park North (CSPN) at this stage is regrettable and it is TCC's view that following a review of both the supporting evidence bases for the JLP and North East Cambridge Action Plan (NECAAP), that neither documents current aims are deliverable without CSPN being allocated.	59269 (Trinity College)
Request that GCLP policy for S/NEC is entirely consistent with NEC AAP. A simple policy that specifies reference to NEC AAP will enable GCLP policy to remain up to date, as and when changes are made through the examination and adoption process.	60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60763 (U+I Group PLC)
GCSPS have taken an inconsistent approach in terms of the scoring of North- East Cambridge site within the HELAA than they have for land adjacent to Rectory Farm. Land at Rectory Farm has been deemed unsuitable on the basis of additional traffic pressure on the A14, however Cambridge North- East, which is both a significantly larger development and closer to the A14 has been deemed suitable on transport grounds. It is therefore unclear, why a different approach appears to have been taken between Cambridge North- East and land at Rectory Farm in this regard, which is not justified or sound in planning terms.	60264 (Gonville & Caius College)
No comment.	58365 (Linton PC)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Relocation of the WWTP / Delivery)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Object to the relocation of the WWTP as it is contrary to Policy GP/GB: Protection and Enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt. Particular reasons include: • destruction of Green Belt • impact on open spaces • impact on biodiversity • impact on surrounding SSSI's • loss of valuable farmland • impact on local communities • densification is against GP/GB • unsustainable location, creating a brownfield site • carbon cost of relocating WWTP • destroys buffer between ancient settlements and new developments • Cop26 and the pandemic should change the priority of the move • Destruction of Honey Hill.	56469 (A Martin), 56474 (M Starkie), 56478 (P Halford), 57471 (C Martin), 57608 (J Pratt), 57664 (J Conroy), 58063 (Horningsea PC), 58115 (M Asplin), 58417 (F Gawthrop), 59159 (M Berkson), 59282 (National Trust), 59591 (CPRE), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60036 (T Warnock), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60503 (A de Burgh), 60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Object to parts of the policy. The area is described as a significant brownfield site. This is not correct as it is occupied by commercial buildings. It can only become brownfield if vacated by relocating the Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant to Honey Hill. The relocation depends on a successful DCO and therefore this policy cannot come into effect if the application fails. There is no operational need to relocate the plant, that would cost at least £227 million of taxpayers money. Other	56474 (M Starkie), 56478 (P Halford), 57664 (J Conroy), 58417 (F Gawthrop), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60503 (A de Burgh), 60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
modern works in UK have been amended or built to minimise their odour and traffic footprint and allow a much smaller buffer zone. A realistic alternative would be to amend the works. Therefore, the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and this policy should be reconsidered.	
NEC development is predicated on the move of the Waste Water Treatment plant. This was voted for by Councillors without due regard to its possible designation. Anglian Water nominated Honey Hill as the location in the Green Belt.	56469 (A Martin)
The map shown in the plan does not show the destruction of the Green Belt that the WWTP will have.	56469 (A Martin)
There is no mention of the WWTPR moving to Green Belt with the GCSP stating to clarify that the relocation of the Cambridge WWTP is not a “requirement” of the North-East Cambridge Area Action Plan. The plan should not be ambiguous. There is a regulatory requirement that the public and all consultees have sufficient information about any significant effects of the Local Plan in order to make a judgement. Horningsea PC believes that Councils are hiding behind the DCO. The public has the right to know why it is being expected to give up Green Belt (high grade agricultural land with important recreational value).	58063 (Horningsea PC), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents’ Associations)
Greater Cambridge is reliant on 8,350 new homes being delivered at North-East Cambridge under Policy S/NEC. This is a significant level of housing to be provided on a brownfield site, part of which is contaminated and comprises a sewage works. There are likely to be significant costs associated with remediating the site and potential time delays on bringing	57155 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57204 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57321 (Huntingdonshire DC), 60264 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
development forward on the site. It is considered that the Council should look at providing more of a range of smaller and medium sites that have the ability to come forward at a faster rate than strategic sites of this size.	
Careful consideration should be taken to ensure the Councils have additional housing sites to meet housing needs if delivery slows as a result of the relocation of the WWTP. Need to ensure there aren't additional demands on the wider housing market in surrounding areas as a result of under delivery in Greater Cambridgeshire.	57321 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Whilst the approach to the Local Plan and North East Cambridge AAP/DCO is acknowledged, there is a risk that the relocation waste water treatment plant proposals could be delayed, which in turn will influence the remaining stages of the Local Plan process, should the Local Plan continue to be contingent on Anglian Water's DCO. The GCSP should consider accelerating the Local Plan ahead of the DCO if this begins hold up the progress of the Local Plan.	58379 (Marshall Group Properties)
Question the deliverability and viability of 4,000 homes being delivered within the plan period given relocation of WWTP and remediation which will be required as part of any development proposal. In view of the average length of time it takes to achieve a DCO consent and the significant remediation that will be required prior to the construction of housing, we have strong reservations with regards to the draft trajectory.	57337 (HD Planning Ltd), 58967 (Endurance Estates), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 60264 (Gonville & Caius College), 60297 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn site), 60304 (Miller Homes – Melbourn site)
This allocation may cause the plan to be vulnerable to challenge at Examination stage.	57337 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Object to the assumed housing trajectory lead in time and build out rates for NEC, as these conflict with those recommended in the Housing Delivery Study and do not provide sufficient time for post-adoption supplementary plans or guidance.	59055 (Axis Land Partnerships)
This site is subject to significant constraints. We consider that the Councils should review both the overall quantum of residential development to be allocated to the NECAAP Area and the ability of the site to deliver within the Local Plan Period to 2041.	58402 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58967 (Endurance Estates), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 60252 (T Orgee)
Anglian Water claim in their submission to the Planning Inspectorate requesting a Scoping Opinion that it is local planning authority pressure for the developments in North East Cambridge which is forcing the move. However, in the Scoping Opinion for the proposed relocation prepared by the Planning Inspectorate, on page 6 of Appendix 2, the Shared Planning Service response states: “We would like to clarify that the relocation of the Cambridge WWTP is not a “requirement” of the North-East Cambridge Area Action Plan and must not be referred to as such. This is because we are not requiring the relocation, but the NEC AAP7 and the emerging joint Local Plan have identified the opportunity that the relocation creates for homes and jobs in the North-East Cambridge area.” So, we can only assume that the North East Area Action Plan can be progressed without the financially and environmentally costly move of the WWTP. This is very welcome news.	59591 (CPRE)
Unsustainable as demolition of an operational sewage plant is not included in the sustainability appraisal.	57471 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Page 58 of the First Proposals says that an alternative to Policy S/NEC of retaining a consolidated waste water treatment works on its existing site (either as an indoors or outdoors facility) is not considered a “reasonable alternative” as it is not “deliverable or viable”. It is not clear what information has been taken into account when the Councils formed this conclusion and as a result we have not been able to comment on this in any detail. We request further detail is provided to explain the Councils’ decision making in this regard. We also note that Anglian Water’s Initial Options Appraisal reported that it “would be technically feasible to consolidate the existing treatment assets and occupy a smaller area of the existing site” which appear to show that this policy option is possible.	58967 (Endurance Estates), 59159 (M Berkson)
Concerns regarding the viability assumptions behind this site. The First Proposals Viability Appraisal by Aspinall Verdi makes a number of assumptions that we think are not reflective of the real world context in which it will come forward. For example: • NEC will be built out by a consortium of housebuilders, whereas it is far more likely a master developer model will be pursued. This has a substantial bearing on scheme viability given no allowance is made for the master-developer profit return. At the very minimum this needs to be tested as a scenario to stress test the assumptions made and ensure a robust approach. • The estimated market revenues require reconsideration. At an average of £452 per square foot these do not appear realistic for a development of this density and	58967 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
scale, where market saturation could become an issue. Again, sensitivity testing is required to ensure a robust approach. • The market revenues then have a knock-on impact on the affordable revenues, given they are based on the former. As a result, the modelled results show that the plot values of the social rent units are higher than First Homes (which are capped at £250,000 per plot). This does not seem correct and we would ask that more detail is provided around the calculation of affordable values and the evidence to support them. • The appraisal also includes zero S106 contributions, which should be included as a cost within any assessment of this nature. Please could information be provided as to why they are not included, or if they have been, where. More information and viability evidence is also required in relation to: a) How the calculation of the residential coverage at 32,000sqft per net acre has been provided; b) how the included finance costs have been calculated; c) how the infrastructure costs at £30k per plot has been calculated; and d) how the abnormal costs of £1.15m been calculated and how these relate to any funding that the project has been granted. For a project of this complexity, more detail is needed to understand whether the assumptions are robust.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Redevelopment of this site requires the relocation of the sewage treatment works and businesses. Development is therefore complex and highly likely to have delays and viability issues, resulting in reduction in affordable housing provided.	60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)
There is no mention in these plans of how relocation of the wastewater plant will address any of the concerns about all the sewage being dumped in the Cam or how Anglian Water proposes to make the River Cam clean and safe for all users.	60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
The spatial options review supporting the existing Local Plan (2018) identified a medium growth approach to NEC that did not require the relocation of CWWTP. This focused principally on employment, 15,000 jobs with homes in the region of 200 close to the station area and outside of the 500m odour buffer zone. These employment targets without the relocation of CWWTP match those of S/NEC in the First Proposals. It is recommended this option is represented as an alternative policy.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Cambridge Airport now presents as a realistic alternative for major housing development on brownfield. The site fares well in the Sustainability Assessment and it has good links to employment sites. Furthermore, if careful planning was carried out, the 4,000 housing supply could be obtained by other locations, including the Cam airport, the Bio-medical campus and 1000 areas of Major Change.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
The impact of large population increases in Greater Cambridge as a result of an unprecedented amount of new homes already in the pipeline, 30,000 + amounting to a 37% increase homes already existing in 2020, are yet to be known/tested and will not	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
be known until mid-plan period and beyond. This high growth strategy may fail if sustainable solutions do not come to the fore in a timely way and the attractiveness of Cambridge for homes and business is eroded. The Aims of the Local Plan: 'Wellbeing & Social inclusion' and 'Great Places' are of particular relevance and at risk here.	
If the vision for North East Cambridge level of densification etc., proves not to be popular and sustainable solutions to support the 31,000 homes already committed and yet to be built are not delivered, these homes, including the promise of affordable homes, may not be built in a timely way or the infrastructure promised realised. If Anglian Water's DCO is successful, long before any of the above are known or review of the impact of the high growth housing targets for Greater Cambridge are realised, relocation will have taken place with significant negative impacts on another area of Greater Cambridge in the Green Belt.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Omitting discussion of DCO planning process from the Local Plan seems quite extraordinary. Including NECAAP/S/NEC in the Local Plan First Proposals but excluding sufficient or significant information about the effects of the fulfilment of the Policy for effective public consultation at Reg 18 is contrary to the principals and regulations of the SA/SEA and will influence the Consultation and could be construed as effecting bias. This anomaly is further exacerbated given that neither the emerging Local Plan nor NECAAP are dependent on the relocation. If it is regulatory to exclude reference to the site selected for relocation or subjecting the full effect of NECAAP to the SA/SEA	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
within the emerging Local Plan, it is recommended in the interest of an informed and fair public consultation NECAAP is excluded from the Local Plan until after the outcome of the DCO is known and that an alternative is presented in the emerging Local Plan that can be subject to SA/SEA and an informed, evidence based public consultation at Reg 18.	

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Climate change)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy CC/NZ.	57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy CC/CS	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Discussion with Anglian Water on how they might reduce the environmental footprint and physical area of their existing site could still yield some land for industrial and housing development. The Anglian Water site would form a convenient barrier between new developments and the A14.	59551 (CPRE)
The existing site at Fen Road, Chesterton continues to be a source of ongoing local water quality and environmental health problems due to inadequate foul drainage provision. There have been a number of reports of foul sewage from the site discharging into the River Cam, causing chronic on-going pollution. The relocation of the existing Milton sewage works and extensive redevelopment of North East Cambridge presents the	59720 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
opportunity to incorporate mains drainage connection into the Fen Road site.	
The intention of the policy is to set out the place-making vision and a robust planning framework for the comprehensive development of this site. There are both environmental risks and opportunities to developing this site sustainably. Ensuring sustainable water supplies, improving water quality and the effective remediation of land contamination will be key considerations in achieving this. The proposed policy direction anticipates the site (once developed in full, which will extend beyond the Local Plan period of 2041) will deliver 8,350 new homes. The IWMS Detailed WCS will need to provide evidence the new homes (and employment) can be sustainably supplied with water in time for the development phases.	59720 (Environment Agency)
Since the site election for relocation by AW there has been no public consultation on the consequences or environmental effects of the Councils pursuing NECAAP /S/NEC in the context of the relocation to Honey Hill, nor has any alternative vision for NECAAP been presented in the emerging Local Plan First Proposals.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Biodiversity and green spaces)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The AAP has fundamentally failed to provide for the strategic greenspace that the new population will require, with lacking open space provision and green infrastructure.	57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 57471 (C Martin), 57649 (Histon & Impington PC), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58967 (Endurance Estates), 59282 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The Local Plan HRA identifies the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces and not rely on existing provision such as • Milton Country Park • Wicken Fen It is essential that this policy and the AAP provide for sufficient strategic natural greenspace, which would also benefit other nearby communities with deficiencies in natural greenspace.	57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 58282 (H Smith), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Natural England's ANGSt would require NEC to have a 100ha site within 5km.	58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policies: • BG/GI • BG/RC • BG/PO • BG/EO	57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin), 58967 (Endurance Estates), 59282 (National Trust) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Highly likely that 20% on site biodiversity net gain will be unachievable and will be dependent on off-site land acquisition or biodiversity credits.	58967 (Endurance Estates)
Allocation policy wording needs explicit objectives, or clear links to other policies on BNG and environmental design.	58984 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
The proposal to create a country park as mitigation appears to be an underhand attempt at carbon offsetting on what is much needed, productive, carbon sequestrating farmland.	59900 (Fen Ditton PC)
Formal sports pitches are required onsite	58282 (H Smith)
Cemetery provision is required	58282 (H Smith)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Welcome changes made to green space provision, following the consultation of the AAP.	60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Wellbeing and social inclusion)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy WS/HS	57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Great places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The site is too high in density with large scale overdevelopment of housing focused on a relatively small site.	57499 (A Martin), 58967 (Endurance Estates), 59551 (CPRE), 60190 (J Preston)
High density and heights are unprecedented in the Cambridge area raising significant challenges in terms of townscape impacts and the sites ability to deliver sustainable development.	58967 (Endurance Estates), 59282 (National Trust)
The development appears characterless and lacking in a practical base for a thriving community, so close to the expanded A14.	59551 (CPRE)
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policies: • GP/LC • GP/GB • GP/QP • GP/HA	57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
This has potential to be a showcase development if done right. The plan should create high-density dwelling with plenty of	57711 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
green space (of varied kinds), recreation and entertainment facilities. The co-location of retail and dwelling provision should be used to enhance vibrancy	
Care is needed to ensure mistakes of the development around Cambridge Rail Station are not repeated.	56806 (M Colville)
Early residential phases provide opportunity for redevelopment whilst still being able to respond to local character. They have the potential to create a scheme of high design quality that would make a significant contribution to the emerging city district at Cambridge North. They will both generate the critical mass that generate exciting new places.	59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
It will be important that the policy ensures the protection and enhancement of the historic environment including the conservation areas, river corridor and wider city scape. We welcome the preparation of an HIA for the site although as previously discussed we have raised some concerns about some aspects of the HIA. The HIA should inform the policy wording in the Plan as well as the NEC AAP. Look forward to ongoing work over the coming months as the revised Draft Local Plan and AAP are developed. Areas that will still need to be addressed include detailed consideration of heights, densities, mass, views from Anglesey Abbey, views from the south, revised wirelines/photomontages of reduced heights, consideration of issues such as light etc and the general treatment of the edge of City site including heritage sensitivities along the river corridor and from other assets.	59603 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Ensure Historic environment considerations are included in policy, including recommendations of HIA. On-going discussions in relation to detail.	
The area is within close proximity to three conservation areas and villages; green infrastructure and numerous historical assets. The historical setting of Cambridge will be impacted.	

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
A focus on employment growth in the area and improved sustainable public transport from within Cambridge City, Greater Cambridge and the wider region as an alternative is recommended.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57643* (J Conroy)
The policy should consider a "Plan B" with fewer dwellings, less commercial especially as the policy also fails to consider the changed working and living conditions resulting from the Covid 19 pandemic.	56474 (M Starkie) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Can’t assume everyone will work from home.	57649 (Histon & Impington PC)
Working and living patterns were different before the global pandemic so should be considered in the plan.	58063 (Horningsea PC)
Acknowledgment that the Local Plan will not have included projected new employment numbers on recently acquired sites west and east of Milton Road.	58565 (Brockton Everlast)
Early residential phases provide opportunity to meet identified need for commercial uses.	59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
Support densification of existing employment uses.	59900 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The further expansion of the Trinity Science Park further exacerbates the need of housing in Cambridge and is unnecessary.	58417 (F Gawthrop)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do not support delivery of homes at North East Cambridge.	57643* (J Conroy)
How many dwellings in Cambridge are a) student accommodation and b) vacant investment properties? If either of these figures are significant and/ or increasing I believe the Local Plan should consider ways to restrict both moving forward. If investors and colleges snap up a high % of property within Cambridge then that pushes residents out & drives the need to build more.	58065 (Horningsea PC)
Support high density development approach within North East Cambridge.	58565 (Brockton Everlast)
DCO process is likely to negatively impact on affordable housing.	58967 (Endurance Estates), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Early residential phases provide opportunity to meet identified need for mixed tenure, Build to Rent housing.	59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
Support for some increases in affordable and social housing on land outside existing and in revised WWTW buffer zone since this will assist shortages in both LA's.	59900 (Fen Ditton PC)
Should offer a residential opportunity for those employed in the technology sectors around Cambridge, including a significant	60046 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
component of affordable housing for market sale, market rent, shared ownership, and social housing.	
We would note that Policy 1 of the NEC AAP proposed Submission states 'approximately 8,350 new homes, 15,000 new jobs', as opposed to 'up to' as set out in S/NEC. S/NEC policy should therefore be amended to refer to 'approximately' and provide a clearer link to NEC AAP	60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60763 (U+I Group PLC)
Challenge the densification strategy, because these dwellings will not be attractive to people beyond young workers, i.e. those in stable relationships seeking family accommodation.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
This many jobs and homes will create an increase in traffic as people will not necessarily work here, and people who work here will travel in. Not necessarily walking or cycling. Property on this site will attract investors and people who commute to London.	57603 (A Martin)
Support a bus and rail network for convenient use.	56567 (Croydon PC)
Road access to Fen Road, Chesterton should be safeguarded	58282 (H Smith)
The housing mix for the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan will generate approximately 1,362 early years' children, 790 primary-aged pupils (3.8FE) and 205 secondary-aged children (1.4FE). This would require two primary schools on site with early years' provision and additional sites allocated for full day care provision. The Council will confirm its education requirements later in the planning process when the housing mix	56927 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
is finalised. School playing fields should be located on-site to ensure that high-quality PE curriculum can be delivered without the requirement to travel.	
Council should have regard to the NPPF requirements to allow for sufficient choice of school places (particularly para 94) and provide new school places directly linked to the need from housing growth.	
CMS would be instrumental in diversifying educational opportunities for this new community, the rest of Cambridge and the wider sub-region. Cambridgeshire County Council has provided a letter of support, and would also consider supporting alternative sites for CMS provided they are equally accessible by public transport and offer equally good connectivity for students travelling from a wide area. If a site for CMS within the NEC allocation were secured, the department would work closely with the councils to ensure the development accorded with the NEC Trip Budget, making sustainable transport the most attractive option for students and staff.	57476 (ESFA -Department for Education), 57493 (ESFA – Department for Education)
NEC relies on a trip budget to manage its transport impacts on the Milton Road Corridor. This means, any new development has to achieve a 0% car driver mode share with the trip budget not allowing any further car trips to be generated. Despite the very good non-car accessibility of the area, this is a very challenging target. Or: Any new development has to commit to reducing the car mode share for existing developments in the area in order to give these new developments some headroom in which they can	58967 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
generate some car trips, albeit the overall car mode share will be significantly less than current mode shares. The issue here is how new developments are meant to have control over the travel patterns and what would be the mechanism for new development's planning permission that secures this?	
Question of practical monitoring and enforcement of the vehicular trip budget. The monitoring itself would be technically complex, but assuming that it detects that the trip budget for the overall area has been exceeded, how would the system identify the perpetrator?	58967 (Endurance Estates)
Trip budget applies to the pre-Covid conventional weekday AM and PM peak hours. Whether this is still the right approach given the very different working patterns that have emerged since Covid is still up for debate. Since May this year, the Department for Transport has advised on the use of their 'Uncertainty Toolkit' to assess uncertainty over future travel demand, and the use of different future scenarios so decision-makers can see the implications of applying differing assumptions on how travel patterns and characteristics may now change over time. Neither the Local Plan transport evidence base nor the NECAAP consultation mention using this Uncertainty Toolkit.	58967 (Endurance Estates)
Development in this location combined with the committed development at Waterbeach will put enormous pressure on existing infrastructure in this area.	59282 (National Trust)
It is also strange that proximity to the existing Guided Busway is given as a positive factor. Are the people living here expected to commute to St Ives? Because	59551 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
from Milton the busway ceases and its vehicles run on the city streets.	
Given its proximity to the existing railway, EWR Co requests that a requirement is included within the proposed wording of the policy allocation to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR.	59870 (East West Rail)
Without significant interventions such as those which may be delivered by Cambridge Science Park North (Land East of Impington (HELAA site 40096)), a reduction in vehicle trips at CSP, sufficient to allow the delivery of the wider NECAAP will be difficult to deliver.	60687 (Trinity College)

The edge of Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - The edge of Cambridge > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

31 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development on the edge of Cambridge, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites within the urban area or at new settlements. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/NEC: North East Cambridge, S/CE: Cambridge East, S/NWC: North West Cambridge, S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus, S/WC: West Cambridge, S/CB: Cambourne, and S/NS: Existing new settlements.

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

General support for developing on the edge of Cambridge, but that encroachment into the Green Belt should be minimal and the setting of Cambridge needs to be preserved. Concerns about the effects on traffic congestion of new developments in this location, and the impacts on those travelling into Cambridge from the villages. Comments outline that there should be clear requirements for new developments in terms of open space, provision of services and facilities, and affordable housing. Site promoters’ comments

highlight that there are too few sites allocated to meet the long term demand, and that given the significant sustainable infrastructure on the edge of Cambridge there are more sites that could be allocate to provide sustainable developments. Site promoters' comments also highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters. Comments that no reference has been made to the pandemic and its implications for future development. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight need particular concerns about assessment of Green Belt and heritage assets.

Response to representations

Responses to representations regarding The edge of Cambridge relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023 are addressed in Appendix A S/DS Development Strategy, and within this appendix as issues are relevant to specific sites. Representations regarding topics beyond those addressed in the locations referred to above are not relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Table of representations: The edge of Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Generally and broadly support these developments.	56575 (Gamlingay PC), 58043 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 58374 (Linton PC), 59903 (Fen Ditton PC), 60115 (C Blakeley)
Too few sites allocated to meet long term demand – more land must be allocated if growth us to be effectively enabled for the wider benefits of residents and the economy.	58753 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College)
Given significant investment in new sustainable infrastructure, there is additional land on the edge of Cambridge that offers opportunity to accommodate demand in a sustainable and inclusive way.	58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College)
Encroachment into the Green Belt must be minimal.	58374 (Linton PC), 59471 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Preservation of semi rural quality of West Cambridge and Green Belt between the Backs and M11 is vital for unique setting of Cambridge.	57940 (E Davies)
Support for completion of new neighbourhoods on the edge of Cambridge as well as bringing forwards new opportunities for sustainable developments.	58343 (University of Cambridge)
Education – will work closely with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire DC to develop action plans and policies for education provision to ensure timing of delivery, connectivity and integration into the community.	56931 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	59145 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.	59145 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Traffic congestion could prevent those in villages reaching education and work in Cambridge, therefore must be part of an integrated public transport system.	58374 (Linton PC)
Recognise that locating development on the edge of Cambridge is sustainable, however too much emphasis on this location in the Local Plan as the focus on providing large sites could lead to problems with infrastructure provision and housing delivery.	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities.	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Object to the high risk nature of the development strategy which is dependent on the delivery of some strategic, complex sites which are likely to have delays in delivery and viability issues. Need greater certainty regarding delivery within the plan period, and that those sites will provide affordable housing.	60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College)
To generate the investment for significant infrastructure and to meet the housing and employment needs, it is necessary to adopt a strategy that combines different locations for focussing growth. Directing development to edge of Cambridge is the only option likely to generate the quantity of land in a sustainable location that is suitable for development.	58391 (Marshall Group Properties)
More focus on home working since the pandemic, therefore less reliance on needing to be located close to urban areas and less need/desire to be located there.	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Over reliance on proposed development on the northern edge of Cambridge compared to existing and proposed developments to south of Cambridge.	58724 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Concentrating development in northern and eastern quadrants will have significant local benefits.	59182 (M Berkson)
Concerned about over development of the eastern edge of Cambridge and impacts on Teversham.	59251 (Teversham PC)
Green Belt assessment ignores historic environment designations and landscape character constraints.	60191 (J Preston), 60682 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Policies in the Local Plan must take a holistic view of the combination of different elements, including historic and natural environment that make up the character of Cambridge.	58328 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60191 (J Preston)
When identifying land for development, must consider how it performs against the functions of the Green Belt and also its built and natural heritage value.	58328 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Green Belt function of preventing urban sprawl to protect the setting of Cambridge is irreconcilable with continued development on the edge of Cambridge.	60682 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Councils should be committed to completing the new developments, with continued support beyond s106 funding to ensure community development and youth services.	56969 (Trumpington Residents Association)
No limit set out for individual scheme sizes on edge of Cambridge.	57981 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)
Should set out more clearly the requirements for new developments to provide open space, access and community areas. Lessons should be learnt from existing developments (e.g. GB1 and GB2), where proposals permitted are not compatible with aims of minimising transport and building new communities.	57981 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)
Developments should be of a sufficient size to cater for daily needs and with good access to public and active transport.	60115 (C Blakeley)
Would like assurances that affordable housing in these new developments will include real social housing and key worker housing.	59251 (Teversham PC)
Although no significant growth in the Green Belt surrounding Coton, the destruction of the rural environment and way of life of	57800 (Coton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
the village has been given low priority by South Cambridgeshire DC and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) for many years. Arguments for protecting this area from development include: • would be destruction of natural environment on a high point overlooking Cambridge • disregard for heritage of American Cemetery • breaching the Green Belt would open it up to further development • refusal by GCP to look at East West rail as a more sustainable form of travel and to look at adapting existing infrastructure	
The map in Figure 25 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.	58126 (M Asplin)
No comment.	57325 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons: • should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities. • over reliance on proposed development on the northern edge of Cambridge compared to existing and proposed developments to south of Cambridge • edge of Cambridge is a sustainable location • site can be delivered within the first five years of the new plan period • too few sites allocated to meet long term demand	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58724 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58739 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58753 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College), 60684 (Trinity College), 60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College), 60719 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Local Plan's aims are not deliverable without additional sites to meet its future jobs requirements • need greater certainty regarding delivery within the plan period, and that those sites will provide affordable housing • will provide a sustainable expansion of a successful hi-tech research and development cluster	

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
North of Barton Road Landowners Group proposals for development of south west Cambridge (HELAA site 52643) – should be allocated for urban extension	58343 (University of Cambridge)
Land north of M11 and west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington (HELAA site 40048) – should be allocated for residential development, primary school, other uses and open space	58739 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)
Land south east and south west of Cambridge Biomedical Campus (HELAA site 40064) – should be allocated for mix of housing and employment uses with supporting facilities	58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College)
Land East of Impington (HELAA site 40096) – should be allocated for employment uses	60684 (Trinity College)
Land east of Gazelle Way and west of Teversham Road (HELAA site 40250) – should be allocated for housing and employment uses	60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College)
Land south of Fulbourn Road and north of Worts Causeway, known as Cambridge South East (HELAA site 40058) – should be allocated for housing and employment uses	60719 (Commercial Estates Group)

S/CE: Cambridge East

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/CE: Cambridge East > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

37 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge or new settlements headings as the comments were specific to Cambridge East. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

There was general support for the development at Cambridge East, particularly the relocation of the airport to allow for the delivery of a mixed-use site, providing open spaces, housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, and cultural facilities with high quality and comprehensive transport networks. Supporters of the proposed policy direction included: Huntingdonshire DC, Cambridge Past, Present & Future, National Trust, Anglian Water Services Ltd, Marshall Group Properties, and some individuals. There was encouragement for transport improvements on already congested access routes, provision of public transport to improve connectivity, and support for separate designated cycle and walking infrastructure.

There was some concern for the relocation of the current airfield, particularly the uncertainty of timing of the relocation of airport and related uses, unforeseen delays in relocation affecting the delivery of housing within the plan period (including affordable housing), reliance on the GCP Cambridge Eastern Access scheme, and deliverability and viability development risks leaving the plan vulnerable at examination stage. Campaign to Protect Rural England were concerned with the loss of existing jobs on the site, with a large number of representations to question 3 also raising concern for the displacement of a skilled workforce and engineering jobs that had been part of the airport for decades.

Some comments including those from Historic England, Save Honey Hill, Cambridge Past, Present and Future, Parish Councils, and individuals were in opposition to the development as they thought the character and landscape of the surrounding areas should be retained with likely pressures on areas including Teversham village, the Green Belt land, Eastern Fens and Fen Ditton. This was also reflected in the responses to question 3 of the questionnaire.

In addition to these representations, question 3 of the questionnaire was also related to the provision of housing, jobs, facilities and open spaces at Cambridge East. Many responses voiced concerns for impacts on water supply and aquifers at high demand. Other responses raised concerns for the provision of biodiversity and green spaces through a range of landscaping of all scales.

Additionally, comments on question 3 thought that the development should be built with a range of well-designed and climate friendly homes (including affordable housing) to accommodate families with provision of a range of job opportunities, retail and leisure facilities within a 15-minute radius to support the local community without having to travel elsewhere. These responses also supported the need for design of safe, and cohesive communities that support the mental health and wellbeing of people living there.

Although responses to the policy were generally in support of improvements to existing road infrastructure and provision of public transport, cycle and walking infrastructure, a high number of responses to question 3 were concerned for impacts on infrastructure from development at Cambridge East. Some comments suggested that congestion will be increased even with improvements due to reliance on cars to travel into town by older people and disadvantaged groups and expressed the need for parking on-site for people who need a car. However, most responses to question 3 were in support of creating a car-free development and the

provision of zero carbon transport options, with separate cycling and walking infrastructure. Lastly, some comments suggested the provision of a light railway, metro or underground as an alternative to bus use.

Response to representations

The response to representations relevant to this policy includes:

- **Support**: Cambridge East Cambridge forms a sustainable development option, including being the second best performing new strategic scale location available for development within Greater Cambridge in transport terms. As such, Cambridge Airport would make good use of safeguarded land in the 2018 Local Plans that is also a brownfield site and is a good fit with a climate focused strategy. Within the Edge of Cambridge outside of the Green Belt there are no alternative strategic scale sites available for development.
- **Concern for impacts**: We are exploring constraints and capacity testing at Cambridge East ahead of the draft Local Plan, including considering transport, landscape and character impacts, and the loss of jobs associated with the relocation of the airport. Our evidence shows that development here can be deliverable and sustainable in transport terms, and we consider that the development can be designed to mitigate its landscape and character impacts, and will provide a range of jobs including for local communities.
- **Deliverability challenges:** Marshall's submission of an application for relocation of their airside uses to Cranfield provides good evidence that we can expect Cambridge Airport to be available for redevelopment by the middle of the plan period. We also consider the delivery and timing risks associated with Cambridge Eastern Access scheme Phase B, which will support development of the site, to be low. As such we expect there to be time for a substantial amount of development to take place within the plan period to 2041, subject to the approach of the plan in respect of water supply and housing delivery.

Table of representations: S/CE – Cambridge East (Relocation of Airport and delivery of Cambridge east)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support in general, for the proposed policy direction and relocation of the existing airport uses to Cranfield Airport to allow for:	56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57327 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57607 (J Pratt), 57666 (J Conroy), 58404 (Marshall Group Properties), 58531 (Cambridge Past, Present &

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• affordable housing • mix of uses • employment • commercial • retail • open spaces • appropriate green infrastructure • cultural facilities • high quality and comprehensive sustainable transport connections • opportunity to meet growth aspirations.	Future), 59218 (M Berkson), 59285 (National Trust), 59904 (Fen Ditton PC), 60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum), 60251 (Tony Orgee), 60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 59903* (Fen Ditton PC)
This is the only side of Cambridge that is not constrained and which can accommodate significant levels of housing and employment, whilst also being close to existing employment centres and transport infrastructure.	58391* (Marshall Group Properties)
Concern for the uncertainty of deliverability in the Development Strategy Topic Paper (2021) that states 'this gives a reasonable level of confidence' / 'there should be sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the plan can be delivered by the time it reaches the later formal stages and so the position will be kept under review during the plan making process'.	59229 (Wates Development Ltd), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd)
The relocation of the airport is a significant undertaking and an 'option agreement' does not provide sufficient justification that the site will be available by 2031.	60296 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn site)
Concern for the relocation of the Airfield, particularly:	57158 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57217 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 57336 (HD

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• uncertainty of timing of relocation of airport and related uses • unforeseen delays in relocation, affecting delivery of housing within the plan period (including affordable) • reliance on GCP Cambridge Eastern Access scheme • deliverability and viability development risks leaving plan vulnerable at examination stage.	Planning Ltd), 60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)
The policy proposals should not depend on complete integration with or extension to the proposed North East Cambridge Area Action plan which predicates on the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to an area of Green Belt at Honey Hill which is the subject of a Development Consent Order.	56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57607 (J Pratt)
Council should provide more of a range of smaller and medium sites to come forward at faster rate than strategic sites of this size.	575158 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57217 (European Property Ventures)
In the case that Marshalls Airfield does not relocate, alternative sites should be identified and reserved in the plan.	57327 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Contingency sites should be included at this early stage in the plan process to ensure deliverability over the plan period.	59229 (Wates Developments Ltd.), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd.)
Alternative proposal for land at Marshalls should be considered including: • Re-wilding with 400 acres of country parks, planted woods, nature reserves • 1 acre ‘Village Square’ with communal inside and outside space	60683 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Natural skills centre for growing, land health, wildlife protection • 500 homes – genuinely zero carbon, good sized private and public gardens, minimum 50% affordable homes • Vehicles kept outside the village, existing local and new residents have access to shared EVs. • Protected wildlife corridor to Coldham's Common.	
Oppose any larger release of land in the Green Belt; the Airport site is large enough for significant development.	57844 (D Lister), 58127 (M Asplin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Climate Change)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge East and other developments will create unsustainable demand on water during building and completion of new homes, from open and green spaces (needing water for plant/tree life).	60231 (H Warwick)
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill will have carbon impacts.	56514 (C Martin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Biodiversity of green spaces)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Maintenance of the green corridor providing green separation as adopted in the Local Plan should be retained (linking the countryside with areas such as Coldham's Common).	56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57666 (J Conroy), 58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Relocation of the WWTP provides opportunity to deliver green infrastructure in Cambridge East including improved connectivity to recreation and open space.	60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill does not accord with the policy intention to provide additional wildlife habitat as part of Eastern Fens GI initiative.	56473 (M Starkie), 57607 (J Pratt)
Recreational disturbance will cause significant risk to important species and designated nature conservation sites.	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
New 'Country Park' provision should be in an area that can divert pressure from ecologically sensitive sites and to tie in with plans of environmental NGO's.	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Biodiversity 20% targets should be referenced in supporting text, objectives and headline targets not only in the AAP but also in allocation policy relating to water demand, GI, SUDs and climate change/great places policies.	58995 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Cambridge East should benefit local people with good quality green and community spaces.	60683 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Important to include space to grow food.	60231 (H Warwick)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge East should be a distinct place with its own character.	60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
Opposed to development due to loss of Green Belt.	59088 (F Gawthrop)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should retain/maintain/extend the character of surrounding areas including: • Teversham village • The Green Belt (inc. at Honey Hill) • Eastern Fens • Fen Ditton	56473 (M Starkie), 56514 (C Martin), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57468 (C Martin), 57607 (J Pratt), 57666 (J Conroy), 58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59634 (Historic England), 59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Concern for the potential impact on heritage assets and their settings including: • on-site Marshalls Airport Control and Office buildings (Grade II listed) • Teversham Conservation Area and associated listed buildings including Church of All Saints (Grade II listed) • Moated site at Manor Farm to east of site is a scheduled monument with the Manor Farmhouse (Grade II listed) • Several Grade II listed buildings to the south (Cherry Hinton Road) with St Andrews Church (Grade I listed).	59634 (Historic England)
Should prepare an HIA to inform the policy wording and settle concerns for significant densities and heights on the edge of Cambridge. It should consider: • the likely density and scale of development • implications of capacity, height and density on overall setting of the city (should provide evidence).	59634 (Historic England)
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill is too close to conservation areas and new development of Marleigh and Airport site.	56514 (C Martin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Employment uses need to reflect post-Covid working and living conditions.	56473 (M Starkie)
Support for the new development enhancing access to services, facilities and employment opportunity of Teversham and RWS Ltd's site Land at Fulbourn Road.	56898 (RWS Ltd)
Where will skilled engineering staff from the existing airport find employment?	59553 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Concern that the move of the Airport will result in a reduction in the range of job opportunities.	60251 (Tony Orgee)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Delivery of 2,900 homes out of proposed 7,000 by 2041: • is unambitious • should deliver more housing in the plan period.	56473 (M Starkie), 56514 (C Martin), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57468 (C Martin), 57666 (J Conroy)
Concern for the deliverability of 350 homes per year from 2031/32 as set out in the assumed housing trajectory if Cranfield Airfield is available from 2030 at earliest.	59229 (Wates Development Ltd), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd),
Object to the assumed housing trajectory lead in time and build out rates for Cambridge East, as conflict with those recommended in the Housing Delivery Study and do not provide sufficient time for post-adoption supplementary plans or guidance.	59060 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Homes built ahead of 2041 should prioritise affordable and social housing to ensure housing available for the employment mix proposed.	56473 (M Starkie)
Housing should be provided that is suitable for a range of users, including: • young workers • key workers.	60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum), 60231 (H Warwick)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cycle and walking infrastructure should be fully optimised to enable safe foot-cycle access, including routes and locations: • across Coldham's Common • National Cycling route No.11 • National Trails e.g., Harcamlow Way • SSSI Quy Fen • SSSI Wilbraham Fen • Wider network of PRoW's.	56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57666 (J Conroy),
Transport assessment should be done for Newmarket Road: • if 7,000 homes and 9,000 jobs are planned • and should be in place/delivered before the development happens.	57657 (Histon & Impington PC)
Concern for the existing local infrastructure, transport connections and use of public transport on access roads due to: • resulting traffic/congestion,	57657 (Histon & Impington PC), 59771 (B Hunt), 60231 (H Warwick), 59088 (F Gawthrop), 56477* (M Mckenzie-Davie)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• weather related dependencies on cars (rather than walking/cycling routes), • transport issues • rat-running on side streets • already dangerous roads on Airport Way (despite lowering the speed limit) • will there be another access off it (as well as from the Gazelle Road roundabout)?	
What public transport solutions will be provided to link new housing at Cambridge East to employment centres like CBC to private car use on roads at capacity?	57844 (D Lister)
Transport network should include provision of accessible and cheap public transport for essential car use e.g., people with disabilities.	59218 (M Berkson)
Connectivity and road links between Cambridge East and the three southern campuses should be improved. Particularly: • Road structure beyond the Robin Hood crossroads • Access to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (limited to Queen Edith's Way) • Access to Babraham and Genome Campuses via Lime Kiln Road.	59771 (B Hunt)
Should consider access links in the North East corner of the Airport site to have direct access to the roundabout and avoid congestion.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Some complicated scenarios relating to education provision to be considered.	56931* (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Education needs required by proposed 2,900 dwellings until 2041: • 2FE/two 3FE schools • further possible 3FE school (630 places) for 1,600 dwellings after 2041 • land allocated for full day care (Early Years provision) • land for secondary provision closer to 2041 and post 2041 residual build-out.	56932 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Need for adoption of an up-to-date AAP for the Cambridge East development to: • allow for coordination of delivery of education infrastructure.	56932 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Challenges and costs of bringing Coldham's Lakes into public use is only likely to be viable as part of the Cambridge Airport development and could be used by new residents.	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Biomedical and high tech opportunities should be encouraged to relieve pressure on existing road networks in existing clusters such as Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge Business Park, Cambridge Biomedical Campus and by-passing the City Centre. Also, relieving pressure on Southern Fringe from expansion of Cambridge Biomedical Campus.	59218 (M Berkson)
Cambridge East should be connected directly to the City centre, Biomedical campus, North Cambridge and the Science Park, Eddington, and West Cambridge.	60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
County Council Highways Committee determined that a separate and integrated policy should be created for Mill Road to	60074 (C de Blois)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
prevent volumes of traffic and accidents. This should be noted in the policy on development to the East of Cambridge.	
Opportunity to connect to the Wicken Fen Vision Area and create high quality green infrastructure, delivering high level ambitions of the Local Plan.	59285 (National Trust)
Why would Cambridge not need its own airport providing national and international travel for significant international business?	59553 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
The new wastewater plant will be able to support the water recycling needs of the mix of employment uses, services and retail.	60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Other)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40306): The Preferred Options rightly recognises the importance of Cambridge East to the growth strategy of Greater Cambridge through the allocation of the site for a significant mixed-use development. Marshall strongly supports the principle that the Local Plan should allocate Cambridge East and optimise the potential of the land to meet housing, employment and cultural needs in the City. It presents the opportunity to plan for forms of development that cannot be accommodated within the historic core and it is capable of providing the key missing links in a comprehensive sustainable transport network for the City.	58404 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Continue to work with Marshalls, Hill and South Cambridgeshire DC to develop the community at Marleigh.	59903* (Fen Ditton PC)
Is Teversham going to remain a village and be screened from the noise and pollution generated by this development?	56477* (M Mckenzie-Davie)
Ecological issues around Biomedical Site will have a negative impact on biodiversity, including: • loss of insects and wildlife • loss of plants • loss of farming bird populations.	60231 (H Warwick)
CE/R45: Land north of Newmarket spatial extents unresolved.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Should link S/AMC/Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane to S/CE: Cambridge East	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Object to moving Newmarket Road Park & Ride as an alternative Greenbelt site will be needed.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Wish to engage throughout progression of the Local Plan and development of Cambridge East (James Littlewood – Cambridge Past, Present & Future, Paul Forecast – National Trust, Martin Baker – Wildlife Trust BNC).	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Site is alongside A14 causing a problem with noise and pollution	57468 (C Martin)
Green belt is being imposed on with the WWTP	57468 (C Martin), 58127 (M Asplin)
Capital carbon / climate change impacts	58127 (M Asplin)
Cambridge East is more suitable in size and can provide sufficient and suitable housing	58127 (M Asplin)
Object to moving WWTW to Green Belt as open space will become important to future residents.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
No comments.	58375 (Linton PC)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

83 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge heading as the comments were specific to Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

Several respondents supported the proposal, with Fen Ditton PC noting that it reflected Cambridge's specific strengths. However, some respondents added caveats to their support, for example, the University of Cambridge argued that the proposed growth requirements were too restrictive. Other respondents argued that the site's design needs refinement, and the Wildlife Trust stressed the continuing importance of protecting the city's green edge. One respondent argued that currently on the site there is an imbalance in the availability of facilities for research organisations compared to the general hospital, but they noted that planning gain from the proposal could be used to address this.

Some respondents submitted neutral comments, including citizens who asked for an assessment of whether the expansion was necessary after Covid-19. Other respondents requested for the masterplan to be redrafted to improve things such as cycle and pedestrian permeability. Several respondents used their feedback to focus upon technical elements of the proposal such as measurements and policy wording. Developers also submitted representations arguing that the proposal necessitated the delivery of additional housing.

Some respondents objected to the proposals. Reasons for opposition included environmental concerns, specifically relating to the perceived threat of flooding, carbon emissions potentially produced by the proposal and the adverse impact that the expansion could have upon red-listed farm birds which currently frequent the site. Other objections were justified on the basis that the proposal would negatively impact green belt land and harm the city's green edge. Some people felt that the proposal would be more suitable in other parts of Cambridge, or if it was in another area of the country.

In addition to these representations, question 5 of the questionnaire was also related to the extension of the Biomedical Campus. Many responses voiced similar concerns that appeared in the representations to the policy, particularly in relation to the proposal's potential impact upon the environment, green spaces, and flooding. Some comments asked for the proposal to improve the layout, traffic flow, and amenities of the Campus as well as the need to provide affordable housing for key workers. There were also different opinions about the types of jobs that should be delivered, specifically whether there should be an emphasis upon healthcare or research.

Response to representations

It should be noted that following the First Proposals Consultation an errata was published in relation to this policy. An error was identified in the online interactive version of the First Proposals. The third bullet in the Proposed Policy Direction for Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Policy S/CBC) was an error and did not reflect the wording agreed by the Councils for consultation. The interactive web based version of the First Proposals included a different third bullet to the pdf document version which was also available during the consultation. The PDF document version reflects what was agreed by the Councils for consultation and is correct. This error will be addressed at the next stage in the plan-making process. It is intended that an opportunity to make further

representations specifically in respect of the paragraph included in error will be given at the next stage of consultation on the emerging plan.

The response to representations relevant to this policy includes:

- **Support**: There is a clear and agreed case to make better use of the existing Campus. The case for Green Belt release continues to merit exploration given the international importance of the campus and opportunities for its improvement.
- **Support for improving existing Campus**: There is a clear and agreed case to make better use of the existing Campus. As an important location for the City the Greater Cambridge Local Plan needs to provide a policy framework to guide its development, including providing a comprehensive approach that carefully considers the need for different land uses alongside infrastructure delivery and transport.
- **Concern regarding expansion of Campus into Green Belt**: The Councils will continue to review the evidence and consider need for the site, but currently consider that the case for Green Belt release continues to merit exploration given the international importance of the campus and opportunities for its improvement. The First Proposals suggested a number of policy criteria that would need to be addressed if the additional area adjoining Babraham Road (S/CBC-A) was released from the Green Belt to meet the long-term needs of the Campus. At this stage we consider that these policy criteria are capable of being met; we will explore them further ahead of draft plan to come to a conclusion regarding the expansion of the Campus into Green Belt.

Table of representations: S/CBC – Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Support)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support	56807 (M Colville), 57659 (Histon & Impington PC), 58453 (University of Cambridge), 58790 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 59905 (Fen Ditton PC), 60047 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum), 60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60564 (Countryside Properties), 60611 (CALA Group Ltd), 60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site) 60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton Site), 60634 (NIAB Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Reflects Cambridge's specific strengths.	59903* (Fen Ditton PC)
Offers the opportunity to accommodate demand in a sustainable and inclusive way. Agree that additional development is possible without undermining the wider function of the Green Belt or impacting on landscape.	58753* (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
Support the policy position that the first priority should be to reassess the existing campus land, however: • the First Proposals, set out an inappropriately restricted approach to growth requirements which have been demonstrated in the Vision 2050. The Local Plan needs to provide a more comprehensive response • the allocated land will be exhausted in the site early on in the Plan's lifespan. • Aware that the existing proposed land release may be insufficient to address all the pertinent matters, including employment, landscape and amenity issues.	58453 (University of Cambridge), 58790 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58982 (Jesus College (working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings), a private landowner and St John's College)
Support with caveats, including: • The importance of providing Green Belt enhancement in neighbouring areas is welcome. • Important to emphasise expansion will not go beyond Granham's Road • There should still be a 'green edge' to Cambridge • Issue of water is still a potential 'show-stopper' • Issue of Lime Kiln Road needs to be addressed • Activities need to be monitored to avoid inappropriate development	57058 (The Wildlife Trust) 57667 (J Conroy), 58382 (Linton PC) 59774 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• CBC should include members of the Queen Edith's Community Forum on their liaison group • Discussion should start with CBC and southern campuses to explore how life-sciences can be accommodated in south-east Cambridge. • Care will need to be taken over site design to limit the impact of buildings/homes on landscape and natural environment • CBC needs to explore the topic of collaboration with the incoming businesses, i.e. who will collaborate with how and how depended is it on being on same site?	
Considers the loss of Green Belt to be justified and the loss can be offset by public environmental and biodiversity gains.	60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Support the proposal not to build south of Granhams Road.	57667 (J Conroy)
At CBC, there is a growing imbalance between the facilities available to the research partners on the site and the public hospital. 'Vision 2050' fails to examine this imbalance and uncritically supports proposals that will place significant further demands on hospital facilities. The hospital should be vigorously pursuing the argument that some of the planning gain from further CBC development must be ringfenced for hospital renewal. This must be in addition to reliance on HIP, prospects for which appear increasingly uncertain. The Local Plan offers an exceptional opportunity for such an approach.	58250 (S Davies)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Objections)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No development due to concerns about Sustainability issues, including: • Carbon emissions from construction • Loss of biodiversity • Effect on national food security • Flooding • Concerns about flooding • Water supply makes development untenable. • Area has high-quality agricultural land, developing here undermines Policy J/AL. • Concerns about pollution/ increase in congestion • Proposal for a country park is 'greenwashing'	56522 (H Donoghue), 56817 (M Guida), 56814 (R Sorkin), 56966 (C Archibald), 57126 (R Cushing), 57130 (M Majidi), 57153 (J Nilsson-Wright), 57313 (J Buckingham), 57584 (M Jump), 57589 (J Jump), 57629 (M Polichroniadis), 57699 (S Wilkie), 57826 (M Thorn), 57830 (S Marelli), 57885 (M Brod), 58030 (K Rennie), 58031 (D Blake), 58042 (F Waller), 58045 (J Carroll) 58077 (S Kennedy), 58078 (J Stapleton), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58120 (P Edwards), 58144 (D Brian), 58352 (R Edwards), 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58450 (F Gawthrop), 58768 (J Lister), 58916 (A Sykes), 59046 (Great Shelford PC), 59254 (C Goodwille), 59493 (J Hunter), 59555 (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 59739 (S Steele), 59816 (A Thompson) 60230 (Heather Warwick), 60238 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60400 (V F Bolt), 60559 (J Buckingham), 60742 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
No development, due to concerns including: • Impact on views • Impact on Green Belt + would weaken the urban/ rural divide • Area should be designated as a country park/ Land including Nine Wells LNR must be protected • Areas for accessing nature are being pushed further away beyond walking reach of Queen Edith's	56522 (H Donoghue), 56734 (Croydon PC), 56796 (R Elgar), 56817 (M Guida), 56814 (R Sorkin), 56966 (C Archibald), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57126 (R Cushing), 57130 (M Majidi), 57584 (M Jump), 57589 (J Jump), 57629 (M Polichroniadis), 57699 (S Wilkie), 57826 (M Thom), 58077 (S Kennedy), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58120 (P Edwards), 58144 (D Brian), 58342 (F Goodwille) 58352 (R Edwards) 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future) 58450 (F

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Commercial gain from releasing Green Belt land not strong enough justification for development • The Council's planners' Site Assessment Survey for the Land at Granham's Road, deems the suitability of the site as 'RED' • Contradicts the aim of Policy 17 of the 2018 Local Plan • Would contravene Policy 18f) of 2018 Plan • Ninewells houses were sold on idea they would be at the boundary of the city • Any large development should have been planned at the 2018 Local Plan. Ninewells, GB1 + GB2 have already been approved and development will now be piecemeal rather than integrated • Contradicts the Council's own policies on Green Belt and entrance into the city policies • Would produce several commercial structures unsuitable for area • Would undermine Cambridge's 'special character' • The soft edge of the city should be defended + it would give the city a hard, commercial edge	Gawthrop) 58768 (J Lister), 58916 (A Sykes) 59046 (Great Shelford PC) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59267 (M Berkson), 59493 (J Hunter), 59555 (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 59739 (S Steele) 59816 (A Thompson) 60238 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60400 (V F Bolt) 60559 (J Buckingham)
Object due to reasons including: • Brownfield sites in north Cambridge would be more suitable • Spreading services around surrounding areas would reduce travel burden for patients, airport area is suggested.	57153 (J Nilsson-Wright), 58042 (F Waller), 58144 (D Brian) 58768 (J Lister) 59739 (S Steele) 60400 (V F Bolt)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Undermining of government's policy of 'levelling-up' • Not developing the site will mean less need for houses on other sites • Not developing would mean that it could go to another part of the city	
Object due to reasons including: • Concerned about developing poor quality housing • Traffic is already bad on-site. There is a lack of consideration given to how transport will operate on site, leading to an increase in traffic • Lack of consideration about civic facilities • Lack of consideration about amenities for campus users • Lack of consideration about school facilities	56817 (M Guida) 56814 (R Sorkin), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57126 (R Cushing), 57313 (J Buckingham), 57699 (S Wilkie), 57826 (M Thom), 57830 (S Marelli), 58030 (K Rennie), 58031 (D Blake), 58042 (F Waller), 58077 (S Kennedy), 58078 (J Stapleton), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58120 (P Edwards), 58144 (D Brian) 58342 (F Goodwille) 58352 (R Edwards) 58768 (J Lister) 59046 (Great Shelford PC) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59739 (S Steele) 59816 (A Thompson), 60400 (V F Bolt), 60559 (J Buckingham)
Object due to reasons including: • It will make wealthier residents flee which will lead to further development. • Plan will have negative effect on lives of residents/ not improve their lives	56814 (R Sorkin), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57584 (M Jump), 57589 (J Jump), 57699 (S Wilkie), 58089 (D Lister),
Object due reasons including: • Increasing use in technology undermines need to expand • The evidence that justifies the need for development beyond the CBC's current boundary has not been demonstrated	56814 (R Sorkin), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57584 (M Jump) , 58030 (K Rennie), 58045 (J Carroll) 58077 (S Kennedy), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58144 (D Brian), 58164 (S Kennedy 2nd comment) 58342 (F Goodwille) 58352 (R Edwards) 58120 (P Edwards), 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58419 (S Marelli) 58450 (F Gawthrop) 58768 (J Lister), 58916 (A Sykes) 59046 (Great Shelford PC) 59254 (C

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• There are limits to land which Campus can expand. Why not build a new campus in a different location now as part of this Plan? • Question the need for facilities to be next to each other • Why are nearby employment sites already identified sites not sufficient? • The Biomedical Campus should first be required to optimally utilise its existing space • Proposed growth exceeds that which is projected • Why expand when research buildings are empty? • Bottleneck for filling existing space is not lack of housing, but Brexit, so more development is not needed. • Indication companies will not move to UK after Brexit which lessens need for development. • It is unclear what kind of development would be allowed • Land is smaller than CBC want to build in their '2050' vision. So where do we draw the line? • Significant amount of southern Green Belt land was taken out because of the 2006 and 2018 Local plans / The campus has enough land to run to the end of the Plan's current period • Importance of hospital buildings not recognised in 2050 vision document. • No indication in 2018 Plan of these changes	Goodwille) 59267 (M Berkson), 59555 (Campaign to Protect Rural England) 59816 (A Thompson) 60230 (Heather Warwick)
Why should we trust an organisation – CBC - which has consistently failed to plan their campus.	58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Above all, don't allow a speculative sprawl now. Don't give permission that depends on conditions being met, but make it part of a future Local Plan with all of the consultation and consideration that entails.	58164 (S Kennedy 2nd comment)
It puzzles me why the air ambulance doesn't go straight to a dedicated helipad on the roof of the hospital. This would free up land and undermine the need for building in the Green Belt.	58077 (S Kennedy)
There has been a lack of consideration for resident's views/ a democratic deficit in the process and evidence-base/ an appreciation on how the proposal will impact residents	57629 (M Polichroniadis), 58030 (K Rennie), 58042 (F Waller) 58095 (A Hobbs) 59816 (A Thompson), 60400 (V F Bolt), 60559 (J Buckingham)
Angered by proposal to change the junction of Granham's Road as this was recently modified, including a hedgerow which was cut down and still hasn't been restored.	58077 (S Kennedy)
I support the letter of objection sent to you by Friends of the Cam	58042 (F Waller)
Need to sort out other problems before developing and pursuing Ox-Cam Arc	60230 (Heather Warwick)
We have previously objected to the expansion of CBC that was included in the current Local Plan (S/CBC/Policy E/2), as far as we are aware, no plans have been put forward for the use of the growth area that was included in the current Local Plan.	56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Restrict housing to south of the present line of Granham's Road (which is apparently to be rerouted to the south anyway) and use S/CBC/A for recreational purposes. A boating lake would help with drainage both north and south of the field	57885 (M Brod) 58095 (A Hobbs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Infrastructure improvements need to be delivered before further development permitted (within existing boundary) to reduce impact and improve wellbeing of surrounding communities.	58089 (D Lister)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Neutral)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No comment	57335 (Huntingdonshire DC)
There needs to be an assessment of whether the expansion is needed in the post-Covid context	58095 (A Hobbs) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59739 (S Steele), 59774 (B Hunt) 59816 (A Thompson)
Accept the desirability of expanding the campus, but there are more pressing issues, such as the inadequate public transport and the need to 'green' the campus.	57596 (C Maynard)
You have already allocated extra land on Dame Mary Archer Way, and that has been accepted. If more land is required definitely required, that area could be extended round Ninewells, which would have to be carefully landscaped	60559 (J Buckingham)
If Campus expansion is deemed to be inevitable there would appear to less environmental impact from development of the land south of Addenbrooke's Road, between Hobson's brook and the railway line, or indeed land further to the West, between Addenbrooke's road and the M11.	58144 (D Brian)
Who will judge whether the existing CBC site (including its current allocations) has been properly utilised before releasing development land at S/CBC/A?	58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Deliverability)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
GCSP should ask for a review of the 2020 Vision, the existing master plan, outline planning permission for the Biomedical Campus and the more detailed subsequent applications to pull together things proposed, or conditions imposed which have not yet been fulfilled	58916 (A Sykes) 59254 (C Goodwille)
The masterplan document is key, it should: • Coordinate in time and space with all the local and regional transport, housing and industrial proposals. • The masterplan must cover the whole Campus and the effects on the surrounding region.	59267 (M Berkson)
A revised 2050 document is needed, it needs to: • begin with the hospitals and set out their renovation and expansion plans, and explaining expected timing and funding. This is likely to highlight that, among other things, s106 funding will be needed to make them achievable. • The hospitals should, in this suggested revised 2050 Vision, along with their partners on the biomedical campus, identify what the clinical areas which support further expansion are. • The revised 2050 Vision needs to review other employment sites identified in Appendix H of the Greater Cambridge Economic Development and Employment Land Evidence Study close to the Biomedical Campus	58916 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
and, if appropriate, explain why they cannot be used for its proposed expansion. • It should also be scaled back to address the more limited allocations already in SCDC's Local Plan and, if appropriate, the additional allocation in the First Proposals • The hospitals should also lead the revision of this document.	
Attached in their representation, the commenter included a list of tasks which they assert will need to be completed with GCSP to deliver the site. This long list includes outputs such as an environmental strategy and placemaking strategy. It is not copied here but is attached with the representation. In their representation, the commenter also offers to formalise this approach with the Council	58790 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
An effective series of Town Planning controls is essential to guide development, help realise Vision 2050 and deliver benefits for local communities. CBC seeks to work with the Planning Authority to agree a suite of planning framework controls to safeguard the 2050 Vision.	59129 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd.)
The establishment of a formal review forum to review and influence any proposed campus planning applications and Planning Gain discussions would ensure that all those with a material interest in the campus had a say. A similar forum could also engage in negotiations on Community Infrastructure Levy, Section 106 or other 'Planning Gain' mechanisms.	59129 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd.)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
If it has to be delivered, there is a case for phasing it well into the future beyond 2041 after the current site's area has been maximised and requiring a design code that restricts its visual impact, removing homes and instead prioritising functions that need to be on campus.	56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Argue that a more rigorous set of criteria should be agreed so that new enterprises and activities have to demonstrate why co-location within the Campus is absolutely essential for their operation.	58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
The commentator points out mistakes in the site allocation including: • "There are no apparent priority habitats within the site". This is not so: please see John Meed's Response to Local Plan Policy S/CBC. • That the development would "not have a detrimental impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads". This is highly improbable. • "Distance to City … Centre: Less than or Equal to 2,000m". This is incorrect. The distance from Ninewells to the City centre is more than 4,000m. • "Distance to Rapid Public Transport: Less than or Equal to 1,800m". This is incorrect. The distance from Ninewells to the Central Railway Station is 3,300m	58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)
If the Campus must be extended, do it in-line with the present permission on Dame Mary Archer way to the south creating a	57313 (J Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
park round Ninewells and maintaining and adding to existing greenery.	
If the proposal is brought ahead, other features could include enhancing sustainable access routes towards the Gog Magog Hills	57058 (The Wildlife Trust)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Climate Change)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill will have carbon impacts.	56514 (C Martin)
The area between the Ninewells estate and Granham's Road is prone to significant flooding which presents challenges to development in this area.	56814 (R Sorkin), 56966 (C Archibald)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Biodiversity and green spaces)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
We should be protecting the Campus which is already constructed including the new children's hospital with a "natural based" solution / wetland area, which will hold back the water. These areas could be "Green Belt Enhancement"	59493 (J Hunter) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59816 (A Thompson)
Ideally for biodiversity the proposed housing between Worts Causeway and Babraham Road should be an extension to the green belt.	59493 (J Hunter)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land should be set aside to protect to Nine Wells Reserve/ The area should be designated a country park/ the Reserve should be restored	56797 (R Elgar), 57126 (R Cushing), 58352 (R Edwards) 58916 (A Sykes), 60742 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
We welcome the significant Green Belt enhancement which will come with the proposal. In addition to this, policy drafting must ensure that: i). Any development is contingent on green infrastructure and biodiversity improvements in the adjoining area. ii). The scale and type of improvements are spelt out clearly so that both the developer and community understand what is expected.	58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
The area has a remarkable population of red-listed farmland bird species, water voles and other species. Mitigation measures are needed on this area and adjacent land to mitigate and compensate for the loss of biodiversity. These changes would need to be built into the Local Plan, via some form of agreement, and be regularly monitored through surveys.	56962 (J Meed), 57058 (The Wildlife Trust), 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2nd comment) 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future) 60230 (Heather Warwick)
It is unrealistic to expect that Policy S/CBC/A, will achieve a minimum 20% biodiversity net gain, leave the natural environment better than it was before or help halt the decline in species abundance. Proper Green Belt enhancement will require substantially more land.	56814 (R Sorkin), 56962 (J Meed), 57699 57699 (S Wilkie), 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2nd comment) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille), 60559 (J Buckingham)
Policy S/CBC does not specify how the area would be managed to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Even with enlightened habitat management, there would still be difficult decisions to be taken about which species would be favoured and which management measures to implement.	56962 (J Meed), 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2nd comment) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
A walk within a development is not the same as walking in a green field with open views.	58342 (F Goodwille)
Should instead create a green wildflower meadow between Cambridge centre to Magog Down.	58342 (F Goodwille)
Habitat creation is harder work than maintaining existing habitat. Retaining the existing fields would be a less risky option.	56962 (J Meed) 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2nd comment)
Development would likely entail rerouting of helicopter which would lead to visual and noise pollution of green spaces around site.	58342 (F Goodwille)
There is already a very easily accessible large green public space close to the Campus near to and surrounding the Hobson's Park bird reserve, which is currently under-utilised and could be made more accessible by providing easier access by foot and cycle to cross the railway line	58144 (D Brian)
The area could better be enhanced by increasing the green infrastructure either side of the railway line and towards the Shelfords.	58144 (D Brian)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There are no designated heritage assets within the boundary of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus or extension. However, there are nearby listed monuments and long- range views from Wandlebury and the Gogs across the site and City. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. Therefore we recommend you	59607 (Historic England), 59636 (Historic England 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.	
In relation to Policy S/CBC - A Possible future expansion adjoining Babraham Road- there are important views of the edge of the city from the higher land to the south and in particular from heritage assets including the scheduled monuments of Little Trees Hill (on Magog Down) and Wandlebury. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. Furthermore, careful consideration should be given to development because the city edge in this area is currently screened by mature trees, whereas the site itself is much more exposed in views from the south.	59637 (Historic England 3rd comment)
In relation to policy S/CBC/PolicyM15 Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Main Campus), development of this site should ensure the protection and enhancement of the wider setting of the city, with buildings of an appropriate height, scale and mass for this edge of city location. These considerations should be included in the policy for this area.	59638 (Historic England 4th comment)
In relation to S/CBC/Policy E2 Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension existing committed expansion, it is noted that the site lies close to scheduled monuments and long-range views are also a potential issue. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. Development in this location will need to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets	59639 (Historic England 5th comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
including any contribution made to that significance by setting. Opportunities should be taken to enhance the setting of these assets through the wider strategic green infrastructure proposals in the area.	
In relation to Policy 17 –Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) Area of Major Change, Historic England welcomes the proposals for green infrastructure and biodiversity improvements. We suggest that this is widened to include historic environment enhancements given the scheduled monument and other archaeological finds in the area as well as the monument at Nine Wells. The opportunity should be taken to enhance the setting of these assets. This could be informed by the HIA for the area. As with other sites along this edge of the City long range views are also a potential issue, affecting the setting of the City.	59640 (Historic England 6th comment)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There is a sufficient supply of employment land elsewhere, as detailed in the Employment Land and Economic Evidence Base (Appendix H).	56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Benefits that come from life science jobs will outweigh the cons	59774 (B Hunt)
The Preferred Option for future expansion does not support CBC Ltd and the landowners' projections on future demand for life sciences space in Greater Cambridge. We are concerned that	58453 (University of Cambridge)

the Council's preferred jobs forecast is based on an assumption that jobs growth for life sciences to 2041 will be lower than that achieved between 2001-2017. A common set of growth projections for the CBC needs to be agreed in order to inform the next stages of local plan preparation.	

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
It is considered important that substantial housing growth is provided: • in close proximity to the Biomedical Campus to support its growth and so it can be accessed by sustainable transport means. • to the south-west of Cambridge, with access to the railway • South-east of Cambridge • It is imperative that a proportion of new housing growth is located along sustainable transport corridors from the Biomedical Campus/ has sustainable transport links to the Campus	60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton site) 60611 (CALA Group LTD) 60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site) 60564 (Countryside Properties), 60634 (NIAB Trust)
A proper plan for hospital infrastructure needs to support expected housing and economic growth and the ageing population in the region.	59267 (M Berkson)
Given land is constrained in this area, we question whether there should be any housing/ healthcare, research, and technology uses should be prioritised	58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future) 58916 (A Sykes) 60047 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Cambridge Biomedical Campus – to improve and develop this site for the two hospitals and research is sensible. However, need accommodation at affordable prices for those working on the site.	57210* (D Lott)
A high proportion of Key Worker accommodation for the Addenbrookes site is needed	57659 (Histon & Impington PC) 58144 (D Brian), 58740 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 59774 (B Hunt)
Appropriate housing is needed, is there no aims to build a new settlement in this area similar to Northstowe or Cambourne?	56807 (M Colville)
The proposed use of this land is for employment space, won't this intensify the imbalance between jobs (too many) and housing (too little)?	56814 (R Sorkin)
Policy implies there will be no market housing. If affordable housing is limited to campus employees to support the expansion of the Campus, it would have limited impact on the existing shortfall in affordable housing.	56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The Policy states 'Development is dependent on the successful implementation of a Trip Budget approach, to ensure that the level of vehicle trips is limited to an appropriate level for the surrounding road network.' If that is the case, then unless the level is 'zero', no development should be sanctioned because the road network is already overloaded.	56814 (R Sorkin)
The previous expansion of the CBC and Addenbrookes has impacted negatively on the surrounding communities, specifically by an increase in illegal parking, smoking and traffic.	60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
CBC cannot manage the unintended consequences of their growth. How can they expand without robust prevention? Examples to improve this situation for the Red Cross residents could include: • Signage direct footfall/vehicles away from RedCross Areas • Module filters slowing through traffic • Signage not allowing no motorbikes into CBC through cycle path • Add P&R with cycle route into CBC site • Move cycle path around Ninewells so it does not direct traffic through Greenlands which was a cul-de-sac only has 32 houses only 4 road side taking thousands passing by weekly 24/7 letters to patients/staff/contractors /visitors • no waiting or parking in RedCross Area • A multi-agency approach is necessary to address these issues • CCTV • CBC need to better communicate with their staff the issues and enforce policies • Funding for community rangers to resolve traffic issues	
A significant number of people who cannot use bicycles or even walk easily and they must be provided for.	59267 (M Berkson)
A redesigned masterplan should provide: • All the facilities required on a campus of this size, before any further land allocation is considered.	59254 (C Goodwille) 59267 (M Berkson) 58144 (D Brian), 60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Redesign must additionally address inadequate cycle and pedestrian permeability through the campus and to the new station and busway. • Safer walking routes including more street and key area lighting, pavement bollards. • Adequate smoking areas to stop smokers going into neighbouring areas. • Extend Ninewells Cycle path around Ninewells (not through it) and connect to cycle path by Helicopter pad – linking Park & Ride/Trumpington and give a Safer Active Travel Route for the increasing numbers of staff going into the Biomedical Campus • Discourage cars to trail/ illegally park on campus by offering adequate parking on-site. • Better signage on the site • Must take account of historic mistakes in design of campus which has caused parking issues • It is essential that there is a comprehensive network of rapid, accessible and cheap public transport provisions both within the Campus and along the feeder routes. No development can be permitted before such a network is operational.	
CBC needs a station	60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)
Consult with the neighbours who will be impacted by infrastructure changes	60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should the expanded site for CBC be allowed, GSPC believes that an alternative busway along the route of the A1307 would better serve CBC whilst minimising the significant ecological damage that CSET would create.	59046 (Great Shelford PC)
Schemes such as the light rail concept proposed by Cambridge Connect also demonstrate some attractive aspects that could benefit the whole of the GCSP area	59046 (Great Shelford PC)
One of the transport proposals made in the context of the more extensive Cambridge South proposals for Biomedical Campus expansion was to close Granham's Road to through traffic. This would be very damaging to Great Shelford and Stapleford and should not be taken forward.	58916 (A Sykes)
Better signposting is needed on the campus for cycling paths	58916 (A Sykes)
Expect to see some workable, affordable, transport solutions in place before any more major building takes place. Charging people for access to Cambridge would be good for the Council but not for anyone else, and we would all like to see a real commitment from the planners for a top class transport system.	60559 (J Buckingham)
The expansion will lead to increased trips form North Hertfordshire and potentially negatively impact Royston. North Hertfordshire will need data from GCPS to understand the pressures on Royston, so it can respond positively. North Hertfordshire also asks that the central role of Royston is recognised and the policies in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan will allow for appropriate contributions to be made for sustainable travel projects which will support commuters in Royston.	58663 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
We would welcome further discussions about potential longer term cross boundary issues as both the Greater Cambridge and North Hertfordshire plans progress.	58663 (North Hertfordshire DC)
An efficient, high density development will be more effective than a sprawl. Use less space for car parks and keep cars off the Campus more effectively.	58164 (S Kennedy)
(Minerals and Waste) Most of Consultation Area (CA) for Addenbrooke's energy from waste Management Area (WMA) is within the Proposed Area of Major Change. S/CBC/E/2 is partly within the CA. All of the PAMC is within a MSA for chalk and parts are within a MSA for sand & gravel.	56935 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Other)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
In relation to CBC, Land north west of Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA site 60562) would provide vital housing for the new campus and enable sustainable transport. Linton is one of the largest settlements in South Cambridgeshire that will be served by the CSET route and would therefore reduce travel trips. Linton is situated outside of the Green Belt and therefore it is considered that Linton should be the focus for growth ahead of settlements that lie within this designation such as Sawston.	60564 (Countryside Properties)
In relation to CBC, HEELA Site 40247 'Land off Water Lane, Melbourn, Cambridgeshire' would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus and be accessible by the Cambridge South Station once it is built.	60611 (CALA Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Growth in Melbourn would be consistent with one of the key objectives of the Local Plan, which seeks to minimise car travel by focusing growth on locations with good transport infrastructure.	
In relation to CBC, the site 'Land Rear of Fisher's Lane, Orwell' would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus and that can benefit from the Cambridge South Station. Growth in this area would be able to ensure sustainable travel to the CBC, especially due to its proximity to Cambridge South Station via Shepreth which is a short cycle from Orwell	60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site)
In relation to CBC, the site 'Land East if Redgate, Girton' would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus whilst linking with sustainable forms of transport. The site is within half an hour cycling distance of the Campus and bus links are also available. Growth in Girton would be consistent with one of the key objectives of the Local Plan, which seeks to minimise car travel by focusing growth on locations with good transport infrastructure.	60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton Site)
In relation to CBC, their site 'Land West of South Road' in Impington would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus whilst linking with sustainable forms of transport. The site is within half an hour cycling distance of the campus and bus links are also available.	60634 (NIAB Trust)
In relation to CBC, as with the release of Green Belt land at Babraham (Policy S/BRC) Anglian Water consider the role of the Green Belt should be re- assessed and modified where	60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
necessary to enable crucial services and public functions to continue, expand and be delivered when location options are constrained.	

New settlements

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - New settlements > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

25 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development at new settlements, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites or the overall amount of jobs and homes proposed. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/CE: Cambridge East, S/CB: Cambourne, and S/NS: Existing new settlements, or to the housing and jobs requirement policy: S/JH: New jobs and homes.

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

Broad support for new settlements, while noting the need to ensure that they have their own identity and provide the necessary services, facilities, public transport and other infrastructure. Sport England highlight need to provide significant on-site facilities for sport and physical activities, with requirements identified through evidence. Parish Councils support the use of brownfield sites, and reduction of allocations on greenfield sites. Some site promoters’ comments highlight the potential for further new settlements to be identified, including by creating new settlements around existing infrastructure and services. Other site promoters’ highlight the

need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Response to representations

Responses to representations regarding New settlements relevant to the decisions being taken in early 2023 are addressed in Appendix A S/DS Development Strategy. Representations on topics not addressed in the responses above are not relevant to those decisions, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Table of representations: New settlements

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Broadly supportive as Northstowe, Waterbeach, Cambourne and Bourn are major opportunities to meet growth aspirations with good or potential sustainable travel opportunities.	59907 (Fen Ditton PC)
New settlements are the best way of achieving an increased housing stock.	56808 (M Colville)
Support Councils aspirations of ensuring new settlements mature into great places to live and work, that make the most of existing and planned transport infrastructure, that are real communities with their own distinctive identity, and with the critical mass to support businesses, services and facilities.	58684 (Church Commissioners for England)
Potential for further new settlements to be allocated with the Local Plan. Identification of a further new/expanded new settlement would provide greater certainty over housing supply.	58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
New settlements should not be viewed in isolation from existing infrastructure and communities – need to consider opportunities	58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
for creating new settlements around existing infrastructure and services.	
Local Plans sustainability and climate change objectives mean that spatial strategy must optimise sustainable locations adjacent to Cambridge, rather than dispersing growth and travel.	58409 (Marshal Group Properties)
New settlements should include public transport hubs to serve their surrounding rural areas.	56578 (Gamlingay PC)
Support for new settlements of a substantial size to cater for more than local needs.	60116 (C Blakeley)
Crucial that Northstowe, Waterbeach, Cambourne and Bourn Airfield provide significant on-site facilities for sport and physical activities. Requirements should be identified in the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy.	56853 (Sport England)
Should provide a variety of homes and at different densities, including homes with sizeable gardens, to create an environment and homes that are different from the urban developments in Cambridge and on its fringes.	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Develop mechanisms to ensure social facilities and amenities (e.g. schools, shops, green spaces) are provided early in the delivery of the new settlement. If necessary, encouraged by initial lower rent / rent-free premises – could s106 contributions be secured for this?	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Must be sustainable with sufficient transport, water, electricity and other infrastructure.	58388 (Linton PC)
Vital that new settlements are served by low carbon transport options and existing major road networks so that the Local Plan can meet its aims for climate change and biodiversity.	58997 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts area)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	59151 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.	59151 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
New settlements are well places to meet the economic needs of the wider area, and so these areas should not be reused for other uses even if take up is slow.	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Sufficient employment land for mix of businesses, including for smaller manufacturing businesses that are being pushed out of Cambridge.	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Attractive and easily accessible public transport provision needed to workplaces and leisure uses.	57827 (W Wicksteed), 58388 (Linton PC)
Reducing allocation of greenfield sites is supported.	56578 (Gamlingay PC)
Strongly support new settlements, especially those on brownfield sites.	58388 (Linton PC)
No objection to the three existing new settlements that will continue to be developed during the plan period and beyond.	57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Potential to integrate new allocations with planned new infrastructure to the west of Cambridge, such as A428 dualling.	58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities.	57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Evidence base highlights benefits of meeting needs in sustainable locations adjacent to Cambridge. Opportunities for development on the edge of Cambridge should be optimised and preferred, to reduce need for new settlements that do not offer the same sustainability benefits, proximity to existing employment, or public transport infrastructure.	58796 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
Past track record of delivery on the new settlements places considerable doubt on whether the proposed trajectory can be achieved. Should be more smaller sites that can be delivered in the early years of the plan.	58737 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Dry Drayton is in the middle of three new settlements (Northstowe, Bourn and Cambourne) – would we see increased traffic through the village?	59817 (Dry Drayton PC)
No comment.	57349 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons: • should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities • consistent with the proposed development strategy • potential for further new settlements to be allocated with the Local Plan	57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58302 (Hallam Land management Limited), 58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58684 (Church Commissioners for England), 58707 (Grange Farm Partnership), 58737 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58796 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• expansion of Cambourne presents opportunities to achieve sustainable growth • more smaller sites needed that can be delivered in the early years of the plan • opportunities for development on the edge of Cambridge should be optimised and preferred, to reduce need for new settlements	

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Scotland Farm (East & West), Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 56252) – should be allocated as a new settlement	58302 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Land at Grange Farm, east of A11 & north of A1307 (HELAA site 59401) – should be allocated as a new settlement	58707 (Grange Farm Partnership)

S/CB: Cambourne

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/CB: Cambourne > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

48 (albeit see note below)

Note

Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge or new settlements headings as the comments were specific to Cambourne. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

There were mixed views expressed for an expansion to Cambourne within the representations from across the range of respondents.

There was considerable support for making the most of improved transport connections, the opportunity it presents to make the existing town more sustainable and expanding the employment provision and services and facilities available, and agreement that it should be landscape-led and provide a good amount of green space. In addition, some respondents made suggestions for what the

new development should provide, including facilities such as a swimming pool, more sports facilities and retail, plenty of green space for nature and people including parks and nature trails, and improved sustainable transport connections including for active modes both within Cambourne and to surrounding villages.

There were mixed views around transport provision and in particular the relationship with East West Rail (EWR) and the current uncertainty around its delivery. Some respondents were opposed to further development in the absence of or before delivery of EWR and others opposed the EWR proposal itself. It was suggested that with the slow delivery of the GCP Cambourne to Cambridge scheme other forms of transport require consideration. Other respondents seek to maximise the opportunity EWR presents to create a transport hub and maximise opportunities for sustainable travel and achieve integration with the town.

Concerns were expressed by Parish Councils and developers as to whether expansion of Cambourne was necessary and whether development would be better spread across the area. Several site promoters submitted sites in the vicinity of Cambourne and nearby villages for consideration. Concerns raised against further expansion include the potential loss of Cambourne's character from over-development, the potential impact on neighbouring villages and the need to maintain their separate identity, and the need to explore how Cambourne will function with nearby villages. Other concerns related to potential impacts on landscape, open space, biodiversity, and the historic environment. It was questioned whether additional employment would be achievable.

In addition to these representations, question 6 of the questionnaire was also related to the housing, jobs, facilities and open spaces in and around Cambourne. Responses to this question broadly reflected the comments attributed to policy S/CB summarised above.

Response to representations

Housing Delivery

We note the comments received in relation to the site specific housing trajectory for Cambourne, including on the anticipated lead in times, build out rates, market absorption and uncertainty of delivery within the plan period. A response to these representations is

provided in Appendix A within the 'Housing Delivery' element of the response to the representations received on S/DS: Development strategy.

Other Topics

Decisions being taken in early 2023 relate only to limited aspects of the development strategy and only those issues are addressed in the responses to representations above. Representations on topics not addressed in the responses below above are not relevant to those decisions, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Table of representations: S/CB – Cambourne (Support)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support Cambourne development, including: • Agree should be landscape led to minimise impact on wider landscape • Making full use of EWR essential • Goes in right direction; making sustainable, high dwelling location with good green space and active travel provision. • Further development to provide much needed housing is logical • Proposed significant new public infrastructure investment in Cambourne to Cambridge corridor • Growing employment centre will provide opportunities for residents and nearby communities • Making effective connections to surrounding villages	**Individuals** 56494 (D Clay), 57669 (J Conroy), 57735 (J Pavey), 60116* (C Blakeley) **Public Bodies** 56868 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57351 (Huntingdonshire DC), 59472* (Shepreth PC) **Third Sector Organisations** 56854 (Sport England), 57882 (North Newnham Residents Association), 58536 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60743 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties) **Other Organisations** 59868 (East West Rail), 60450 (Anglian Water Services Ltd),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Opportunity to make the most of transport connections and make overall Cambourne area a more sustainable place • Connectivity provided by EWR • Reduce flood risk to surrounding areas through innovative water re-use solutions. Can enable higher water efficiency and reduce quantity of wastewater. • Cambourne has grown rapidly but with a deficit in infrastructure	**Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 58603 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)
Agree that Cambourne presents opportunities to achieve sustainable growth.	58684* (Church Commissioners for England)
Suggestions for what the development should include: • Better quality infrastructure and priority for cyclists and pedestrians within Cambourne and links to surrounding villages & Cambridge • Include and extend the existing nature trails and many parks • Provide a swimming pool • Provide additional retail opportunities (e.g. DIY shop) • Ensure school capacity is provided before development • Employment opportunities – a centre for innovation and design for green technology • Develop infrastructure for sport and physical activity • Ensure the full strategic natural greenspace needs of an expanded population are met, and do not rely on country park.	**Individuals** 56494 (D Clay), 57669 (J Conroy), 57735 (J Pavey) **Public Bodies** 57351 (Huntingdonshire DC) **Third Sector Organisations** 57070 (The Wildlife Trust), 57882 (North Newnham Residents Association), 58536 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59001 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area) **Other Organisations** 56854 (Sport England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Focus on place making • Delivery of wider vision for green infrastructure • Making full use of EWR essential. • Biodiversity enhancement should include scrub, new woodland, and meadows. • Needs attractive, segregated, reliable and frequent public transport between Cambourne and Cambridge to be truly successful • Safeguard employment and services and facilities and prevent gradual loss of sites to residential. • Set a modal shift from private cars to public transport, walking and cycling. • Design concept of walkable neighbourhoods. • Needs to be well integrated with the new EWR station location so the station is integral to the town • Adequate on site green infrastructure to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	
Support expansion to north-in relation to proposed EW Rail Station. Develop as a public transport hub whether or not a rail station materialises or not.	56579 (Gamlingay PC)
Agrees with the proposals and that Cambourne should not expand any further and should keep within its existing curtilage.	58348 (Caxton PC)
Noted the allocation responds to EWR which includes new station. Supports the principle of improved access to green transport and is neither for nor against EWR.	59286 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambourne should provide jobs near new homes, include more employment space potentially including a commercial hub based on any new railway station. Outside this commercial and retail hub, Cambourne should be focused on the large-scale offering of homes for families of those working across Cambridge area.	60048 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Neutral)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No comments	58390 (Linton PC)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Objections)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concern that EWR is driving the development of Cambourne.	56682 (S Houlihane)
Concern over development sprawl into neighbouring villages. Cambourne and Papworth Everard should remain distinct developments and not merge.	56682 (S Houlihane)
Concerns over more development at Cambourne, including for the following: • Already a large development and should not lose its character by over-development. • Natural greenspace and GI from original development could be lost. • Cambourne West already provides less greenspace than Cambourne. • No certainty over Oxford-Cambridge route and station at Cambourne and slow progress with GCP C2C busway. • Other forms of transport require consideration • Could place additional recreation pressures on Wimpole Estate and potential impacts on nature conservation assets, infrastructure and visitor management.	**Individuals** **Public Bodies** 56710 (Croydon PC), 57662 (Histon & Impington PC), 59643 (Historic England), 59818 (Dry Drayton PC) **Third Sector Organisations** 57070 (The Wildlife Trust), 59286 (National Trust) **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners** 57334 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Careful consideration will need to be given to potential impacts on historic environment, including designated assets and their setting • Suggest a Heritage Impact Assessment be undertaken to inform site location and mitigation • Explore how this will function with nearby existing villages • Concern about landscape and habitat harm • Risk of loss of identity of surrounding villages • Erosion of the Green Belt	
Concern over whether there is a genuine need for the expansion of Cambourne, particularly as there are serious adverse landscape impacts that have been identified.	57160* (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Cambourne is already very large – does it really need expanding?	58044* (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Oppose further housing at Cambourne. Consider redistribution of housing to provide a better balance across plan area.	57161 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57224 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Concern about significant development north of A428, which might put recreational pressure on SSSIs like Overhall Grove and Elsworth Wood. New development needs adequate green infrastructure provided on site to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs).	59001 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Objects to policy as so much uncertainty on delivery of a station. Any allocation should be tied to delivery of East West Rail station at Cambourne.	59170 (Cambourne TC), 59178 (Cambourne TC)
Object to any allocation until a final decision has been made on East West Rail and funding committed to the project.	59178 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Object to all potential locations to the south, west and south-east of Cambourne. Major adverse impact on roads, high quality landscape and country park. Only support option (contingent on delivery of EWR station) north of A428.	59178 (Cambourne TC)
Object strongly to further expansion of Cambourne West. Urban sprawl without natural barriers to stop it. Loss of productive farmland. Lead to never ending cycle of demand for development and sprawl joining Cambridge to Bedford. Essential to address issues with existing developments first.	59558 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
New town by stealth. 'Strategic scale growth' and 'broad locations' is vague. Who is setting the agenda to create a 'town for 21st century'? – not local people. No reference to mitigating impact on landscape or character of older communities. Protect Bourn Valley. Justifying based on carbon benefits - should develop in the Green Belt to maximise walking and cycling.	60249 (Bourn PC)
Businesses have already shown they are not interested in moving to this area, and so those living in the Cambourne area cause a large part of the congestion into the city. No point developing this area further.	57210* (D Lott)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Delivery)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Careful consideration will have to be given to timing of delivery with new railway station (EWR) and GCP scheme. No identified fall back position if infrastructure schemes are not brought forward.	57351 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Identified broad location for growth (no identified site to assess) but dependent on EWR programme which could easily slip. Limited prospect of achieving 1,950 completions in plan period.	58431 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington - LLP), 58750 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington – LLP)
Whilst we do not disagree with Cambourne as location for growth, not enough certainty to justify inclusion of 1,950 dwellings in plan period. Dependent on EWR station, location and timescales unknown. Additional sites should be identified to meet needs.	59027 (Scott Properties)
No clarity from Government on funding full EWR route, or commentary on consultation with EWR Company around timetable for delivery. Plan should look elsewhere for growth without dependency on upfront major infrastructure delivery.	59097 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Object to the assumed housing trajectory lead in time and build out rates for Cambourne, as conflict with those recommended in the Housing Delivery Study and do not provide sufficient time for post-adoption supplementary plans or guidance.	59065 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Concern regarding delivery rate. Cambourne c. 4,250 homes was built over 22 years, gives annual rate of c.200 dwellings per annum. Adding Bourn Airfield and West Cambourne would require c.300 dpa. Additional 1,950 would require c.400 dpa. Unrealistic as there is a limit to what the market will absorb.	59178 (Cambourne TC)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Green Belt, City Conservation areas and Historic Approach roads like Madingley Road and Barton road must be protected	57132 (North Newnham Res. Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
from Transport strategies, using principles of visually enhance and protect the character of the approach roads. Engineering must not damage historic streetscape with inappropriate bus lanes, street clutter, gantries and new roundabouts where the car dominates.	

S/CB: Cambourne – (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Council working to expand secondary school capacity. Additional capacity will be needed but not sufficient for a new school. Consider how will function with Bourn and nearby villages and relationship with Cambridge to enhance its sustainability.	56937 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Cambourne needs better public transport - GCP scheme. EWR has no published business case, will cause unnecessary environmental damage and planning blight. If EWR is built it needs to follow CBRR route, within a trench.	57037 (W Harrold)
Policy makes reference to East West Rail, but not Cambourne–Cambridge busway.	58519 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)
New homes at Cambourne will create serious transport implications. Cannot make assumptions based on transport plans not yet developed.	57661* (Histon & Impington PC)
Cambourne's wastewater is planned to be served from Uttons Drove Water Recycling Centre.	60450 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

S/CB: Cambourne – (other)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
First Proposals document states 1,950 additional homes within the plan period. We assume these are West Cambourne planning permission and therefore should be considered an existing commitment. Document requires amending and no plan was included.	57334 (HD Planning Ltd)
Should be a requirement that future planning applications for development of land at Business Park be required to provide enhanced access through Business Park to Cambourne West.	59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)
Seek to maximise opportunities for intensifying development within existing boundary of Cambourne West, consistent with NW Cambridge.	59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)
Policy should allow for the development of residential uses on land identified for employment on Cambourne West Masterplan. Evidence demonstrating the market for employment floorspace in this location is limited.	59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)
Requests a requirement is included within policy wording to ensure that any additional development at Cambourne does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment (once announced) nor the delivery of EWR.	59868 (East West Rail)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Promoters' Sites)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Promoting site for development - Land north of Cambourne, Knapwell (HELAA site 40114)	57890 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Potential to add to range of uses in a highly sustainable way, including new leisure, employment and homes, enabling more residents to both live and work there, increasing self-containment and reducing the need to travel	
Promoting site for development - Scotland Farm (East & West), Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 56252) Broad location should not be limited to expansion of Cambourne, but include other locations accessible to EWR Station and C2C public transport hub at Scotland Farm	58304 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Promoting site for development - Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (HELAA site 48096) Papworth is one of lowest impact locations for development (on green infrastructure) in the A428 corridor	58576 (MacTaggart & Mickel)
Promoting site for development - Land at Crow Green, north-east of Caxton Gibbet (HELAA site 56461) Additional employment land should be allocated to meet the needs for high and mid-technology manufacturing and logistics floorspace on strategic road network, and make Cambourne more sustainable by increasing the mix of uses.	58592 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site)
Promoting site for development - Land to the east of Caxton Gibbet Services, Caxton (HELAA site 47945) Settlement boundary shall include Caxton Gibbet services site given its immediate proximity to the approved Cambourne West development.	58664 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)
Promoting site for development - Land north and south of Cambridge Rd, Eltisley (HELAA site 51668)	58692 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Strongly recommend Councils' review and re-assess the Site in light of the information prepared to support this representation.	
Promoting site for development - Land north west of A10 Royston Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40084) Object to housing trajectory lead in time and build out rates for allocating site.	59065 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Promoting site for development – Westley Green No clarity from Government on funding full EWR route, or commentary on consultation with EWR Company around timetable for delivery. Plan should look elsewhere for growth without dependency on upfront major infrastructure delivery.	59097 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Promoting site for development - Land North of Cambourne (Site 40114) Highly sustainable option for accommodating both new housing and new jobs. Significant opportunity for development of a scale that can promote self-containment and consolidate the functions of existing settlement. Will support internalised movements using active travel and sustainable modes, minimising carbon impacts.	60666 (Martin Grant Homes)

S/NS: Existing new settlements

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/NS: Existing new settlements > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

31 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge or new settlements headings as the comments were specific to the three existing new settlements. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

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

Representations Executive Summary

Broad support for new settlements, while noting the need to ensure that they provide the necessary services, facilities, public transport and other infrastructure. Some site promoters’ have highlighted the limited contribution from new settlements within the first five years of the plan period, and the need for more small and medium sized sites to be allocated to deliver within this period. Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggest that all new settlements need to deliver the same role as identified for Cambourne – well connected, town for the twenty-first century, employment areas, and a place that meets day-to-day needs. Campaign to

Protect Rural England highlight need for various issues with existing new settlements to be resolved before further permissions are approved.

SS/5: Northstowe – comments highlight the need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace. Some site promoters' question the evidence for increased delivery rates and how these increased rates will be achieved. Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets, Environment Agency highlight continued investigation of flood risk management options to reduce risk of flooding in Oakington, and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight concerns about the impact of the development on the local water tables.

SS/6: Land north of Waterbeach – comments highlight the need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace. Some site promoters' question the evidence for increased delivery rates and how these increased rates will be achieved. Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets, Waterbeach PC highlight need to consider the Neighbourhood Plan and infrastructure issues that still need to be resolved, and other comments highlight transport implications from this development.

SS/7: Bourn Airfield – landowner of the employment area highlights that development needs to be compatible with existing industrial uses, and site promoter highlights that there is potential for higher annual delivery rates. Other site promoters' comments highlight transport and infrastructure requirements for this development as being threats to delivery. Cambourne TC comment that transport links for this development should be considered in line with Cambourne and West Cambourne. Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets.

Response to representations

Note: This addresses only those issues raised relevant to the Development Strategy Update decisions being taken in early 2023.

Housing Delivery

We note the comments received in relation to the site specific housing trajectories for Northstowe, Waterbeach New Town, and Bourn Airfield New Village. A response to these representations is provided in Appendix A within the 'Housing Delivery' element of the response to the representations received on S/DS: Development strategy.

Other Topics

Decisions being taken in early 2023 relate only to limited aspects of the development strategy and only those issues are addressed in the responses to representations above. Representations on topics not addressed in the responses above are not relevant to those decisions, but will be taken into account in the preparation of the full draft plan and a response to those further issues will be provided at that time.

Table of representations: S/NS – Existing new settlements

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support / Broadly support / Agree / Sensible approach / No objection	56580 (Gamlingay PC), 56714 (Croydon PC), 56869 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57737 (J Pavey), 59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59644 (Historic England)
New settlements are better than dispersed development.	56714 (Croydon PC)
Need to have good public transport, schools, doctors etc.	56714 (Croydon PC)
Support provision of better public transport at existing new settlements – they need to act as a local transport hub.	56580 (Gamlingay PC)
Even with higher delivery rates, new settlements will not be contributing to the housing supply in the first five years of the plan period – see 'Start to Finish' by Nathaniel Lichfield &	58437 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Partners. Although agree the Local Plan should be planning for new settlements, need a greater reliance on small and medium sized sites that can deliver homes earlier in the plan period. Especially important in Greater Cambridge given high house prices and trend for in-commuting.	
Contingency sites should be included to ensure the Local Plan is deliverable throughout the plan period, as required by the NPPF.	59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Need to improve the carbon footprint of houses already in the pipeline at Northstowe and other existing planned developments.	56874 (J Prince)
All new settlements need to deliver the same role as identified for Cambourne – well connected through high quality public transport, cycling and walking facilities; town for the 21st century; employment centre to provide opportunities for residents and nearby communities; and place that meets the day to day needs of residents. Therefore, need to safeguard employment areas, services and facilities within the settlement, support a shift from cars to public transport, walking and cycling, and include design concept of walkable and cyclable neighbourhoods.	58550 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
New Local Plan will set out significant requirements for Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity Net Gain and environmental design. These requirements need to be reflected in policies for existing allocations that have not yet received planning permission e.g. Northstowe to potentially support Green Infrastructure in the Great Ouse Fenland Arc.	59007 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Understand that existing new settlements will be carried forwards as allocations, but concerned by poor building control,	59559 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
lack of democratic control on detailed planning decisions, damage to underground water bodies, increasing flood risk, lack of engagement with communities, and lack of engagement with local experts and statutory bodies e.g. Internal Drainage Boards. These issues need to be resolved before any further permissions are approved.	
Increased densities in areas with access to transport hubs could creep into Dry Drayton.	59819 (Dry Drayton PC)
No comments.	58393 (Linton PC)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons: • need a greater reliance on small and medium sized sites that can deliver homes earlier in the plan period	58437 (Deal Land LLP), 57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Continuing existing allocations

SS/5: Northstowe

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support.	59472* (Shepreth PC)
Concur that off-site modular construction can assist in accelerating delivery on sites.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Must ensure that faster delivery rates does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas e.g. access to doctors and transport networks, and recreational pressure on green infrastructure.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Can the necessary infrastructure for this site also be delivered at the faster pace?	58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
If faster delivery rates, essential that supporting infrastructure and services are also delivered at an accelerated rate.	58121 (P Bearpark)
Careful consideration should be given to impact that faster delivery could have on market absorption rates and tenure diversity to justify that this is achievable.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Query whether evidence to justify increased delivery rates is robust, as absence of evidence for higher completion rates and unclear what evidence is being relied on.	58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Consultation document states that there is evidence for higher annual delivery rates, however, Strategy Topic Paper states in the section on Policy S/NS that the Councils “have not completed evidence focused on this topic”. Therefore no clear justification for increased delivery by 2041. Unclear whether assumptions on delivery provided in Strategy Topic Paper are from promoter or Councils.	58437 (Deal Land LLP)
Object to assumption that higher delivery rates can be achieved. There are triggers in place for highways, transport and infrastructure works, which are threats to delivery. Realistic review of timeframes for development and impacts on the trajectory is required.	58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No evidence has been put forward to detail how delivery will be sped up – what mechanisms will be used to ensure that the assumed faster delivery happens?	58977 (Endurance Estates)
Unclear what technical work has been undertaken to demonstrate that an additional 750 dwellings within the plan period is achievable.	59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)
There is no credible evidence that faster delivery can be achieved at Northstowe. No reference to site specific circumstances that would result in above average annual completions being deliverable on these sites.	60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)
Northstowe Area Action Plan is now 14 years old – is the Local Plan an opportunity to replace any out of date policies?	58550 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.	59644 (Historic England)
Investigating flood risk management options to reduce the risk of flooding in Oakington, including attenuation upstream within Northstowe, potential channel modifications, and natural flood management. Policy should include this as an opportunity for delivering flood risk management measures or securing financial contributions.	59721 (Environment Agency)
Being served by the Uttons Drove WRC.	60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Share concerns about impact of building on local water tables. A Hydroecological Assessment concluded that land use change as a result of the development of Northstowe is the most significant impact on local groundwater. Unclear whether local ground water features will ever recover. No further building until issue is	60744 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
resolved. Need tighter enforcement of environmental standards on new developments.	

SS/6: Land north of Waterbeach

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Offers excellent opportunities for linked trips to the existing settlement.	57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Further growth should be located here to ensure the long-term vitality of the settlement.	57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Must ensure that faster delivery rates does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas e.g. access to doctors and transport networks, and recreational pressure on green infrastructure.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
If faster delivery rates, essential that supporting infrastructure and services are also delivered at an accelerated rate.	58121 (P Bearpark), 59843 (Waterbeach PC)
Can the necessary infrastructure for this site also be delivered at the faster pace? Trip budget caps on both Waterbeach West (first 1,600 dwellings) and Waterbeach East (first 800 dwellings). No certainty over build programme for dualling of the A10. Similar concerns regarding waste water infrastructure and relocation of Waste Water Treatment Works.	58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Unclear what technical work has been undertaken to demonstrate that an additional 750 dwellings within the plan period is achievable.	59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Careful consideration should be given to impact that faster delivery could have on market absorption rates and tenure diversity to justify that this is achievable.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Query whether evidence to justify increased delivery rates is robust, as absence of evidence for higher completion rates and unclear what evidence is being relied on.	58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Consultation document states that there is evidence for higher annual delivery rates, however, Strategy Topic Paper states in the section on Policy S/NS that the Councils “have not completed evidence focused on this topic”. Therefore no clear justification for increased delivery by 2041. Unclear whether assumptions on delivery provided in Strategy Topic Paper are from promoter or Councils.	58437 (Deal Land LLP)
Object to assumption that higher delivery rates can be achieved. There are triggers in place for highways, transport and infrastructure works, which are threats to delivery. Realistic review of timeframes for development and impacts on the trajectory is required.	58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)
No evidence has been put forward to detail how delivery will be sped up – what mechanisms will be used to ensure that the assumed faster delivery happens?	58977 (Endurance Estates)
There is no credible evidence that faster delivery can be achieved at Northstowe or Waterbeach. No reference to site specific circumstances that would result in above average annual completions being deliverable on these sites.	60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Issues relating to public transport and active travel options must be given proper consideration, and trip budgets will need to be revised.	58121 (P Bearpark)
New homes at Waterbeach will create serious transport implications. Cannot make assumptions based on transport plans not yet developed.	57661* (Histon & Impington PC)
Any changes to the policy for Waterbeach New Town must properly consider the Neighbourhood Plan.	58121 (P Bearpark), 59843 (Waterbeach PC)
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.	59644 (Historic England)
Would like to know whether Policy SS/6 will be carried forward into the new Local Plan.	59843 (Waterbeach PC)
There are identified infrastructure issues that need to be overcome in a timely and funded manner: • water – until there is a sustainable water supply, the proposed growth may be unsustainable • sewage – build out must be limited until a new Waterbeach pumping station is commissioned and operational • electricity – barrier to current growth, will reinforcements be in place to enable accelerated delivery? • transport – proposals for sustainable transport infrastructure are piecemeal, and responsibility for delivery, cost and funding is unknown	59843 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Will be served through a connection to Cambridge main and then to the existing Milton Wastewater Recycling Centre and new Cambridge wastewater facility.	60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

SS/7: Bourn Airfield

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the development of Bourn Airfield.	59471* (Shepreth PC)
No objection to the allocation being carried forwards, but development needs to be compatible with the existing industrial uses at Wellington Way and not hamper future expansion plans. The existing uses on the site generate noise and are serviced by heavy goods vehicles. Exploring expansion opportunities that could increase noise and number of heavy goods vehicle movements a day. Design of Bourn Airfield New Village will need to ensure sufficient separation from noise sources and may require acoustic barriers.	58267 (DB Group (Holdings) Ltd)
Recent pre-application advice sought in relation to extension of hours of operation resulted in a response that an application was unlikely to be supported as a result of a “detrimental impact on the living conditions of existing neighbouring properties and future occupiers in the New Village development”. The proposed development of Bourn Airfield New Village is constraining expansion plans and highlighting compatibility issues between neighbouring uses.	58267 (DB Group (Holdings) Ltd)
This is the only existing new settlement not to have amended annual delivery rates. Consider there is potential for higher	59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
delivery rates of up to 190 dwellings a year due to mix of tenures, enabling a range of housing products to be delivered without competing with each other.	
Proposed policy maps should include the strategic site boundary and major development site boundary.	59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)
There are triggers in place for highways, transport and infrastructure works, which are threats to delivery. Realistic review of timeframes for development and impacts on the trajectory is required.	58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)
The transport links / hub for Bourn Airfield should be considered in line with Cambourne and West Cambourne.	59180 (Cambourne TC)
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.	59644 (Historic England)
Within the Bourn waste water catchment, although given the constrained capacity it is planned to be served by a connection to Cambourne main and then to Uttons Drove WRC.	60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Appendix C: Summary of Representations on Strategy: Quick Questionnaire

Q1. Do you agree that we should plan for an extra 550 homes per year, so that new housing keeps up with the increase in jobs in our area?

Responses	Number of responses / percentage
Strongly Agree	63 / 11%
Agree	115 / 20%
Neutral	90 / 16%
Disagree	111 / 19%
Strongly Disagree	201 / 35%

Q2. Do you agree that new development should mainly focus on sites where car travel, and therefore carbon emissions, can be minimised?

Responses	Number of responses / percentage
Strongly Agree	225 / 39%
Agree	166 / 29%
Neutral	89 / 16%
Disagree	51 / 9%
Strongly Disagree	41 / 7%

Q3. We think a major new neighbourhood can be developed at Cambridge East, on the current airport site. What housing, jobs, facilities or open spaces do you think this site should provide?

Deliverability of the site

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do not need to build in this area because: • It destroys the Cambridge landscape and biodiversity • Creating a never-ending urban sprawl • Transport infrastructure around the area is insufficient to support any new development • Local infrastructure cannot support the people e.g., amenities, GP's, facilities, schools • Already excessive development including Eddington, Darwin, Green, Waterbeach, Northstowe, Marleigh and LNoCH • Contributes to local pollution • Local residents don't want it • It will make life unpleasant for current residents. • Increases congestion and traffic	2, 5, 7, 18, 20, 22, 30, 36, 49, 62, 64, 71, 75, 81, 90, 92, 100, 109, 123, 134, 138, 171, 226, 251, 257, 267, 286, 290, 316, 353, 382, 395, 414, 431, 436, 457, 461, 469, 485, 486, 507, 588, 592

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Site is too big • Planned for more housing than nationally required • Don’t need for housing • Don’t need more jobs • Would put pressure on Cherry Hinton, Coldham’s Lane, Teversham • It would exile older residents who need personal transport • local roads, facilities, schools, and GPs are not designed for such population levels	
Are Marshalls willing to vacate the site & relocate - there's been discussion of this for years?	113
I suspect that given Marshall's are already actively looking at re-locating this is already a done deal?	187
Agree with rational approach in choosing sites.	245, 247, 520, 574
The sites for development should be chosen after a comprehensive evaluation of the impacts on the environment, current and required infrastructure including water, sewage,	439

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
transport and future risks e.g., flooding due to climate change. Looking only at car travel is disingenuous.	

Climate change

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Too much impact on water supplies. How much water will be used from local aquifers already at high demand. Should not be developed until water supply is guaranteed through survey of needs.	28, 123, 134, 141, 242, 255, 283, 291, 311, 373, 378, 431, 436, 485, 495, 521
How much absorbent surface will be lost?	28
Paved areas should be permeable where possible.	255, 510, 511, 526
Should ensure that the local water supply can sustainably cope with the increased demand including: • Through new pipelines to wetter parts of the country • Increasing local supply through new reservoirs • Desalinisation plants along regional coastline	68, 510, 511, 526

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs)	
Ensure that rain water is captured and used in houses as grey water and then recycled.	148
Everything should be carbon net zero.	86, 218
All homes should of better environmental standard and high quality including: • Passivhaus standards for all new build projects • Using air source and ground source heat pumps • Ventilation systems • Airtightness • Good insulation • water harvesting and saving like at Eddington • Unobtrusive solar roof tiles/panels with batteries for storage of excess power • Buildings with renewable energy • Buildings with natural light to conserve energy • Planting close to buildings helps to regulate their heating loss and gain	42, 45, 63, 89, 148, 153, 158, 179, 224, 230, 236, 248, 263, 266, 291, 293, 296, 328, 330, 384, 407, 468, 489, 497, 510, 511, 526, 570

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Outstanding BREAAM rating • Insulating walls and roofs • Green walls and roofs • Nature spaces integrated into design.	
The flat airport landscape lends itself to siting wind turbines to feed the local power grid; this should be assessed, and a suitable area should be left unobstructed as appropriate.	255
Encourage community renewable energy projects, with any profits going towards local good causes or to invest in more renewables.	89
How does this help in fight against climate change? The economy cannot always come first we have to think of the environment too. We do not always have to keep growing to develop.	123, 173, 276, 495
The climate impact of developing the current airport site must include the carbon cost of removing current embodied energy infrastructure as well as the installation of a new airport.	506
With no track record on creating any development to date that is carbon neutral, this is a sham to suit the needs of developers	495, 506, 596

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
and banks. Planning Authorities are likely to agree compromises during negotiation with developers - for example the number of social housing units is often reduced.	
This will increase already existing impacts on air quality due to: • New building works with generators providing power instead of taking it from the national grid.	134

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Provision of green space should be more than the national minimum green area/resident capita in order to protect and promote the environment and human wellbeing.	26, 63, 84
Should provide biodiversity through planting and green landscaping of all scales including: • re-foresting the airport site • increasing woodland and small woodlands	12, 28, 29, 42, 54, 63, 75, 89, 93, 129, 135, 166, 181, 231, 233, 238, 262, 263, 266, 276, 282, 287, 291, 311, 330, 340, 343, 358, 363, 367, 368, 371, 384 376, 378, 385, 386, 387, 394,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• other green carbon reducing areas • re-wilding at the edges • open space for other species • promote wildflowers on verges • green corridors for wildlife access • mature and young trees • bushes • ponds • lakes • insect hotels • mixed hedgerows • meadows • not just sterile urban planning • leave to go wild • hedgehog highways • marshland • bacteriological barriers.	401, 404, 406, 411, 423, 463, 476, 484, 500, 527, 537, 553, 562, 568, 588

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The link through a corridor of natural and semi-natural habitat should be maintained, ideally by the creation of a new Local Nature Reserve (LNR).	17, 129, 135, 387, 519, 566
If Marshall did move, then the area should become a wooded area like Wandlebury enabling local recreation.	90, 183, 242
Significant potential effect on biodiversity including: • deer • owls • newts • mice • voles • wildflowers • bees • butterflies • sustainable chalk streams.	109, 255
Existing sites are already at capacity including: • Wandlebury • Anglesey Abbey	373, 592

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Fulbourn Fen	
The grassland of the airport does remove some carbon and supports a certain amount of species diversity.	330
Should provide outdoor community spaces including: • Green spaces • Country park • Recreational parks • Pocket parks • Allotments • Gardening areas and community gardens • Herb and flower garden • 'Mini CoFarms' • Food growing spaces • Sport facilities e.g., a new athletics track (as the only one is on the west side of Cambridge) • Tennis/basketball courts • Playing and sports fields • Football pitches	6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 23, 29, 31, 32, 40, 45, 52, 53, 63, 70, 77, 79, 84, 101, 106, 119, 120, 121, 126, 127, 128, 130, 135, 144, 148, 150, 151, 155, 157, 158, 162, 174, 179, 190, 201, 206, 212, 215, 220, 221, 224, 228, 230, 231, 236, 237, 238, 239, 247, 248, 253, 261, 262, 264, 266, 267, 274, 278, 280, 282, 283, 284, 287, 293, 296, 299, 306, 309, 311, 315, 317, 318, 319, 321, 323, 325, 327, 330, 340, 342, 343, 345, 349, 350, 351, 352, 356, 362, 363, 364, 367, 368, 371, 373, 375, 376, 378, 379, 384, 385, 386, 387, 393, 394, 400, 401, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 409, 413, 415, 418, 419, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 433, 437, 445, 449, 450, 454, 459, 468, 473, 474, 477, 480, 482, 483, 484, 487, 490, 491, 492, 493, 500, 502, 504, 505, 508, 509, 510, 511, 515, 518, 525, 526, 527, 528, 535, 537, 544, 545, 547, 548, 550, 551, 554, 562, 565, 567, 568, 570, 572, 574, 582, 583, 584, 586, 590, 596

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Outdoor recreational play areas / parks for children and teenagers • Splash pools • Free exercise facilities/outdoor gym • High quality open spaces for city to use • Public benches and picnic tables • BMX park and track • Bridleways • Dog walking areas • Skateboarding ramps and ledges • Well-lit skateparks for children, young people and adults • MUGAs.	
Green spaces in between housing, not just on the edge of a housing development.	179
Keep development to a minimum as you are in danger of destroying the very elements of living here including: • green spaces • countryside	200, 397, 484, 486, 855

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• separation with Teversham • nearby nature reserves such as Fulbourn Fen Nature Reserve, Little Wilbraham Nature Reserve, Little Wilbraham River and Quy Water.	
Development opportunity to build sustainably on brownfield sites.	200, 365, 397, 498
Build as much at Cambridge East rather than spoil the villages.	370
Ensure integrated completely with CBC.	454
It should all be open space to compensate for open space taken already by new developments such as Eddington and Northstowe.	115

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should provide indoor community facilities including: • Community centres like Clay Farm	6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 29, 31, 32, 47, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 58, 73, 74, 77, 79, 85, 96, 106, 108, 113, 121, 127, 128, 129, 130, 135,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Communal hub/hall with kitchen facilities for cooking/community kitchen and food sharing • Community centre for group uses and special hire • Community café • Meeting places • New public swimming pools • NHS dentists • Pharmacies • Opticians • Libraries • Doctors surgeries • Small scale respite care facilities • Medical facilities • Mental health support hub • Nurseries • Primary and secondary schools • High schools • Special needs schools	146, 147, 151, 157, 171, 174, 177, 179, 190, 192, 212, 213, 215, 220, 221, 224, 229, 230, 232, 233, 238, 246, 248, 261, 267, 274, 279, 280, 284, 291, 293, 296, 309, 315, 317, 324, 325, 327, 330, 331, 334, 340, 343, 345, 348, 350, 351, 356, 359, 361, 363, 367, 371, 375, 383, 386, 388, 389, 392. 400, 403, 405, 407, 411, 415, 416, 419, 423, 425, 426, 432, 433, 434, 437, 449, 450, 454, 456, 459, 463, 466, 468, 474, 483, 487, 488, 489, 490, 493, 498, 502, 504, 505, 508, 509, 514, 515, 518, 519, 525, 535, 537, 538, 540, 544, 547, 548, 549, 551, 560, 562, 568, 570, 572, 575, 584, 586, 590, 597

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Church centre • Indoor play parks for children and teenagers • Indoor skate facilities to accompany the ice skating rink • Youth clubs and facilities • Faith centres • Education facilities • Places of worship • Facilities for surrounding neighbourhoods e.g., Barnwell • Village hall.	
Should provide space for Cambridge United Football Club.	253, 577
One respondent asked for the following things: • An indoor skatepark facility should be provided in this area to accompany the existing ice-skating rink. • It should be managed by the GLL Better leisure provider. It could be incorporated within a multifunctional sports and leisure facility, including swimming pool with flumes and water play, climbing walls, trampolining,	514

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
competitive BMX race track and top of the range soft play space to encourage family use throughout the year. • This would be the only facility of its kind in Cambridgeshire and would help address the under provision for young people and families. • It should not be a quantum of open space provision, but actual facilities that will be used and enjoyed for generations to come. • Sell the Abbey swimming pool site for housing and spend the money on a new facility at Marshall's.	
Should provide ambulance and police standby location.	279
More money should be given for Addenbrooke's hospital to expand and support the health of the people moving to Cambridgeshire. It is a disgrace that Addenbrooke's is being left without support.	295, 368
Access within 15 minutes to all primary care services, schools, and essential shopping to minimise travel.	190, 232, 289, 425, 468, 490, 497, 508, 510, 511, 526, 544, 545, 548, 571, 572, 586

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The need for housing in Cambridge is for people who earn the national average income or less. This is what our community needs. Should support underprovided groups and respond to social issues e.g., homelessness.	495, 496, 506, 521
Provision of a cemetery.	12
Provision of community centres and open spaces before residents move in, not several years later as done elsewhere including Northstowe and Cambourne.	106, 232, 268
A thoughtful plan, providing a balanced mix of on-site work, social and cultural facilities will be developed, creating a community and identity of its own. Early promises will be quickly forgotten as developers do the calculations and figure out how much more they can earn by building more houses.	171, 173, 196, 212, 244, 265, 282, 290, 294, 315, 425, 429, 450, 454, 473, 486, 489, 490, 495, 498, 506, 540, 545, 565, 581, 595, 596
Design communities that benefit people's mental health and wellbeing, to build a cohesive suburb where people want to live, and communities cohesively support each other. Cambridge is overdeveloped and the quality of life must remain a key criterion.	212, 251, 262, 291, 306, 327, 347, 349, 356, 363, 378, 386, 387, 496, 500, 596
Safe open streets for children.	544

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should use lessons learnt from growth of CBC where infrastructure surrounding the site are polluted, noisy, and has antisocial behaviour.	308
Lessons learnt from other new developments including CB1, Trumpington, Orchard Park where there are high levels of antisocial behaviour and crime. Council should take action and protect the community rather than ignoring the issue.	106

Great Places

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should use precedent such as Garden City design and ethos with excellent design standards, including: • Natural surveillance • No fenced blocks or flats • No cul de sacs • Should feel safe • Should be attractive	26, 278, 291, 356, 470, 482, 492, 525, 561, 568, 584, 582, 592, 596

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Should be sympathetic to architecture of Cambridge • Avoid style of housing that creates the feel of 'little boxes in a row' • Architectural variety to avoid monochrome flats • Must not be a dormitory • Encourage vibrancy throughout day and night • Serviced 24/7 by public service.	
A learning centre teaching others how to build sustainable communities.	54
Art spaces with changing exhibitions. Have a fourth plinth style system that allows residents to choose the artwork, and have it change every 2-5 years to keep fresh artwork that stays relevant.	502
Part of Marshall was in the Green Belt, and taken out for them to expand, moving that land should return to greenbelt.	90
Green Belt should be replaced/extended and be accessible if built on at all.	330, 339, 363, 566
Think outside the box, this will impact future generations.	365

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should celebrate the aviation heritage of this space.	551

Jobs

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should provide out of town, accessible retail, and leisure facilities, including: • Supermarket • newsagents • convenience store • cafes/coffee shops • space for local craft and farmers markets • independent shops • post office • hardware stores • restaurants • public houses	9, 11, 29, 31, 32, 46, 50, 51, 53, 56, 73, 77, 78, 89, 93, 108, 113, 127, 128, 129, 130, 135, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 155, 157, 158. 179, 187, 201, 220, 229, 238, 246, 247, 248, 261, 262, 264, 266, 267, 278, 279, 280, 284, 296, 309, 311, 315, 323, 325, 327, 331, 340, 350, 359, 362, 364, 375, 375, 386, 389, 392, 403, 405, 416, 426, 450, 454, 459, 466, 470, 474, 478, 483, 493, 515, 519, 525, 535, 537, 538, 540, 545, 547, 549, 551, 552, 560, 562, 567, 568, 572, 575, 577, 584, 586, 590, 597

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• nightlife facilities • entertainment • leisure facilities • a cinema • bowling alleys • gym • live music and sports venues • creative spaces • butchers • green grocers • petrol station • toy stores • hospitality	
Should provide more facilities that will contribute to a circular economy in the city.	6
Retail Park to prevent having to go to the city centre or along Newmarket Road.	130, 538

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should service the established Tech / Silicon Fen in terms enabling companies already here to develop and expand.	191
More of a focus on remote working, enabling people to work where they like and less need for office space.	168, 385, 496, 500
Has COVID impact on homeworking been considered and fact that a large proportion of people now want to live in rural community.	520
Should provide a mix and variety of job sectors and employment opportunities including: • local businesses • not just chain supermarkets • diverse local foods, markets and goods • small start-ups • workshops • space for repairs and shared tools • offices/shared office environments • light commercial units • light industrial units	12, 56, 58, 64, 67, 79, 89, 93, 96, 112, 127, 129, 135, 147, 148, 155, 174, 177, 190, 191, 201, 206, 212, 229, 236, 237, 247, 261, 266, 267, 274, 289, 293, 296, 301, 311, 323, 330, 342, 350, 352, 359, 364, 376, 379, 386, 407, 422, 450, 454, 459, 477, 486, 493, 500, 502, 510, 511, 526, 545, 560, 567, 568, 570, 572, 583

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Affordable/low-cost retail units • An enterprise area • Early product development facilities • Manufacturing space • ‘Green jobs’ • Lab space • Research jobs.	
Employment opportunities for low skilled workers, including apprenticeships and training for local people.	190, 400, 489
An eastern science/business park to rival/complement those on the north of Cambridge with associated housing.	170, 284
Should not close functioning airport which has been a source of engineering jobs for decades. The removal of the site will displace skilled workforce. Where will these people be able find jobs to work at nearby?	20, 41, 80, 90, 251, 283, 503, 568, 579
Support existing jobs only - don't attract any new business or jobs.	119, 173, 248, 304, 330, 378, 385

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Opportunity to relocate many businesses currently spread along Newmarket Road between Coldham's Lane and the football ground, including: • DIY • Electrical goods	432, 577
Good commercial links to the site.	563
Employers would want to choose from a pool of people applying for jobs, not just from people living in those new development sites.	259
Don't think people would want to live next to their place of work.	259
Not convinced how the council proposes to offer jobs.	281

Homes

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Provision of homes is critical. Should provide a mix of housing that is:	8, 11, 16, 24, 25, 29, 31, 33, 53, 54, 58, 61, 67, 73, 76, 79, 112, 113, 127, 130, 135, 136, 146, 151, 159, 162, 173, 174, 177,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• truly affordable including rental properties • at least 20% affordable housing • up to 50% affordable housing • socially inclusive e.g., for tradespeople who can support the new local community • of ranging size and mix including 3-bedroom homes, apartments and maisonettes, small starter homes, single occupancy homes • social housing, bungalows, town houses, detached and terraced • accommodation for NHS staff and key workers • suitable for young people • social housing specifically for those who have lived in Cambridge since birth • sheltered housing • co-housing developments and community-led housing projects • off-grid housing	178, 179, 187, 190, 201, 204, 206, 221. 223, 228, 229, 238, 241, 251, 262, 263, 264, 266, 267, 268, 274, 284, 293, 296, 306, 311, 315, 317, 319, 321, 323, 327, 340, 342, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 362, 365, 378, 383, 384, 385, 388, 389, 392, 401, 416, 418, 419, 420, 421, 423, 432, 437, 438, 442, 443, 449, 474, 475, 477, 479, 484, 486, 491, 493, 498, 527, 531, 538, 539, 540, 545, 550, 551, 552, 554, 555, 562, 565, 566, 567, 568, 575, 578, 582, 583, 584, 590, 596

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• low cost (with maximum output) • actual council housing • low-rise • not over-priced and inflated for developers • shared ownership with long leases • no ground rent, right to manage and no service charges • adaptable housing • imaginatively planned housing • council housing like in Norwich • no luxury houses or flats • less ‘executive housing’ like Eddington and Trumpington Meadows (that is unaffordable).	
Should limit student accommodation.	241
Provision of well-designed homes including: • with good sized gardens • roof gardens • private space • flats with large balconies	236, 237, 253, 266, 296, 407, 418, 424, 491, 493, 526, 550, 554, 567, 575, 584, 594

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• homes with lots of storage • space available to work from home • downstairs toilets for the elderly • use example of Marmalade Lane	
Encourage renovation of existing housing stock and other existing buildings (including converting current airport facilities) to cut carbon cost.	173
Numbers of homes proposed on this site are too low and should provide higher density to: • ease the housing crisis • increase housing affordability • reduce long-distance commuting • support efficient public transport.	66
Numbers of homes proposed on site are too high and should deliver fewer houses than planned.	175, 386, 480, 562
Mixture of low-density mid-rise housing to minimize the burden placed on water infrastructure, transport and the environment.	120, 239, 397

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should include space for informal outdoor camping and for the Gypsy and Traveller community to use as a transit stop.	12
The site has good access to employment areas such as Addenbrookes so should provide housing for potential employees of these locations.	68
New housing should be built further out of Cambridge to help provide infrastructure and employment to historical areas that are poor in this e.g., the Fens. Better to build next to a new park & ride site.	111, 461
Limit the amount of overseas investment in the housing market in Cambridge. No property should be allowed to stand empty.	223, 443, 550, 554
May be a challenge for housing delivery depending on the plan for the airport usage in the mid/long-term.	301
No opinion on housing.	166

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should make it a car-free development. See example of car-free Vauban in Freiburg, Germany or Cayala in Guatemala.	6, 119, 143, 208, 248, 263, 468, 527, 544, 545, 552
Should provide plenty of parking for: • residents and visitors • including underground parking • encourage electric car use in future • people living there that need a car.	19, 29, 233, 236, 261, 340, 351, 392, 474, 488, 554
Don't provide parking spaces for cars and do not allow for future conversion of front gardens to parking spaces. This would be a showpiece of an alternative approach to living.	175, 208, 266, 425, 490, 510, 511, 526, 571
Should not negatively impact on existing infrastructure including water, drainage, sewage, gas and electricity.	189, 351, 480
Fully self-contained site where travel is kept to a minimum.	163, 189, 195, 201, 218, 350, 405, 459, 504, 505, 540, 544, 547, 548, 570, 572, 573, 586
Car trips should only be allowed for trips east of the site.	144
Zero carbon transport.	158, 256, 497, 510, 511, 526

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Hireable cars (including electric).	59,
Electric Vehicle charging stations and access for people at their homes. And EV pods.	29, 45, 147, 203, 233, 340, 594
Should build infrastructure before housing and other uses.	260
Should provide cycling infrastructure including: • cycle paths with separate bike lanes • bike stands • communal bike sheds for residential streets • cycle storage for cargo bikes • off-road cycle routes • well-lit cycle networks connecting Cambridge to other areas • paths that have sufficient capacity at peak times without crowding e.g., that occurs on the guided busway from Trumpington to the station • paths safe for children to allow for independence (see the Netherlands) • built in line with Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 • learn from mistakes in GB1 and 2.	12, 15, 16, 50, 70, 76, 77, 79, 89, 101, 106, 108, 121, 142, 156, 179, 218, 233, 239, 240, 253, 264, 266, 278, 280, 284, 306. 311, 340, 367, 379, 394, 411, 425, 490, 497, 510, 511, 526, 527, 545, 552, 571, 572, 573
Too far for most people to cycle into town particularly, for the elderly who cannot use bus services. Promoting cycling and	192, 272, 275, 306, 560

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
limiting car use is for advantaged groups of people. Cannot stop people using cars or taxi services for vulnerable groups.	
Should provide regular, reliable public transport links (inc. free buses) to the surrounding areas including: • Cambridge city centre • South Cambridgeshire • Cambridge North and South stations • Addenbrooke's/Royal Papworth Hospital • Science Park • New east-west railway • Newmarket • From Tesco's through housing areas and along to beehive centre • Areas of new development • Retail parks • Cambridge Biomedical Campus • Abbey leisure centre • Cambridge Ice Rink	15, 16, 29, 31, 33, 46, 50, 58, 70, 77, 79, 85, 89, 99, 101, 108, 111, 131, 144, 179, 190, 206, 218, 228, 229, 253, 262, 280, 306, 309, 311, 343, 352, 373, 375, 389, 404, 416, 425, 466, 488, 490, 493, 498, 508, 510, 511, 525, 526, 527, 530, 534. 545, 551, 565, 571, 572, 580, 581, 582, 584, 597
Should have high quality bus shelters at all bus stops.	253, 275
Provision of a new public transport hub e.g., Park and Ride or a bus way.	29, 233, 256, 411, 508, 575
Connection to the rail network including:	29, 77, 510

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Provision of a train station near to Cherry Hinton • A station constructed on the existing line to Ipswich.	
Provision of light railway or rapid transport e.g., DLR, Metro station, underground or CAM project due to: • buses being too infrequent • nobody wants to travel by bus • underground is a good alternative to car use.	59, 82, 108, 192, 203, 260, 262, 424
Improvements to existing road networks to reduce traffic on already congested routes, including: • Newmarket Road • (Including between Barnwell and Elizabeth Way roundabout) • Mill Road • Coldham's Lane • Cherry Hinton.	29, 77, 82, 87, 99, 203, 211, 373, 378, 419, 466, 519, 560, 582, 592
Should have well-lit paths (with CCTV) separate from any roads, for walking and skating, with cut throughs between streets for quick access. Eddington is a good example of shared-use paths that are well used.	45, 137, 190, 264, 278, 298, 328, 367, 379, 407
Wide roads for easy movement, including for vans and trailers.	261, 306
Provision of public toilets.	545
Multiple well-designed entrances and exits to the site.	261, 299

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Reducing road capacity will not represent the ordinary voters of the area, or the viability of Cambridge as a commercial and retail centre.	306
Do not introduce tarmacked cycle tracks over Coldham's Common in order to connect to Cambridge East. Existing road structure can be modified without planning more cycle tracks on Coldham's Common.	445
High volume of traffic this would be worsened with large local neighbourhood goods being built, including: • The Foxton station level crossing • Newmarket Road • During construction.	92, 150, 433, 503, 521, 577, 592
Good recycling infrastructure including: • Recycling centre • Facilities for recycling electrical items and repair of broken/damaged goods. • Similar to as in Eddington.	12, 29, 179, 262
Underground delivery points for goods and maintenance.	54
Drop-off and pick-up parcel points.	158

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Good digital connectivity such as fast broadband for working from home, and innovative sectors that need reliable internet connectivity.	29, 500, 551, 594
Need a detailed and new public transport proposals.	82
Should provide an airport for the Cambridge area.	27
It will need appropriate drainage and sewage processing plant.	113, 260
Should not provide a new sewage treatment site.	339

Other comments

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No comment.	57, 185, 270, 332, 533
Don’t feel qualified to comment.	374, 595
Has this site already got planning permission?	10
Heard that the option of moving the airport wouldn’t be able to progress?	506

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Retain Green Belt at Honey Hill	63
This is a leading question, why is there no option to say we do or don't agree to development at Cambridge East?	117, 223, 382, 495
More honesty required as developments are agreed long before the public are made aware.	202, 495
As developers have the upper hand in all development decisions and have shown again and again their willingness to tear up agreed plans once the projects commence what have up put in place that legally stops them doing this?	495

Q4. We think that the area east of Milton Road in Northeast Cambridge (including the current waste water treatment plant) can be developed into a lively and dense city district, after the waste water treatment plant relocates. What housing, jobs, facilities or open spaces do you think this site should provide?

Opinion

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Object, for reasons including: • Involves relocation onto a Green Belt/ greenfield site • Disagree with idea of 'dense' city • Impact on biodiversity / environment • Post-Covid, people want gardens, not density • Disagree with city growing/ over-expanding • Address infrastructure issues before expanding • Re-wild the area • City is already congested • Sewage works was recently upgraded, so this is a waste of money with no benefits for Horningsea or Cambridge. Sewage plant has capacity till 2050	2, 4, 5, 18, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 30, 39, 41, 45, 49, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, 71, 75, 79, 80, 81, 100, 111, 113, 115, 123, 130, 131, 134, 138, 146, 148, 155, 177, 183, 185, 205, 210, 226, 250, 251, 256, 268, 272, 277, 281, 283, 286, 290, 304, 324, 332, 345, 353, 356, 362, 378, 382, 385, 392, 393, 395, 409, 427, 428, 429, 431, 433, 436, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 448, 460, 461, 469, 479, 480, 484, 485, 486, 495, 496, 507, 518, 539, 553, 554, 556, 558, 576, 577, 578, 584, 588, 594, 596

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Site is not tenable for anything apart from industrial use • Ruin valuable agricultural land, which contravenes policy CC/CS • Will devastate local community • Have council not learnt from mistakes of high-rises in 60s/ 70s? • People need access to green spaces, but Milton Country Park, but it is at capacity. Approving this would strain it further and mean they don't have access to enough green space. It will also strain the River Cam • Waste should be processed where it is produced and not fair to put this onto the villages • Unless water supply issue is sorted then dense developments should be avoided • Poor use of government funding • Will have an adverse effect on air quality • Isn't this area prone to flooding? • City is already dense + vibrant- leave it alone	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• No reasons given • The same wealthy people will buy the apartments and rent them out • Will just give dividend to shareholders • Will lead to poor mental health • Recent developments such as Eddington have failed to build a ‘lively development’ so developers will also fail here. • Concern about the word ‘dense’ • Don’t build unless better place for treatment plant is found • Many of the negative effects have been missed out of your consultations/ the proposal will push us far from Net zero aims • Can’t this occur outside of Cambridge? • With the Marshall’s site we will have enough housing • Proposal needs to be reviewed in light of change in working habits.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Anglia Water carried out consultation in 2020, but there was more support for it staying where it currently is than alternatives • Will harm quality of life of existing residents • Homes will have cars anyway and contribute to fumes • Disagree with density as will have to be fit to live in flats • Resident's living in high-rise flats will have a poor quality of life due to the A14 • Moving sewage works contravenes policy GP/GB of Local Plan. • It will harm the historical setting of Cambridge and impact nearby conservation areas. • In relation to policy CC/NZ, Carbon expenditure, emissions, to decommission a fully operational CWWTP and decontaminate site and build new plant within 1 mile of existing inclusive of transfer tunnels, HGV traffic etc., should be factored into carbon cost of fulfilling S/NEC Policy	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should put the proposed housing in the Green Belt (where the treatment plant is mooted to move to) rather than putting the housing in current proposed location, as it would save money and tonnes of carbon	71
Ask for a mixed development without going into detail about what should be included	53, 86, 96, 174, 196, 244, 543, 551
Keep the current plant and develop it with low-density housing / keep plant and put social housing on site	130, 460
Need as much development as a small town would need?	137,
Should not be delivered until water supply is guaranteed	141
Should build at a lower density. Comments included: • Either commercial space or housing should be reduced. • The pandemic has highlighted that many people are looking for more space, both internal and external. • The surrounding areas are not built-up so it would not be in keeping with the suburban/rural feeling of this part of Cambridge • Don’t just cram in a load of sub-standard housing.	63, 101, 112, 203, 224, 264, 291, 330, 359, 383, 386, 500, 521, 527, 578, 594
Support building it high/ dense	15, 66, 190, 544, 565

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Would prefer other sites to be prioritised	156
Government have given money, but this will need facilities, schools, pastoral care, all of which are likely to be overlooked for financial gain of housing	187
Balanced amount of development as appropriate to a normal town	174
I have some concern that this area as planned will become the low-income Qtr. of Cambridge while house to the South of City and I expect East will become the high value / high income area/ one commentator worried it might become "banlieue" on edge of rich city	191, 339
Given the site's proximity to Cambridge North station, it should not become another area of housing for London commuters and not addressing the housing need relating to local jobs. This has happened in the area by the existing station, i.e., property has been bought by commuting Londoners. Same mistakes need to be avoided	247
Support new development, but wastewater treatment plant's relocation should not damage small villages or ecosystems	261

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
If this area doesn't flood it's OK to build	289
Support development/ Good opportunity to use and repurpose land	301, 317, 498
I think the modified plans as recently published are beginning to get there, but there should be replacement of the Green Belt	330
Mixed feelings about the development as it will put pressure on existing green spaces and water supply issue, but it will have excellent transport links	373
No preference	397
Adhere to 15-minute city principles	425, 459, 468, 490, 497, 510, 511, 526, 545, 571
Support but caveats, including: • Need 100% support of surrounding villages • the sewage problems must be improved not to pollute Cam river any further • Delivery of the proposals in the plan is contingent on water supply being adequate without causing further environmental harm.	548

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
This is an 'overkill' solution to Cambridge's housing problems, given that there is already planned so much more housing at Cambridge Airport, Marleigh and Waterbeach.	578, 594
The overall new development in all locations needs to be definitive and balanced.	595

Climate change

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
New homes to meet high environmental standards, including: • New houses should be net zero • Solar panels • Heat source pumps • Build to Passivhaus standard • Build to environmental standard of Eddington • Greywater harvesting • Reduce concrete use	29, 42, 63, 89, 109, 148, 153, 158, 179, 218, 223, 224, 230,233, 248, 263, 293, 328, 363, 388, 407, 468, 489, 494, 564, 570

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Planting close to buildings to help regulate heating loss and gain • Ventilation systems • Air tightness as standard • Not gas • Should maintain optimum levels of water-use, i.e., vacuum assist toilets • Green roofs • Planting on verges • All pavements and parking spaces should be permeable to allow water to drain into landscape and not rush off to disrupt chalk streams and the Cam • Rain gardens in streets allowing deluges to be absorbed rather than putting pressure on water removal/flooding • Green landscaping to include trees	
Development must be carbon net-zero	86, 101, 143
Encourage community renewable projects with profits used for good causes	89

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Encourage retrofitting before new housing	

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Green spaces, including: • Open spaces • Room for nature to thrive • A county park • Biodiversity planting • Insect hotels • Lakes • Parks • Green spaces should be wild, rather than just a patch of grass • Quality green recreation area • Nature reserve • Encourage wildlife	6, 8, 11, 12, 16, 23, 32, 38, 53, 63, 70, 81, 84, 86, 89, 93, 96, 106, 126, 127, 128, 135, 136, 143, 144, 148, 151, 158, 162, 163, 166, 171, 177, 179, 190, 191, 192, 196, 206, 216, 230, 231, 233, 238, 239, 244, 251, 261, 262, 263, 264, 267, 268, 274, 275, 276, 278, 282, 291, 293, 296, 306, 309, 315, 318, 319, 321, 323, 325, 337, 340, 343, 347, 349, 350, 352, 359, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 370, 371, 375, 376, 379, 386, 387, 399, 401, 403, 404, 405, 406, 415, 417, 418, 423, 424, 425, 445, 449, 459, 466, 468, 474, 476, 477, 482, 483, 484, 487, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 500, 501, 504, 508, 510, 511, 521, 525, 526, 531, 535, 543, 544, 545, 547, 548, 550, 551, 557, 561, 562, 564, 565, 566, 571, 567, 573, 579, 582, 583

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Green spaces in between developments not just at edge • Tree planting • One commentator specifically asked for 3 open spaces • Open spaces should be landscaped • Ecologically useful places • Native shrubs and trees to reduce the ‘heat island’ effect • Pocket parks are needed • Hedgehog highways • Parks should be linked up with safe and convenient walking and cycling routes to each other and to all the residential neighbourhoods surrounding them + should be safe for children to access by foot. • Parks within the built-up area should be overlooked by houses and shops, with a welcoming design that encourages interaction with the surrounding community, and which feels safe throughout the day. • Nature reserves connecting to existing reserves • A recreation ground for each group of streets	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Housing should offer natural surveillance • Connect to the river	
Food growing comments, including: • Allotments • Community food growing • Orchards • Space for peri-urban agriculture • Good composting facilities • Community kitchen • A community farm extension project here and make it an innovative community with green heating, sedum roofs etc • Balconies are needed where food can be grown • Community fridge's • Multi-purpose space for farmer's market • Gardening area	6, 12, 127 135, 253, 262, 325, 337, 349, 363, 371, 400, 401, 508, 545
Provision for informal camping for Traveller community	12

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
More open space than has been currently proposed/ not bare minimum	38, 84, 473
new development should have access to green spaces and ensure residents don't have to travel across town	93, 242, 291
The proposed development is too large in relation to its impact upon Milton Country Park/ new development shouldn't put pressure on existing developments/ not enough to encourage locals to stay local	109, 216, 484, 521, 527, 557
Recreation areas should be dog-free	228
The recreational areas should be easy to maintain	228
Protect the river area as a green oasis	317
It should be 100% green space/ all land given to a new forest or park	75, 393, 469, 588,
Land will need to be taken from agricultural land around Cambridge to provide enough green space for residents as it currently does not look like enough will be provided	484
Open spaces corresponding to the work opportunities created in the area.	493

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Possible replacement of the open grassland with more formal park facilities. Greater emphasis on mixture of retail outlets.	543
Half the area should be allocated as green open space,	562
Milton Country Park is nearby so the need for open space is reduced	564

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Sports facilities, including: • Swimming pool • Athletics track • Splash pools • Free outdoor exercise facilities/ outdoor gym • Tennis court • Basketball court • Skateboard facilities/ skatepark both indoor and outdoor skatepark to match Trumpington's	6, 9, 12, 13, 90, 96, 106, 128, 163, 166, 171, 174, 177, 187, 190, 191, 192, 196, 213, 215, 244, 264, 267, 282, 293, 309, 331, 337, 340, 350, 367, 370, 375, 406, 407, 413, 417, 422, 425, 437, 449, 459, 463, 490, 502, 504, 505, 508, 510, 511, 514, 525, 526, 528, 531, 543, 545, 549, 551, 570, 571, 573, 582

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Riding school • Football pitch • Cycling routes	
Community / leisure facilities, including: • Community centres • Libraries • Playgrounds for children (a respondent asked for 5) + playgrounds aligned with best practise i.e., not segregated by age or ability, natural features, accessible, supports risk and challenge, no fence, open to all. • Hang-out spaces for teenagers • Youth clubs • Cycle track for older children • Meeting places for adults • Cinema • Climbing wall • Go-Karting	6, 9, 12, 13, 29, 51, 53, 67, 90, 96, 106, 128, 135, 147, 148, 151, 155, 158, 162, 163, 166, 171, 173, 177, 187, 190, 191, 192, 196, 212, 215, 230, 233, 238, 244, 246, 248, 264, 267, 279, 282, 284, 289, 293, 296, 309, 330, 331, 343, 348, 350, 359, 367, 370, 375, 383, 386, 388, 400, 401, 403, 405, 407, 411, 417, 419, 425, 437, 449, 459, 463, 466, 468, 489, 490, 493, 504, 505, 508, 510, 511, 519, 525, 531, 543, 545, 549, 551, 564, 565, 570, 571, 572, 582

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Theme Park • A meeting point for the community • Clubs • Entertainment venues • Information hub • Community apartments for the locality to book • Hotels • public spaces that can be used for local fetes and markets too • Public toilets	
Out of town shopping/ cinema complex	11
An open area that can be used for outdoor shows	11, 54
Farmers markets and events	11
Cemetery	12
Youth club	12
Healthcare institutions, including: • GP surgeries • Convalescent/ respite care	9, 12, 29, 50, 51, 73, 74, 90, 96, 106, 127, 128, 163, 166, 171, 174, 177, 179, 187, 190, 196, 216, 244, 267, 274, 280, 293, 296, 309, 325, 330, 331, 350, 351, 367, 370, 386, 407, 415,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Dentists • Opticians • Mental health hub • Care home	423, 425, 434, 456, 459, 466, 487, 490, 493, 504, 505, 508, 510, 511, 519, 525, 543, 549, 545, 551, 557, 571, 574
Education/ childcare: • Primary schools • Secondary schools • Nurseries • Pastoral care • Special needs schools	9, 13. 29, 50, 51, 67, 73, 74, 90, 96, 128, 135, 147, 163, 166, 171, 174, 179, 187, 190, 196, 216, 229, 244, 248, 261, 267, 274, 279, 280, 293, 296, 309, 315, 331, 340, 350, 351, 361, 367, 370, 386, 388, 403, 411, 423, 425, 434, 456, 459, 484, 487, 490, 493, 504, 505, 508, 510, 511, 519, 525, 535, 543, 545, 547, 549, 551, 564, 571, 580, 590
Leisure facilities	51, 229, 282
Faith facilities	56
A major theatre/ concert hall is needed as the current cultural infrastructure is inadequate	78
Artists' studios are needed	78
Outdoor space for sport, health and fitness	78

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Need to actually deliver community/ leisure facilities otherwise this will strain existing facilities. Deliver at the start, not like at Cambourne	90, 468,
Activities shouldn't 'cost the earth' to enjoy, i.e., fishing lake at Milton used to be cheap, but now £700 membership a year	236
Ambulance/police standby location	279
Safe community, including: • CCTV • Well-lit footpaths	328
Given the lack of provision in nearby areas (e.g. Chesterton) and the pressures on Milton Country Park, there must be good provision for sports, leisure and wellbeing	572
What is being done to increase beds and staff at the hospitals? It's easy to build new schools but health provision and social services provision doesn't increase proportionately with the population growth	368

Great Places

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Needs to have a good centre with amenities to: • avoid it feeling sterile • reduce negative carbon output • create a community • Needs to be a modification of Trumpington/ Eddington model- support more local diversity • Essentially a micro-city within the city and not just a blob of houses that satellites its resources	15, 93, 190, 376, 405, 459, 489, 504, 508, 545, 540, 561, 571
Cambridge city centre is 'the old' culture, so how about this site being 'the new'. See how they do that in Valencia, with the Old Town centre and new 'City of Arts & Sciences' - the two sit beautifully together.	78
Whatever is built needs to be sympathetic to its surroundings	224, 482
Need to deliver a thoughtful plan that builds a sense of community and not imitate Cambourne's mistakes where developers have built too many houses compared to	171, 364

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
community amenities, transport, leisure facilities and outdoor markets	
Mid-rise housing that makes good use of space and leaves public open spaces available for parks, public squares, outdoor seating, cycle lanes etc.	239
New neighbourhoods should focus on urban design that prioritises walking, cycling and convenience I.e., no cul de sacs, no fenced blocks of flats with only one entrance	278, 425, 459, 490, 510, 511, 526, 545, 557, 571
Avoid excessive road space to create a cycling / walking campus with high quality landscape (like Accordia)	287
The working and living areas must be well divided and screened with attractive planting and trees.	358
Quiet streets are needed	401
shops are needed to take the pressure off town	475
Changing art space. Have a fourth plinth style system that allows residents to choose the artwork and have it change every 2-5 years to keep fresh artwork that stays relevant.	502

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
A new neighbourhood must not be a dormitory. Make entire neighbourhoods so that all essentials can be accessed locally to minimise need to travel, not increase car traffic on roads.	405, 459, 425, 490, 508, 510, 511, 525, 526, 545, 557, 561, 571
It would be good to preserve the rural character.	538
Further reduction to the height of buildings should be strongly considered without any reduction of green spaces.	548
Use of the residential "tower" above retail/leisure facilities can generate great vibrancy and allow good areas of public green space within a somewhat restricted site.	568
Focus on green spaces, not just cramming loads of houses in to maximise profits. Design communities that benefit people's mental health and well-being and include community and business facilities where the community can get to know each other.	212
This is a vast site, and any development must be planned with great care so that we don't finish up with another Trumpington entrance to Cambridge. More pleasing house designs (in keeping with historic Cambridge.	424

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
main policy focus of a local plan should be to design for children. If you make it work for them, you make it work for everyone.	545

Jobs

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Comments relating to jobs • Variety of jobs needed • Spaces needed for start ups • More office space needed • A community of local businesses, including local, eco-sustainable business community • Good opportunities for employment for low-skilled workers • Space for manufacturing for small businesses • Support for business clusters	12, 67, 86, 89, 96, 127, 135, 147, 148, 159, 162, 163, 166, 171, 174, 177, 187, 190, 196, 206, 244, 259, 261, 267, 274, 289, 315, 323, 350, 370, 371, 379, 459, 489, 501, 502, 504, 508, 531, 543, 551, 555, 561, 564, 568, 570, 571

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Jobs should be available to young people (by creating spaces where businesses that employ unskilled and semi-skilled). • Affordable rent for businesses • Space for artisan workshops	
Small number of jobs needed. One commentator suggested 1,500	228, 562
Better commercial facilities: • Local shops • More retail generally • Grocery • Hardware • Pharmacies • Restaurants • Pub • Nightlife facilities • Cafes • Bakery	9, 12, 29, 50, 51, 53, 67, 73, 89, 93, 96, 127, 128, 135, 147, 148, 151, 162, 163, 166, 171, 174, 179, 187, 191, 196, 229, 238, 244, 261, 264, 267, 278, 279, 280, 289, 293, 296, 309, 315, 323, 325, 340, 343, 350, 364, 376, 401, 403, 405, 411, 425, 459, 463, 475, 489, 490, 493, 501, 504, 505, 510, 511, 526, 535, 541, 543, 545, 547, 551, 555, 561, 562, 565, 567, 571, 575, 590

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Post office • Takeaways • Food shops • Butchers • Petrol station • Pet shop • Art facilities • Independent shops, similar to the ones on Mill Road • Around offices need spaces for markets • One commentator suggested 5 pubs • One commentator suggested 5 community centres • One commentator asked for not having a big supermarket, but smaller shops • Hairdresser	
Include enough amenities so that people don't have to go into Cambridge	50, 89, 425, 459, 508, 490, 510, 511, 526, 544, 545, 571
Diverse shops, not just one superstore/ local goods + food should be encouraged	56

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should be more of a focus on remote working with homes allowing space for it.	168, 266
An extension of the existing Trinity science Park /business park	170, 221, 259, 302
There should be light industrial / industrial sites.	293, 315, 459, 544, 570
Less jobs are needed, comments include: • Already close to science park, no more jobs are need. • No more jobs as need houses to outstrip number of jobs • Creating more jobs and thus needing to build even more new housing just pleases the developers, not your electors. The plan will fail as the climate crisis bites ever deeper.	144, 173 191, 248, 331, 339, 526
keep the same jobs that are currently there	297
Any expansion of Cambridge Science Park, such as associated manufacturing rather than on land owned by Chivers Farm in the Green Belt east of Impington	302
Ideally residents would work locally	315
Needs better infrastructure to support new businesses	520
Need cycling connections with surrounding more industrial job sites to further reduce the need for cars	544

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
New jobs should be non-polluting	583

Homes

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
More housing generally	16, 42, 86, 127, 162, 163, 166, 170, 177, 180, 187, 206, 221, 244, 251, 274, 293, 296, 299, 315, 319, 321, 331, 337, 423, 449, 498, 519, 531, 543, 544, 551, 555
Lots of apartments	237, 262, 544
Mix of housing types including small homes for those that want them	67, 76, 151, 159, 238, 274, 327, 340, 375, 540
Comments relating to affordable housing: • More affordable housing needed • Housing should be socially inclusive, i.e., plumbers + tradespeople should be able to park their vans on the site. Don’t just attract office-based workers • 3-bedroom homes, not large expensive ones	29, 31, 36, 66, 73, 90, 109, 136, 144, 179, 187, 204, 216, 228, 229, 238, 241, 263, 267, 274, 293, 297, 311, 323, 327, 340, 348, 423, 437, 474, 491, 493, 498, 501, 502, 519, 545, 550, 575, 582

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Social housing not just for locals and not just people with local connections • Not luxury flats • Not ‘affordable housing’, but housing which locals can afford • Should have a charter for local people encompassed in its charter • Council homes • Housing for local people • Make it majority affordable • Housing for staff at local business parks • Council should do more to ensure houses aren’t empty	
Suggestions for housing: • Should be big enough and properly adapted for families • Should be suitable for wheelchair users • Starter homes for young families • Homes big enough to work from home	42, 86, 127, 135, 203, 237, 253, 262, 344, 346, 347, 348, 349, 365, 418, 419, 492, 544, 565, 568, 590

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Young families should have houses with substantial gardens • Share of freehold, not just leasehold • Flats with balconies + communal gardens • Housing for elderly • Sheltered housing • Co-housing developments • Should be built to highest standards with proper thought given to light and outside space • Housing shouldn't be cookie cutter, so allow lots of smaller developers the contracts	
Houses should have access to the river	93
Comments about it being low-rise, including: • Low-rise housing with no flats • Low-rise housing should be targeted towards families • Low-density housing, not squeezed together as in St Matthews Garden / should have garden • High-density, but low-rise	192, 203, 205, 296, 349, 311, 347, 407, 492, 503

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Adequate outside space to accommodate the utilities, hidden washing line area and a small raised bed for growing food • Inside - a utility room, small study and plenty of storage space are necessary, especially with people working from home.	
A few houses are needed/ less houses for population growth	175, 242, 566, 583
Nothing should be too tall, one commentator suggested capping storeys at 4 storeys	237, 562
Mid-rise housing, similar to Cambridge North	239, 510
Housing could also be quite dense with smaller houses & apartments.	565
Apartment buildings with mandated larger than normal apartments and with lots of green space through the streets. Terraced housing/detached housing should be prohibited.	544
Absolute maximum 3000 new homes	562
Homes should be 1-3 bedroom with a garden.	575
Homes should have garages so cars don't need to be parked on the street	233

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Car comments, including: • It should be a car-free development • Minimise car usage • Cars should be kept to a minimum. • Design of development should make running a car unnecessary • No parking, except for disabled people • Ban conversion of front garden to parking • Parking for residents should be on the Freiburg, Cayala in Guatemala, or Ypenburg models, outside the residential areas, in order to create sociable streets which are largely car free and provide space for people to socialise, play and enjoy the streets outside their homes in safety. • Design for low number of cars. Marmalade Lane is an excellent model to copy, for example. This allows more	6, 144, 200, 208, 218, 262, 263, 278, 291, 297, 401, 404, 425, 468, 490, 497, 503, 510, 511, 525, 526, 544, 545, 552, 571

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
green space, and for it to be central and overlooked, not 'round the back'.	
All infrastructure should be completed before development of houses/ factories begins. This should include development of good roads.	260, 547, 560
All facilities should contribute to the circular economy, including: • Recycling centres • Spaces for repairing broken/ damaged goods + workshops	6, 12, 262
Transport comments, including: • It should be accessible for people from surrounding villages • Cycle paths / off-road cycle paths/ segregated shared-use paths + not just lines on road • New development needs to be accessible to the rest of the city • Need to link to nearby Milton Country Park • Park and Ride	11, 12, 15, 16, 29, 50, 70, 76, 81, 93, 106, 112, 131, 136, 142, 144, 158, 163, 170, 171, 174, 179, 190, 195, 218, 228, 229, 233, 239, 248, 253, 260, 261, 262, 264, 267, 278, 280, 287, 291, 297, 306, 309, 327, 337, 340, 343, 349, 364, 367, 375, 379, 404, 407, 411, 416, 417, 419, 424, 425, 445, 466, 468, 490, 493, 497, 506, 508, 510, 526, 530, 534, 544, 545, 547, 546, 548, 549, 552, 555, 557, 571, 580, 582

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Links between new town and city • Link to the rail network • Should be able to access cycle lanes • Adequate bike parking, including for cargo bikes. Possibly bike sheds/ bike stands • The Science Park entrance in Cambridge is poorly designed causing traffic and promoting dangerous driving by a few drivers. • adequate public transport for residents to get to work without having to come into Cambridge causing more congestion • A tramway-style connection to the city centre of Cambridge • Drop off and pick-up parcel points • Take advantage of Cambridge North Station • Good bus links to the city for all people, not just commuters	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Walking + cycling routes should join existing routes outside of development • Cut through between streets for pedestrians • Links to retail parks • Extended public transport hours for staff at Addenbrookes • Bus shelters • A new light railway or underground as buses are inadequate • New site needs multiple entrances and exits • Better and cheaper guided bus service • Have more trains to London • Protect and improve walking routes • Adhere to LTN 20/1 and all cycle routes are part of connected network • Children should feel safe travelling • Buses to station/ hospital should take the shortest route	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• New developments should site and finance new arterial roads where possible, not just place extra load on existing ones.	
Pro parking comments, including: • Ensure there is enough parking. • Having no car parking is impractical for modern parking • Houses should have multiple spaces • There should be a car park for visitors	19, 29, 112, 120, 233, 261, 287, 351, 474, 580
Electric parking charging points for residents and visitors	29, 147, 179, 203, 233, 287, 340, 474, 548
Digital connectivity	29
A new cycle over the river and railway line parallel to the motorway would allow residents to be able to use Fen Ditton and Horningsea services (e.g., Pub, Art Gallery). This would also allow people in Fen Ditton/ Horningsea to commute into the new district more easily, and access for example Milton Tesco and Milton country park by bike.	121, 151, 282, 394
Reduce the need for cars, so a neighbourhood provides everything in walking/ cycling distance	143, 163, 376, 544, 548

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
First and foremost, there should be new drainage and sewage processing	260
The Fen Road area beyond the railway crossing from Chesterton needs a new access from the A14 and the access from Chesterton should be closed. If this is done, perhaps access to Cambridge North station could be made from the East.	282
Limited parking, i.e., one per house	328
Need to ensure adequate infrastructure for new incoming residents as there is already too much pressure on infrastructure/ cannot just simply add more houses	367, 403
Support EWR	546
Pro car comments • Please do not neglect the roads in order to deliberately make them congested and encourage people to use public transport. Many people e.g. elderly need to use cars and roads for medical purposes and many other purposes.	306, 506, 560

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Do not punish cars/ van users as not everyone can cycle. Reducing road capacity that will not represent the ordinary voters of the area, or the viability of Cambridge as a commercial and retail centre. Creating a transport desert is in no ones' interest. • Even with public transport, people will still use cars + you will have to take account of commuting traffic created into Cambridge from towns	
The new infrastructure must not overload existing infrastructure e.g. water, drainage & sewage, gas and electricity and ongoing question of how water supply will be managed for extra houses	351, 468

Other comments

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Moving the sewage works has been assigned as a nationally significant important infrastructure project, so why isn't it	26, 63

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
mentioned in the Local Plan? This omission breaches the democratic process of ‘public consultation’	
Assume this housing is for the Science Park etc so needs to have the appropriate green content since the residents will not be rich but deserving of a nice area. If you plan it to service elsewhere you need to replace the metro with something of equivalent concept and green. The new Mayor's vision of "compassion, cooperation and community" is meaningless.	33
Fair consultation did not take place	41
It's good you intend to overpopulate Cambridge so current residents can move out and get a good sale price.	59
Pre-defined survey answer, why no option to say we don’t agree	117
I guess ‘dense and lively wouldn’t accommodate that. More things like the above somewhere else to offset this maybe?	166
Given demand for commuting into London will have fallen with the rise of working from home. Why would living in dense city district on the edge of the city be appealing on the edge of an industrial estate be appealing?	192

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Hope it's sufficient with all the new citizens incoming	
How are the Gypsy Roma Traveller residents up Fen Road featuring in your Plan? I asked Town and had not got a reply	223
Arbury Road east is very dangerous and polluted - must be filtered or made one way as recommended in your own LCWIP	276
More special needs schools are needed. My daughter is currently unable to find a place and its severely affecting her mental health. Counsellors tell me there's a £39m deficit and that apparently is it. Children have to reach crisis to get a place at a SEN school	361
You should have mentioned moving the plant to the Green Belt. This omission, on your part, will mean that people responding in this survey will do so without fully understanding the implications of what they might be suggesting. This will give your survey a distorted and misleading view of public opinion	385, 496, 518, 594
Concerned/ dislike / unsure about the word dense	389, 423, 582
All the development on NEC should not be in this Local Plan as there is no guarantee it can happen	427, 428, 429, 433

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Difficult to see how this project can be considered a nationally significant project as Anglian Water say there is no need to move	443
I can't see how anyone living there won't need a car. There would need to be schools, doctors' surgery, a really good bus service. Also, on-site job opportunities. Without this it will just be dormitory housing for people to commute from in cars.	488
A robust monitoring systems should be set up to ensure that the developers are living up to the plans approved and not constantly amend afterwards not always to the best of the intentions in the plan. The Darwin Green project in the North area is a bad example of the prolonging and amending plans + reducing provision of community facilities, and other amenities.	548
The best thing about this site is that it is close to A14 - is this a site for people who will be working in Cambridge?	597
Use brownfield sites	89
The Council should learn lessons from other new developments e.g., CB1 at the train station, Trumpington and Orchard Park which have been plagued by anti-social	106

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
behaviour and crime. If occupants of council properties are involved in anti-social behaviour and crime then the council needs to protect the community and take some action rather than just ignoring the issue.	
New "communities" may not be initially occupied by the same range of family structures as they will in 20 years' time. This needs to be taken into account in the long-term plan for the area.	506

Q5. We feel that we should support the development of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Addenbrookes) with space for more healthcare facilities, research, and housing. What housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces should be created around the campus?

Opposition to development

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There should be limits to the development: • It should not sprawl out onto the green belt • There should be a readiness to set limits on the development • We cannot keep building over countryside • The Council must respect biodiversity	2, 4, 11, 95, 128, 223, 288, 289, 299, 303, 309, 330, 335, 363, 404, 408, 413, 419, 358, 349, 170, 335, 144, 299, 279, 445, 448, 450, 469, 476, 477, 495, 498, 512, 523, 529, 535, 538, 551, 561, 563, 572, 582
No development due to concerns about: • Sustainability • Biodiversity • Pollution	22, 223, 258, 272, 290, 303, 335, 402, 354, 400, 134, 435, 471, 472, 598
No development due to concerns about: • Flooding	303, 435, 547, 598, 523, 543

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Significant flooding already occurs in buildings in Addenbrookes + at Ninewells estate. • The expansion would have serious detrimental effects upon the chalkland ridge and Gog Magog Hills in relation to increasing the chances of flooding. There are also significant issues to do with pumping and sewage which already effect the Ninewells development.	
No development due to concerns about: • Water infrastructure • Impact on traffic • Strain existing infrastructure	335, 378, 141, 431, 471, 485, 95, 100, 106, 203, 275, 419, 487, 515, 527, 555, 559, 588 249, 260, 289, 117, 87,
No development due to concerns about: • Aesthetics • It will blur the Cambridge- Shelford rural-urban divide • Urban sprawl • Impact on green belt • There is enough development	5, 18, 19, 20, 27, 49, 57, 63, 84, 90, 96, 106, 123, 130, 175, 183, 211, 242, 256, 275, 290, 303, 304, 319, 331, 335, 374, , 381, 388 , 393, 395, 398, 399, 415, 435, 436,, 457, 470, 472, 473, 488, 523, 526, , 527 545, 547, 555, 552, 559 561, 566, 573, 588, 589,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Research facilities are currently underused on the Campus; therefore, expansion is not an appropriate use of land. • Due to innovations in digital communications, there is little need for research facilities to be next to each other. It would have made more sense to put the campus on the Papworth site as it would have a less negative impact. • No more new housing or other development until all infrastructure is in-place including roads, schools, GP's, etc • It will make communication more difficult between different Addenbrooke buildings. Clever planning could expand the site's current footprint without needing to expand into the green belt. • Disagree with the model of hospital expansion (e.g., Boston Medical District) • Amenity of residents	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There should be no development that infringes on the Gog and Magog hills	68, 106, 289, 477
No development should go ahead, with no reasons given	138, 167, 173, 268, 273, 491
If development has to occur, it will have less environmental impact if it was to the south of Addenbrooke's Road or to west between Addenbrookes Road and the M11. Both could link to sustainable transport in better ways	523
The commentator questions the Council's ability to deliver the scheme	409
Instead of developing this land, other parts of Cambridge should be developed/ Is it appropriate to have such a dense concentration of healthcare services on one site?	106, 191, 236, 358, 340, 386, 399, 432, 450, 521, 523, 561, 565
Other parts of the country should be developed rather than Cambridge/ biomedical industry needs to be spread across a wider area	339, 479, 436, 311
Proposals would significantly impact upon the amenity of residents at the edge of the city.	523, 545
BMC growth should be halted. Growth should be spread across city, i.e., north Cambridge site/ Milton Science Park	40, 70, 95

Deliverability

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Scale of development should be constantly reviewed to avoid impacting green belt land in this area / The new development needs to learn from the lessons of development from previous developments/ previous problems have not been addressed by development plans	42, 86, 407, 308, 340, 395, 308, 497, 572
The hospital and its facilities should be prioritised for development. Specific changes include: • Large horticultural therapy should be created at Addenbrookes as a referral unit for people with stress and high blood pressure + staff • Care homes and recuperation facilities	226, 308, 386, 507, 554, 514, 543
Supportive of developing all the suggested uses	244, 245, 248, 353
If there is a real need to expand the campus, please extend the area to the south. The field at the north-east could then be improved. Hedgerows could be reinstated on Babraham Road and more trees beside the cycle path could instated. This	365

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
would preserve Cambridge's view and maintain the city's 'soft edge'.	
Before development can go ahead, the following improvements would have to be made, including: Road improvements	211

Climate Change

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
In relation to climate change and housing, changes should include: • Well-insulated housing • Carbon net-zero housing/ New facilities should be built to the latest NHS net zero carbon standard • Heat pumps • Built to passivhaus standard • No gas • Electric charging points	66. 89, 93 109, 117, 148, 150, 151 179, 233, 239, 296, 324, 392, 474,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Mid-rise housing that makes good use of space and leaves public open space for parks. • New housing needs access to the river • Houses should be built on stilts due to flood risk • Ensuring rainwater is capture in houses and then recycled	
Encourage community renewable energy projects	89
All surfaces should be permeable to facilitate drainage into an aquifer	564
Non-polluting activities should occur at the campus	583
Rain gardens by roads and walk-ways to assist the cleaning of surface run-off and drainage into an aquifer	564

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Green Spaces including: • Open spaces	3, 8,11, 12, 13, 17, 23, 42, 46, 67, 71, 75 79, 93, 101, 111, 120, 131, 148, 162, 187, 200, 206, 216, 230, , 231, 233, 238, 251, ,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Incorporate Ninewells Reserve as a park • Maintain the open space around the campus as much as possible • Wildlife sites • Reforesting • Protect Ninewells Reserve in a new development • Sites for patients to go out with visitors • Food growing opportunities should be provided, e.g., allotments, co-farming, community gardens. • Land for bio-diverse habitats • Trees/ hedges • Semi-natural areas • Facilities should be built to take advantage of the outside views, natural light and ventilation • Water features	261, 262, 274, 282, 283, 288, 293, 294, 301, 304, 311, 317, 319, 343 , 356, 358, 362, 365, 371, 373, , 376, 383, 387, 389, 397, 398, 400, 401, 403, 405, 406, 407, 415, 417, 418, 423, 449, 463, 471, 477, 483, 484, 489, 492, 502, , 506, 518, 523, 527, , 528, 543, 545 547, 550, 567, 586, 582, 583, 592 ,
Skateboarding facilities/ skatepark that is well-lit/ indoor skating facilities	67, 413, 422, 502
Cemetery	12

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Green spaces in between houses, not just on the edge of housing developments / Planting close to buildings to help regulate building's heating loss and gain	179, 148
Avoid building on low-lying flood-prone areas and instead keep them as recreational areas	410
Informal camping which the Traveller community could use	12
Ninewells, Great Kneighton, Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits should be joined up with Wandelbury and the Beech Woods to make a proper wildlife corridor	401
Woodland	262, 343, 498
New or more parkland/ parkland should be easily accessible by community + children	74, 75, 79, 262, 278, 306, 318, 321, 323, 362, 375, 379, 425, 466, 470, 490, 498, 511, 525
Outdoor facilities such as: • A running track • Tennis courts • A football pitch • Outdoor gyms • Outdoor Splash pools	8, 12, 50, 54, 67, 71, 73, 79, 80, 86, 93, 111, 128, 135, 148, 238, 233, 264, 267, 314, 323, 325, 371, 375, 411, 426, 449, 518, 525, 582, 586, 348, 545, 375, 505, 535, 582, 586

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Playgrounds • Community gardens • swimming pool	

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Changes to encourage wellbeing on the site, including: • Farm animals (for patients and their families) should be provided for therapeutic visits	506
Whole development should revolve around maintaining good health and a healthy sustainable environment for all/ should link with aims of GCPS/ the development should link with the aims of 15-minute neighbourhoods and have a mix of uses that are easily accessible	96, 278, 407, 425, 490, 497, 511, 544, 571, 572, 578, 545
Healthcare facilities, including: • GP surgeries • Dental practice	12, 128, 179, 190, 212, 216, 261, 274, 324, 325, 343, 396, 466, 505, 518, 586, 545

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There needs to be more health facilities and beds provided, nothing else.	368
Space for alternative therapy	506
Community facilities such as: • Libraries • Allotments • Toilets • Community centre • Cultural and social places to give the area an atmosphere	8, 12, 50, 67, 71, 73, 79, 80, 86, 93, 135, 148, 238, 264, 267, 314, 323, 325, 371, 375, 411, 426, 449, 518, 525, 582, 586, 233, 348, 545
Meeting places for adults	67
Communal hubs	317, 324, 233
Youth clubs	12
Childcare facilities including: • A special needs school • School • Nursery	31, 50, 67, 76, 79, 146, 156, 179, 190, 194, 216, 261, 274, 280, 323, 360, 426,505, 523, 580, 545, 550
Swimming pool	213, 371, 545

Great Places

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Recreational areas are needed for staff to socialise	334
Needs more buildings on a walkable / human scale with a diversity of users as currently too many massive single purpose buildings.	108, 537
Public square/ public spaces	239, 410
Changing art space- a 4th plinth style system which residents can vote to change every 2 – 5 years	502
Space for local craft and farmer's markets	12
Public benches and picnic tables	12, 239

Jobs

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
More general research facilities (i.e. not only healthcare)	6, 11, 66, 162, 174, 190, 194, 323, 426, 437, 477

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
More of a focus should be placed on remote working	168
Pub	58, 93, 179, 279, 470
Dining / cafes	46, 93, 148, 238, 296, 309, 398, 401, 470, 522, 529, 537
Co-working spaces	564
Training site for different jobs	127
Education sites for qualifications for different jobs	127
An alternative idea could be making a medical school on the site.	113
More healthcare research facilities / Biomedical facilities	6, 39, 174, 301, 389, 396, 482, 503
No more research facilities	315
Comments about CBC: • CBC lacks hospitality facilities for people it employs. Having a network of facilities including restaurants, cafes and supermarkets will support current users. Currently after 20:00 only 1 café is open in CUH's concourse. • More consideration needs to be paid to the shift patterns of staff	229, 343, 506
Small shops (not a big supermarket)/ local shops/ independent	58, 93, 179, 264, 267, 278, 309, 411, 456, 470, 567

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Post office	93, 156, 261, 398
Spaces for recycling and repairing damaged goods	12
Focus on health care provision, not houses	232
Small business spaces/ support for business clusters	12, 148, 261, 274, 379, 502
Jobs for local people that are not medicine-related	25
High quality jobs/ high-tech jobs, research jobs	52, 127, 192, 323, 456
More jobs generally	159, 162, 206, 274, 571, 592
Secure jobs that are not on zero-hour contracts and which provide living wage	327
Hi-tech facilities	120
Shops	46, 50, 127, 146, 190, 194, 238, 279, 280, 296, 315, 324, 375, 376, 450, 466, 505, 522, 537, 564, 567, 572, 586, 545

Homes

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No more housing/ minimal new housing	4, 6, 39, 64, 75, 80, 135, 289, 293, 294

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	301, 311, 360, 437, 503, 523, 559, 563, 566, 583 592
Houseowners should be banned from converting front gardens to parking spaces to reduce cars	208
Housing shouldn't be too dense	101, 597
Provision of homes is critical. Should provide a mix of housing that is: • Affordable housing for younger people who might want to get involved in medicine or teaching • Affordable housing for people with low-income levels, key workers, local people, lower paid healthcare workers, NHS staff, families, researchers, care workers, local people • More affordable housing is needed in this part of the city • Mix of social and private housing • Smaller developments for smaller developers • Flats with different numbers of bedrooms • More housing for the elderly/ people visiting the elderly	7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 24, 29, 42, 50, 56, 58, 59, 62, 72, 76, 81 86, 89, 90, 101, 109, 112, 115, 119, 127, 136, 150, 155, 162, 179, 187, 197, 205, 216, 219, 228, 238, 247, 251, 253, 263, 264, 267, 274, 279, 282, 283, 291, 296, 297, 299, 315, 324 327, 340, 344, 345, 348, 351, , 362, 368, 370, 382, 401, 407, 410, 417, 420, 432, 442, 449, 461, 474, 492 493, 495, 502, 504, 506, 511, 519, 520, 523, , 531, 534, 539, 540, 543, 545, 550, 567, 569, 574, 575, 577

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Housing for those who have family-members that are staying in hospital for a long-time / Respite facilities/ a hotel for family members • Suitable for wheelchair users • Housing for first-time buyers • Have a garden • Co – housing schemes • Luxury housing shouldn't be built • Council housing • Avoid segregation • Larger family homes, not high-rise flats • Should be an appropriate mix of housing and places for people to work to encourage and work in the same vicinity rather than commuting from outside of the area • Small 1 room flats or studios, possibly with shared gardens	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Is there no aim to create a new community like Cambourne or Northstowe? / Build a copy of Cambridge North here	
Densify the Addenbrookes site in-between buildings already there	147, 190, 287, 296, 483
Acceptable to increase housing density/ reduce garden size to increase provided public green space	544
Houses need garages so cars aren't parking on-street	233
A trust could be set-up to ensure that properties remain in-use for low-income biomedical staff and NHS staff	495
A lot of housing in Trumpington has been bought by buy-to-rent investors and this should be stopped	194, 368
Student accommodation	253, 323
Need for housing, but it would encroach onto the environment. The Food, Farming and Countryside Commission is currently developing a land-use framework and doing a pilot project in Cambridgeshire. This research should be consulted before irrevocable decisions are made	363

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
High quality housing is needed as the stock in the area is already looking a bit care worn	284
Due to the way housing sales currently work, whilst some housing would be available to key workers, the majority would still not be affordable. It is therefore hard to justify this expansion on the grounds it would increase the stock of affordable housing	523
New housing should be near the site to minimise the need for private transport	367

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Addition of research hubs could create S106 funds which could be used to fund staff facilities.	117
These facilities need cash to be built.	295
Create a mini-Science Park	293

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Better transport links, including: • Good transport links to other research centres at Babraham and the Genome Campus • A tramway-style connection to the rest of Cambridge • Cheaper transport • Better transport links generally • Community transport between accommodation and medical facilities	89, 109, 101, 142, 179, 190, 306, 340, 362, 375, 404, 416, 420, 456, 483, 506, 508, 523, 530, 546, 571, 580, 586, 592, 594
Houseowners should be banned from converting front gardens to parking spaces to reduce cars	208
East – West Rail should enter Cambridge via Northstowe to take traffic off the road and assist the Addenbrookes site by enabling more people to use the train	328
Cycle improvements, including: • Cycle paths • Making it safer for cyclists • Sustainable transport • Cycling paths should be built in-line with LTN 1/20	12, 16, 45, 50, 67, 76, 87, 93, 101, 121, 142, 156, 233, 239, 264, 280, 282, 293, 297, 306, 311, 367, 379, 425, 468, 490, 497, 505, 511, 523, 545, 552, 564, 569, 571, 572, 577, 586

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Cycle storage • Segregated cycle paths • Multi-user cycle paths • Should emulate Dutch infrastructure • Enable children to travel	
Safer for pedestrians/ walking routes/ running routes	45, 263, 280, 297, 367, 379, 142, 445
Additional road capacity/ new arterial roads which should be financed by the development/ wider roads	306, 261, 475, 559
Minimise the need to travel into the town centre	410
Parking improvements, including: • Disable parking • Parking for incoming residents • Parking for staff • More parking generally • Parking for residents • Parking modelled on the Freiburg or Ypenburg models	24, 51, 158, 180, 233, 261, 353, 416, 417, 424, 426, 474, 506, 549, 478, 511, 545

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The Campus has failed to supply the active travel aspects it promised in its previous ‘vision plan’. It has appalling cycle provision where cyclists have died. These things need to be held to account before further expansion.	526
A public transport hub	131
Better transport links generally/ consideration of transport impact	15, 51, 58, 62, 109, 143, 180, 264, 267, 291, 293, 301, 364, 416, 417, 468, 511, 525, 567
Multiple entrances and exits to the site	261
Car facilities should be kept to a minimum	109, 47, 477, 483, 508, 544, 571, 572, 208
More attention needs to be paid to the transportation of hospital staff to the site	291, 87, 117, 289, 291
A railway station	99, 156, 177, 265, 283, 301, 373, 411, 546, 564

Other Comments

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
It is a leading question	382

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Where is your analysis of the radical changes to work-life patterns/ travel needs from the Covid-19 pandemic?	395
Natural elements are currently lacking in the CBC	408
CBC has brought anti-social behaviour into nearby communities. Parking on drives, littering and did not socially distance during Lockdowns	559
Affordable housing is a ‘joke’, you need a large mortgage to get a house near Addenbrookes	171
It is a high-quality asset in Cambridge and therefore needs to be planned and developed well, not saturated with housing	286
It currently feels soulless/ architecture his horrible/ area lacks amenities which means residents have to drive	337, 598
Uncertain whether the campus is a housing development/ industrial site or university campus	424
It appears that you have already planned new development. The Council needs to ‘come clean’ about it.	202
National chains should be banned from owning shops or property in the area	71, 73

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Addenbrookes should be treated like a small town/ neighbourhood with appropriate facilities	343, 350, 525
Fundamental aim of the Local Plan should be aiming to design for children	545
A mixture (undefined) of things are needed	53
Any new development needs to be definitive and balanced	595
Less unimaginative development	63
Just because developers are building affordable housing, it doesn't mean that they should be able to get out of paying penalties if they don't deliver	500
Better food is needed for people who are visiting the hospital	135
Only ethical medical companies should be allowed to move to the campus	187
CBC should be leading the environmental, social and governance efforts of Cambridgeshire.	486
Has anyone done a survey of where campus staff live? Where would they ideally like to live to inform questions on housing + transport links?	373

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Any new development needs a proper centre/ centre needed that is not based solely on a supermarket.	376. 233
Impact of this development will be less because it is near a lot of jobs.	353
Fully self-contained site where travel is kept to a minimum	163

Q13. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about what Greater Cambridge should be like in 2041?

Opinion of vision

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The broad aims, vision + sites in the Plan is correct/ appreciate its attempt to balance competing impulses	16, 85, 196, 245, 249, 270, 497, 503, 581
Wants to see GC as a world leading centre of technical excellence, with homes and environment to match	58
Villagers must accept that the villages need to expand and also allow others to move to them without making it so difficult.	31

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Preservationist recommendations, including: • Preservation of green spaces and landscapes • Preservation of green belt • Prioritisation of brownfield sites • All communities should share the burden of any housing needed so that as little countryside as possible is built on • Green belt should have more protection • EWR Southern route shouldn't be allowed to cut through the Green Belt/ important villages with conservation areas • Development should be constrained by amount of available water • Protect Nine Wells Hills/ ensure not blocked by development • Hope there is still farmland to provide produce locally • Preserve few remaining rural villages • Don't ruin rural aspect of the county	2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 20, 34, 42, 45 , 50, 51, 57, 95, 97, 111, 123, 128, 133, 138, 147, 165, 183, 185, 200, 210, 221, 225, 247, 249, 253, 256, 270, 279, 289, 290, 295, 296, 297, 298, 313, 322, 325, 328, 335, 338, 354, 356, 378, 381, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 395, 401, 403, 407, 412, 415, 417, 421, 431, 433, 442, 446, 449, 455, 458, 463, 467, 477, 478, 479, 481, 483, 485, 487, 492, 494, 501, 521, 531, 537, 549, 550, 551, 553, 564, 574, 583, 586, 588, 590, 591, 594, 597

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• The Ox-Cam Arc should be set aside too • No expansion of villages • 'insult' to put more housing in Longstanton • Don't destroy the last remaining paddock in Melbourn • the river basins including Nine Wells should be protected for say 30 or 50 m on either side • Chalk streams should be protected • Too much development in Petersfield recently that is too tall and unclear how facilities can support it • Don't allow EWR to build a 30ft high embankment across the countryside • Preserve area around Biomedical Campus • No to expansion of Trinity Science Park • Plan to build houses between Mingle Lane & Hinton Way is terrible • Have limited/ moderate growth	
A densified, compact Cambridge is needed	2, 106

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Comments criticising the rate of growth, including: • The housing/growth projections are based on the pre-levelling up policies. • Needs to take account of how things have changed post-Covid and reduce housing figures/ reduce commercial office space • Assumptions about job growth should be reassessed • Combining jobs and housing is a nice idea but doesn't always work as it is easier to move job than move house. Jobs also usually come after housing, e.g., Northstowe • With working from home, people can live much further away from their place of work/ have more dispersed development • Need more data that incorporates climate change Question whether housing can be delivered due to water issues	132, 163 171, 174, 188, 247, 328, 354, 385, 498, 515, 521, 564
New developments need to have character	91
Council is destroying Greater Cambridge	7, 255

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Some expansion into the green belt seems inevitable but I think the creation of satellite settlements seems a good way to accommodate expansion in a way that saves Cambridge from becoming an endless urban sprawl and everyone has good access to green open spaces and the countryside.	287
Concentrate development and new jobs in new towns, ensure there is enough in the new town so that residents do not need to commute in cars	309, 479, 522
Disagree with the concept of compact housing developments. People are looking for space for their families. If people cannot find/afford the space in the Greater Cambridge area, they would choose to move out of the area, rather than live in squashed conditions in the city. This would then defy the objective of reducing commuting/people living closer to their employment.	259, 265
The Greater Cambridge area in 2041 should be dynamic and prosperous	66
Need to encourage employment opportunities outside of city of Cambridge	68

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Object to the Plan for reasons including: • Stop expanding population • Want an underdeveloped and preserved area • no more housing • emphasise retrofitting, not new development • Limited jobs • Don’t build on St Matthews Garden • Don’t build in Great Shelford • Fewer people will lead to fewer emissions • Vast overestimate of needed houses. Instead, there should be a limited number • Should be net zero change in the sqm of built environment • Easier to decarbonise without growing • Previous developments have brought negative consequences. Trinity Science Park is a prime example of what should be opposed	18, 22, 57, 64, 71, 80 123, 134, 138, 144, 169, 200, 203, 223, 226, 241, 242, 257, 303, 304, 318, 319, 321, 330, 365, 378, 382, 387, 393, 395, 399, 414, 423, 426, 448, 460, 462, 469, 474, 484, 485 486, 488, 495, 500, 503, 504, 507, 513, 529, 545, 569, 573, 576, 578, 586, 592, 595

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Expanding Cambridge is against governments levelling-up agenda • Don’t build in the city of Cambridge • Plan will exacerbate inequalities • Cambridge will be hit hard by flooding so should stop building and should also stop harm to chalk aquifer • Need to keep it ‘nice and quiet’ • Development will harm quality of life for residents and their health • Street design of Cambridge is not adequate for population growth • Where is your analysis of the radical changes to work-life patterns post-Covid? • Where is your analysis of climate change degradation of unnecessary new buildings? • Should prioritise less growth and should prioritise small homes instead • Water supply issue	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Effect on food security • Democratic deficit in process • Spatial strategy of putting work + employment in one centre is outdated and belongs to industrial age, not digital economy • Based on previous record, the addition of more homes doesn't add to the availability of affordable homes. Nowhere does the plan address this • Transport is in hands of so many different groups, it is difficult to understand who is consulting on what and results in a muddle • Move for sustainable transport will negatively impact the poor + key workers • This Plan is dependent on EWR, but unclear what is happening with OX-CAM Arc + EWR, how can issues such as water be conclusively dealt with?	
Same as now, but without the unelected Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership	19

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Local farmland can be used to provide local food for local people.	11
A greener and friendlier city - working together well as a community and growing more of their own food with vibrant markets selling them.	148
There isn't enough water to support existing plans, let alone adding more. Greater Cambridge in 2041 should be a better version of what we have today, not a bigger version. No transport through villages that doesn't serve villages.	95
Embrace Doughnut economic ideas and principles	89
I am very impressed with the research and thought that has gone into the development of this plan as well as the commitment to genuine consultation.	245
I think it’s an awful plan which will destroy and swamp the city of Cambridge and surrounding areas. Why are you so desperate to build so many ugly, pokey, packed in houses to destroy our lovely county?	27

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Services should be spread equally, small villages like Fowlmere are usually forgotten	217
Provide new development over infill and there should be no infill of overdeveloped Bourn	171
Understand need for affordable houses, but sites need to be chosen which will not exacerbate environmental and infrastructure pressures	412
Cambridge should be the world leading Environmental, social, and corporate governance city by then	483
The Plan seems to prioritise biomedical rather than technology. Where is the next Arm (company) going to come from/ grow/ expand? The Plan should not exclude the Trinity Science Park and I request it is put back in the Plan as would also mean North of Cambridge gets a significant new open space with the Country Park	191
I disagree with economic growth plans, which were never put out to public consultation, we've just had to accept this and hence all the subsequent development and congestion that comes with it.	128

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
I fully appreciate the inevitability of development and need to reduce personal car use in support of global climate change	202
Stop assuming growth should be maximised	119
Most of the population appear to feel that to turn the area into a metropolis is a short-sighted approach given that the UK is a relatively small island in the big scheme of things. Communities are being eroded and the population is being distanced from democracy.	41
I worry about the impact of all this development on the quality of life for existing residents/ healthcare needs of existing residents, and those who need to drive for work in the city, especially in terms of increased congestion, supply of clean drinking water and the necessary infrastructure and utilities	36, 87
If you want your strategic plans to be meaningful for an uncertain future, you need to design in flexibility so future societies have options to deal with situations beyond our normal current experience. The pressure on local plans to meet population and job growth within local authority areas prevents progress made on a national conversation about	506

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
where we should be focusing any community growth – i.e., why would we choose to grow a city on the edge of the fens where the extremes of drought and flood are potential threats?	
No	62, 77, 493

Climate Change

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Need to have high environmental standards, including: • Need to be carbon net-zero/ reduce carbon footprint as much as possible • Solar panels on all buildings/ solar farms around the city • Remove the reliance on burning oil. • No gas should be available • Wind turbines for some rural homes for energy generation • Use rainwater harvesting	11, 16, 45, 81, 86, 101, 102, 109, 111, 133, 136, 179, 193, 255, 260, 263, 267, 272, 277, 282, 340, 350, 353, 381, 385, 389, 400, 404, 439, 447, 459, 489, 497, 506 508, 510, 513, 535, 551, 561, 566, 574, 575, 582

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Reduce carbon usage • Funding for eco-proofing older properties • Prioritise research into climate change and water safeguarding issues • Prioritise improving air quality • All development over 10 new homes should have WLC assessment • Highly insulated houses • Heat pumps • More renewable energy • Drones for deliveries • Should focus on repurposing, reducing travel, insulating housing • Important that Service Water Drainage at a site is completely understood. Underground pipes cannot be seen, so an observation window on the important flow pipes should be installed and observed.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Infrastructure within the G.C. area for a comprehensive circular economy, including facility to repair all kinds of goods for resale or charity, recycling of all recoverable materials, use of biomass waste for energy generation by anaerobic digestion, or for carbon sequestration • Geothermal energy should be linked with new developments • All areas to have plug-in EV sockets • Must be designed to passivhaus standard • Criminal that the new ‘wing development’ is not using world class standards for efficiency and is only using current building regulations. Should be ambitious as a ‘hi-tech’ city • Next to no black bin rubbish with people having changed buying habits to only essentials and must haves • New development should have green space which acts as heat sinks in summer and flood attenuation in winter	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Is there a case for shared facilities in some residential developments, which might attract climate change conscious purchasers/renters? e.g., shared laundry • Support proposal to require new developments to use a green infrastructure standard such as Building for Nature. Clear targets and requirements help developers by giving them certainty about what they need to do to obtain planning permission	
Suggestions relating to traffic + congestion, including: • Radical reduction in motor traffic • Private vehicle free Cambridge • Car-free in Greater Cambridge area • Low-emission zones • Cars should automatically be slowed down which would enable speed humps, etc. to be removed • Congestion charge/ penalties for cars should be applied. • Developments should prioritise non-car forms of transport	2, 4, 6, 8, 16, 76, 81, 104, 117, 128, 136, 143, 173, 200, 208, 237, 263, 264, 267, 276, 280, 281, 309, 317, 354, 366, 375, 382, 394, 401, 405, 411, 425, 459, 463, 468, 477, 485, 490, 508, 511, 519, 526, 529, 540, 545, 548, 562, 571, 573, 572

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Filters on traffic on narrow roads • More incentives for people to not use cars • Cars should have to go around city, not in it • Do not funnel traffic down a few streets	
Sustainable water supply should be a priority	475
The critical issue of embodied carbon in new buildings has been ignored in this consultation. Car travel is not the main source of carbon emissions.	132
The conversation around embodied carbon is developing fast, with it even being discussed by politicians and in the news. If it isn't possible to introduce targets in this current iteration of the local plan, it would be prudent to include a mechanism to enable the local authority to introduce these in future without a whole new Local Plan.	447
In G. Cambs there are a considerable number of rural communities reliant on oil. They have ageing power networks without the capacity to install heat pumps or car charging points. There is a risk that these communities will be further left behind. As part of new developments, section 106 agreements	593

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
must be negotiated to help rural residents also install renewables. There are many roofs in these areas that would benefit from solar PV with batteries plugged into this “smart” network.	

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Change the overarching approach of the Plan to place more emphasis on safeguarding biodiversity and saving the planet. Comments include: • Avoiding flooding should be a priority • Must be a huge retrofitting programme • Sustainable water supply should be the absolute priority • Cambridge should be leading on environmental action. • Cambridge should prioritise well-being not just economic growth.	11, 40, 54, 75, 173, 200, 230, 250, 256, 282, 285, 289, 323, 327, 347, 356, 373, 381, 382, 386, 387, 410, 411, 415, 423, 451, 471, 484, 485, 497, 501, 503, 525 , 526, 564, 566, 569

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Want GC to be a place where commercial interests do not 'call the shots' in planning • Improving air quality to WHO standards • Needs to be a realistic assessment of water supply/ energy supply • Many dangerous suggestions currently in Local Plan, including expansion of Biomedical Campus • Nothing that harms environment should be considered. After environment issues are put front and centre, then Council can address issue of socio-economic improvements	
Suggestions to improve green spaces including: • Bigger and more joined up wild areas • Wildlife corridors • Increase in natural parks with trees and lakes • More trees • A place where locals can help the forest. • Nature reserves where animals can run free	17, 20, 23, 45, 47, 75, 76, 81, 109, 111, 130, 135, 143, 151, 155, 166, 183, 196, 238, 239, 251, 253, 262, 264, 265, 267, 287, 313, 321, 340, 347, 365, 371, 375, 378, 382, 388, 397, 399, 421, 434, 436, 450, 454, 466, 476, 487, 490, 508, 510, , 511, 519, 525, 542, 543, 548, 553, 562, 566, 568, 574, 575, 579, 587, 588

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• More green spaces • Country parks • Preserve Coton Corridor • Preserve Magog Down area • Develop a wooded area for recreational use • Park on airfield • Protect wildlife and plant-life. Keep wild areas truly wild • New development should not damage trees • Woodland around individual centres • Green spaces need to promote biodiversity • Hedgehog highways • More hedges • Should switch away from pesticides to protect biodiversity • Needs to better manage wildlife at Coldham's lane and Snaky Path, but city is good at planting street trees and attractive roundabouts	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Where there is development on green field sites (e.g., Darwin Green), the adverse impact would be greatly diminished by stipulating that existing hedgerows, vegetation and topography along existing roads must be maintained. Where such do not exist, a margin of newly planted trees should be required. • The amount of land devoted to car parking and roads should be reduced in favour of more space for trees and plantings, which will help to absorb carbon and make roads and streets more pleasant. • The number of dedicated nature reserve sites should be increased proportionate to any new housing. • Green places to get away from people + public transport links to get to these places • At least 1 hectare of NEW high quality nature space for every 10 new homes, within a 5-minute walk from those homes. • Mix of woodland, meadows, marshland, ponds, etc, with walkways.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• A new country park in Longstanton or Northstowe	
Keep natural habitat compared to the vast tracts of open crop fields. On the crop fields, promote cycling and create wildlife corridors. Don't allow private owners of meadows to sell them for development	166
It is paramount that Grantchester meadows be included as an integral part of G. Cambs green infrastructure. This would extend the Cambridge Nature Network. The plan mentions King's College specifically as a potential delivery partner. It should work with them and Cambridge Past Present and Future to create a conservation covenant across the Grantchester Meadow area. This would aid its inclusion in the W.Cambridge buffer zone. Low carbon public transport should be provided into and around the area. Litter collection, car travel and parking all need to be organised better.	593

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Community food facilities, including • Allotments • Small agriculture that can provide fresh fruit and vegetables to the locality in ways that enhance the soil, nature and biodiversity • Should create facilities to promote knowledge of where food comes from and where people can enjoy food together • Zero food waste	9, 262, 363, 371, 400
A safer/ inclusive area, including: • Open and visible new streets • Safer streets where children can play • Better lighting • New development should be well-maintained	106, 202, 251, 354, 466. 468, 497, 510, 529, 540, 582, 490
Healthier communities, comments included: • Tackling mental and physical health issues. And for health care a more long term and preventative system	121, 134, 148, 206, 265, 373, 385 398, 407, 421, 439, 468

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
including exercise, complementary therapies and community building to prevent loneliness. • Recent blocks of flats will not lead to healthy communities • New housing needs adequate open, green space • Trees should provide shade on streets • Emphasise community building	
Another hospital.	521
Community facilities, including: • Retirement homes for old people • Community centre • Provision for arts activities • Community theatres • Galleries • One respondent is supportive of policy WS/CF to protect community/ sports/ leisure facilities • All housing needs new GP surgeries	8, 119, 262, 369, 378, 410, 422, 466, 487, 542, 551, 553, 575, 579

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Small neighbourhoods with public spaces would be welcome • Ninewells is currently without a community centre • Require a sliding scale of contribution from all new developments not just those over a certain threshold • More facilities for young people • A swimming pool in Northstowe	
More leisure facilities, including: • Allow permissions for entertainment venues and retail parks outside of Cambridge so everyone doesn't have to travel to Cambridge • More wet weather activities for families • Emphasis on 'square lifestyle' in main city with outdoor seating and licenses for bars and coffee shops until 2am • City needs a world class concert hall like Saffron Hall • Skateboarding facilities that light up at night • Need skateboarding facilities on the new meadows' development	48, 52, 81, 239, 246, 408, 410. 413, 466, 514, 516

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Sport facilities	81, 466
Social justice aspirations, including: • Break down the barriers between the university elite, super rich and those from lower socio economic groups - there is a feeling of fragmentation at present • No homeless people • Investing in poorer parts of the city • The colleges should do more, particularly working with deprived schools in the city • Reducing inequality across the city • Poor people shouldn't be pushed to the margins • Consider controlling visitor/ tourist numbers, possibly through tourist tax • Concentrate on moving economic activity to areas that actually need it. • Control on greedy growth	148, , 151, 169, 339, 509
School improvements, including: • There should be schools for people of all ages	135, 361, 490, 511, 548

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• There should be more SEN schools • Schools should never be on major roads.	
Not enough commitment to connect jobs, culture and social facilities. Facilities promised by developers during the early days of big developments have been quietly forgotten and replaced by flats. A whole generation of bored teenagers have been neglected by unimaginative plans that have not delivered pools, gyms, etc.	171

Great places

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Identity considerations, including: • Protect old buildings • Maintaining differentiation between city and villages • Too much traffic currently in Cambridge, don't spoil it more.	46, 69, 70, 71, 105, 106, 249, 286, 296, 356, 386, 390, 407, 418, 480, 492, 494, 540, 548, 574,

• Maintain the beauty + identity of villages • No urban sprawl • Less isolating • Cambridge should not become a dormitory town for London	
Why are the centres of these new developments pound-stores and supermarkets? Surely in a region with Cambridge's history of innovation we can be more imaginative in our urban design – creating village squares that are the heart of historic market towns, precincts and Saturday craft and food markets, and small units for sole traders and start-ups?	171

Jobs

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
More commercial facilities are needed to improve the lives of citizens, including: • Pubs • Shops • Cafes	31, 262, 362, 408, 470, 471, 490, 510, 511, 526, 548, 575, 598

• Housing developments need shops that will act as a 'natural centre' • Amenities should not be an afterthought • Amenities should be close to housing to reduce need to travel • Need to move away from out-of-town shopping centres	
Out of town shopping areas are needed	47
More businesses are needed	31

Homes

Summary of issues raised in comments	**Comments highlighting this issue**
Housing suggestions, including: • Low-rise flats of 3/4 levels, including basements and roof top gardens • Green spaces between houses • Many new homes are needed • Provide more housing for people to downsize into • Lack of smaller, affordable homes	9, 16, 73, 106, 111, 128, 169, 179, 181, 218, 231, 251, 253, 266, 280, 283, 337, 407, 432, 439, 490, 500, 510, 511, 519, 540, 548, 579

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Less large luxury homes/ luxury suburbs are needed • Should exceed minimum space standards • New housing should be beautiful • Keep innovating like Marmalade Lane • New housing should fit in with local architecture • Should ensure housing is well-insulated • Use sustainable materials to build houses • Needs to be well-designed and big enough • Must be truly sustainable • Need an emphasis on quality, smaller developments • New developments should not be cut off from amenities • Use brick and tiles, not render • Should be in harmony with existing neighbourhoods and not pull-down quality pre-existing buildings • Ensure enough homes for old people • Provide support for housebuilders to ensure pace of construction isn't slowed down.	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Intention to build more compact buildings is not a good idea as it will destroy wildlife • Integrating different housing types and construction of regular meeting places can improve community cohesion • All new housing should be constructed to be water neutral, and no housing should be built until the problem of unsustainable abstraction is resolved adequately. • Housing should be on quiet neighbourhood streets that are good for cycling because they have very low levels of car traffic. • Nuclear housing development	
Affordability suggestions including: • Affordable housing • More small homes, closer together • Homes for essential workers • Housing needed for biotech industry • Much lower house prices	8, 52, 76, 81, 99, 121, 169, 278, 323, 327, 339, 340, 344, 348, 349, 360, 381, 383, 385, 392, 420, 466, 471, 475 ,503, 575

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Making Cambridge a more affordable place for young people • Affordable housing should be mixed with other tenures • Greater emphasis on community/ co-housing housing • More council housing • Need to ensure there is a community on new housing estates • 40% affordability should be rigorously enforced and a large % of this being at social rent level	
Housing development should be where there is employment within 200m We should have pockets of developments - say c 500 people to a unit and then gaps; with greater gaps over say 2000 people. And allow commercial and entrepreneurial activities to develop - leave room for future technology changes and growth of both population / commercial activities.	289
Need to ensure that the Local Plan allocates enough houses so that uncontrolled development isn't taking place in unsustainable village locations	213

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do more to change people owning multiple homes/ stop wealthy landlords owning multiple homes	64, 210
Less ugly new builds that look like shipping containers/ City should flow out from its historic core/ Developments should look less like prison blocks and more like “English” houses.	45, 49, 106, 283, 286, 334, 337

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Comments about infrastructure, including: • Must not fall into what has happened with the last Local Plan where housing was built without infrastructure • Must ensure all infrastructure is right and put in place first before any developments are allowed to be built. • Must be open if development is going to be placed onto busway stops, the parish councils must be informed so that they can plan for proper infrastructure.	90, 126, 141, 171, 187, 202, 225, 243, 249, 260, 271, 365, 382, 439, 463, 465, 468, 470, 505, 513, 526, 537, 551

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Must be realistic + build only number of houses that can be sustained by water, infrastructure etc. • Level of development is causing massive parking, school capacity and health capacity issues, yet you still allow it? • Spend less money on roundabouts, but more on pavements • Current infrastructure must improve • Developers must be held to account and actually deliver amenities • Building too many houses without infrastructure is very stressful for residents • Cambridge is an old town, and the centre cannot support the number of people who it seems will be here by 2041. The infrastructure in and around the city needs to be thought about proactively rather than reactively. • Want to see it become a city with adequate water, power, digital and communications infrastructure	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Sewerage treatment plants should be built to adequately support any new housing development. • Use planning conditions to mandate micro generation like solar panels on all new dwellings, and EV charge points for new developments. • Mandate 1Gbps network connections as a minimum for new development.	
Transport improvements, including: • Adequate parking spaces (possible underground garages) • Routes which encourage active transport • Better road surfaces to make cycling safer • Scooter for hire schemes • Areas to prioritise cycling and walking over cars • Safe, lit walking routes, especially for women + children • P & R should run 24/7, be more regular be doubled in size and linked to train. Suggestion it should be free. • We need a metro system	8, 20, 29, 45, 48, 53, 66, 68, 76, 83, 84, 86, 87, 93, 104, 106, 108, 117, 120, 121, 123, 128, 130, 136, 142, 143, 151, 159, 166, 169, 171, 179 , 200, 202, 206, 212, 218, 221, 225, 228, 233, 239, 242, 246, 251, 253, 263, 264, 265, 276, 278, 282, 284, 299, 306, 309, 317, 325, 327, 337, 343, 347, 354, 358, 362, 371, 373, 382, 384, 394, 398, 400, 404, 405, 408, 410, 411, 412, 415, 417, 422, 425, 434, 453, 454, 459, 463, 468, 475, 477, 485, 490, 491, 492, 497, 499, 509, 510, 511, 519, 520, 522, 525, 526, 528, 530, 534, 544, 545, 546, 551, 552, 553, 554, 557, 560, 561, 562, 564, 568, 571, 575, 577, 582, 598

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Bicycles should be prioritised at junctions • Should include disabled people and ensure that they also have good transport. Inclusive cycle routes for all forms of travel • Intersecting bus routes, not linear ones • More footpaths open to public • Cycle paths for all ages • Develop travel hubs in towns and villages with links to Cambridge • Better connectivity to areas outside of the Greater Cambridge area. • Buses to be electric, hydrogen or zero emissions • Use small buses not double deckers • Need modern buses • Remember, not everyone can cycle, should prioritise pedestrians • Schools need to be located off main roads • Public transport needs to run for later hours	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Improve links of new towns, such as Cambourne, to Cambridge • South Cambridgeshire villages need better public transport to Addenbrookes and the City Centre for our elderly, students and those who work on the biomedical site and city centre. • Secure, attractive bike parking/ storage • Affordable and reliable public transport services are desperately needed. • Centralised bus system with one price per ticket which could be switched on different services • Free public transport • More space between cars and people • Transport should link from Cambridge to tourist sites outside of Cambridge • Pedestrianisation of Cambridge centre • Cheap underground railway	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Pavement needs to be widened along the Moor near Melbourn • Provision of public areas to access services + green spaces • Busway needs improvements • Through-routes to traffic should be avoided in residential areas, including villages. The strategic road network should be the primary route for heavy traffic. Provision for segregated active travel should be made alongside these roads with regular safe crossing. • Roads need to be drastically improved to cope with population and vehicle use • Delivery should be based around delivery hubs so last-mile is cycle-based • Rapid transit connections to the centre of Cambridge and station are needed, especially from new developments • Set a policy that all new developments will have at least 50% of journeys by cycling and walking	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
• Developers are continually getting away with providing poor quality cycle parking. • Cycle parking needs to be usable by non-standard cycles, including cargo cycles • Metro needed with stations setting out to village/ other settlements in Cambridgeshire	
Forget guided bus, tram and metro schemes as too expensive for returns	263
Congestion charging is not the answer. Congestion occurs mildly at two peak times each weekday.	325
Private electric cars are not sustainable transport	571
Prioritise train/ light-rail/ tram network and reduce some bus services	265
Need diverse public transport, adjusted to the different needs of the region and competing for every single passenger. Relying on solely on buses is a mistake and you'll likely to see the effects of that when people start leaving the Greater Cambridge because of a ghetto style of house development	131

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
with poor access to Cambridge while the elites can cycle and walk to work.	
Comments relating to cars • Improve planning for electric cars, including electric car charging point • Each dwelling should have charging point • EV charging points should not obstruct paths. • Communal charging points for flats • Incentives for electric cars • Think about self-driving cars	38, 46, 324, 468, 477, 509, 526, 547, 564, 575, 582
Until the public transport system can provide affordable, reliable and frequent journeys that support peoples' individual lifestyle choices, provision for the car should not be sacrificed/ some car travel might be unavoidable// Both the climate and air quality concerns of cars will naturally go with the move to electric cars, so no need for the local plan to solve those problems / stop closing roads in the city	72, 87, 112, 215, 243, 306, 554, 577
Cambridge has one of the largest proportions of the classic car market (£10bpa) in the UK. By reducing car access and	261

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
bringing in emission's charges, many small businesses will have to close or move and the £10b will reduce and with it tax.	
Don't forget about electrical power generation. Where is it all going to come from, and how resilient are the systems in place to unusual weather and/or malicious attack?	24
In relation to water issues, abstraction rates may need to be reduced significantly to safeguard natural river flow and there is no capacity to increase groundwater abstraction from the chalk	171
More affordable parking	47, 81
No parking facilities in new development / should be a rare exception on new developments	102, 552
Please abandon the proposed travel hub near Babraham as it will destroy the greenbelt and numerous habitats along the way with no benefit for the residents. It is hugely expensive as well. Make improvements along A1307 instead or restore the old railway from Haverhill.	533, 538, 597

Other comments

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
It would be nice if the planners were honest instead of asking for input on a deal, they have already agreed behind closed doors.	74
Colleges should free up land to sell for building on, so much of their land is unused and central.	81
Better than Carbon neutral; restoring nature, drawing down Carbon and with a vibrant blooming natural environment.	89
Can we honestly say the last local plan is improving Cambridge?	90
Policy 60 in the existing 2018 Cambridge Local Plan must - in all iterations of the Local Plan - be not only retained 100% in full but also strengthened to make it more easily observed and enforced.	12, 265
Support Policy 23, of the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan.	12, 265
Cambridge should be cleaner	323
My home area is green but overrun by those who do not live here to use it for anti-social behaviour	308

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There have been suggestions that the government is planning to override planners with very large-scale developments this is not helpful in the long-term growth of this area. Strongly oppose massive developments	424
In an updated version of Policy 23 the boundary of the 'Eastern Gate Opportunity Area' must be redrawn to exclude both the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and the allotments on New Street	12
Comments about relocation of Wastewater Treatment Plant • Would like the Northeast Cambridge proposal not to be dependent on the unnecessary relocation of the Wastewater Treatment Works to Green Belt Land • Disagree with relocation of Plant • Keep the Cowley Road treatment plant where it is. as it will ruin the green belt and waste our taxpayer's money/ it should be shown on the Local Plan/ Local people should be listened to	60, 100, 146, 150, 385, 395, 438, 461, 518, 594
Want it to be a place people want to live and will look after	133
Copy the Netherlands	15

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
As it is now rural and happy	30
It will be covered in concrete ugly boxes and drinking water will be rationed. There won't be any green belt left, and no one will want to live here.	63
A town that is safe from rising sea levels. A town that is a safe place to be for my children and grandchildren. A town that plays its part in saving the planet.	101
Overdevelopment threatens to undermine social cohesion and it will be essential to support resident/ interest groups in new developments to maintain civic identity/ social fabric	190
I feel that nobody in government or government is listening to the voices of residents, but only to the voices of those who want to make money	134
Works shall be done to Newmarket Road	157
Needs to take account of how things have changed post-Covid and working in coastal towns should be prioritised	175
Be bold and use all space, don't restrict to certain areas	204

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Avoid Thakeham new town/ Should not be accepted just because they give money to government/ Thakeham tried to bypass democracy	164, 233, 270, 293, 595
It depends if the railway to the West gets built or not.	177
It was a bad idea to move the Council offices to Alconbury, as public transport access is terrible	113
It should be like it was in 1991 - a nice place to live.	268
Thankfully I will no longer be here to see my beloved Cambridge transformed into an urban new town.	273
I should like if there are planning conditions attached to a planning application that these are carried through and checked	275
New development should only be made after substantial consultation with members of the public. Could the attached survey be attached to the Cambridge News as it not everyone uses computers	386
Need to advertise Local Plan initiatives	437
To Question 11, I would like to add: housing that cannot be used as buy-to-let or second homes - must be primary	168

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
residence. Question 12 I would like to add prioritise proper drainage and sewerage - in Longstanton we suffer as our sewerage systems often overflow as they have not been updated to take into account the extra load from more houses and residents. In addition, the development has caused more flooding, whilst also adversely affecting the local water table. There seems to be little accountability for the developers of projects, section 106 agreements are not honoured, and restrictions ignored, and it feels like developers are there to make a quick buck and there is no care for what is actually being delivered and the long term impact. I strongly feel there should be no more development additional to what has already been signed off in Longstanton and Northstowe. We have had over a decade of constant development and noise, there needs to be an end point and our green spaces need protecting for local wildlife as well as for drainage and water absorption.	
No more cheap flights or foreign packaged holidays	508
I would like to see analysis of the % of dwellings that are a) for students and b) foreign investor owned and for the latter, are	441

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
these all occupied or are many vacant? If there has been an increase in either of these over the recent years, I would like to see a discussion on whether there should be a limit on both. Colleges and investors buy up a lot of property in the City, pricing locals out of the market. This is exacerbating the need for housing and should not be allowed to get worse.	
2041? By the time you sort this out and get the ball rolling it will be useless and too small for everybody's needs. 2041 you should be ashamed of yourselves.	236
The St Neots road cycleway should be a source of shame the anyone involved with the planning and development of Camborne and is a key example of why there is so much public cynicism about new developments, and the single minded profiteering of the developers.	171
Plan is so dependent on EWR, but unclear what will happen with this.	595
EWR Southern approach should be rejected	593
Wording of Plan suggests EWR is approved, but the business case is flawed	171

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Yes, the results of this questionnaire be published.	482
Change its name, housing already decided	409