Appendix 9: Representations received on First Proposals consultation 2021

The responses received on the Fist Proposals Consultation are set out in Appendix E. These include:

- Vision and Aims
- Development Strategy
- Sites and Policy Areas
- Climate Change
- Biodiversity and Green Spaces
- Great Places
- Wellbeing and Social Inclusion
- Jobs
- Homes
- Infrastructure
- SA and HRA
- Quick Questionnaire

Vision and aims

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 and plan process. Comments shown here are those that relate directly to the vision and aims; comments relating to development strategy will be presented at the JLPAG meeting on that topic.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Broad support for the vision and aims was expressed within the representations. Specific elements praised by respondents such as the Environment Agency and the University of Cambridge include the aspiration to locate development in the most environmentally friendly locations, the prioritisation of climate mitigation and adaption, the vision for villages and emphasis placed upon infrastructure and water. Respondents suggested improvements to the vision such as including references to Cambridge as a centre of educational excellence, tightening up language to avoid ambiguity and placing greater emphasis upon landscape, heritage, and nature.

Criticisms of the vision included a perception that it was too Cambridge-centric and that rural settlements needed to be included. Other respondents were concerned that the level of development in the Plan could undermine environmental goals. One respondent noted that a greater emphasis on placemaking was needed, and several argued that the Plan would not sufficiently address inequality. Other issues which respondents felt should gain prominence included water efficiency, the issue of the water supply and sustainable transportation. Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted the significant infrastructure required to support the plan, and other public bodies stressed how the Plan needs to protect sports facilities, promote healthier lifestyles, and safeguard biodiversity. Some developers stressed the importance of using the Plan to deliver ambitious housing targets, and also noted that the environmental aims of the plan should not have a detrimental impact upon the other elements of delivering sustainable development.

Table for comments on ‘Vision and Aims’

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support vision and aims

Comments highlighting this issue

- **Public Bodies**
- 56570 (Gamlingay PC), 56859 (Bassingbourn PC), 59138 (Cambourne TC),
- **Third Sector Organisations**
- 57538 (Save Honey Hill Group), 58294 (University of Cambridge),
- **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners**

- 58181 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58300 (Hill Residential and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58591 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons ltd), 60668 (Mill Stream Developments), 58327 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support for Vision, including:

- Accords with NPPF;
- Sets a clear theme which runs through policy particularly in relation to reduction in climate impacts, minimising carbon emissions, increasing nature, wildlife and green spaces;
- Climate mitigation and adaption and a thriving ecosystem are vital and integral to health and wellbeing of residents and long term economic prosperity;
- Support vision for villages;
- Focus on increasing quality of everyday life for all communities, sustainability, accessibility and healthy place shaping;
- Safeguarding landscapes;

Comments highlighting this issue

- **Individuals**
- **Public Bodies**
- 56906 (West Wickham PC), 57311 (Huntingdonshire DC), 59483 (Shepreth PC), 59718 (Environment Agency), 59880 (Fen Ditton PC), 59965 (Natural England),
- **Third Sector**
- 58962 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area),
- **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners**
- 57163 (Deal Land LLP), 57343 (HD Planning Ltd), 58254 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58648 (Deloitte LLP), 58697 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 60216 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support overarching vision and strongly support Great Places and Jobs aims.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57188 (Deloitte)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support overarching vision and strongly support Great Places, Jobs, Homes and Wellbeing and Social Inclusion aims.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57264 & 58201 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (Commercial))

Summary of issues raised in comments

Suggested amendments to Vision:

- Mention high levels of in-commuting and aim to reverse it;
- Lacks reference to Cambridge as centre of excellence and world leader in higher education and research, what makes Cambridge distinctive and successful;
- 'Big' should be defined to avoid ambiguity;
- Amend to "…all our and neighbouring communities";
- Align to NPPF aims (paras 7 and 8) and demonstrate the importance for Greater Cambridge;
- More holistic approach to securing multi-functional benefits through protection and enhancement of natural environment;
- Recognise wider benefits of ecosystem services, considering a natural capital evidence approach and making strong links to Nature Recovery Network and Cambridge Nature Network;
- Integration between location of new development (homes and jobs) and infrastructure needs to be expressed more clearly.
- Add reference to Oxford-Cambridge Arc, need to plan positively to deliver transformational growth;
- Want an inspiring vision that recognises importance of landscape, heritage and nature; where growth complements well known characteristics of the historic core of Cambridge;
- Reference supporting rural communities and ensuring proportionate growth to ensure they thrive;
- Recognise the River Cam is invaluable but vulnerable asset for its nature, wildlife, amenity or heritage.

Comments highlighting this issue

- **Individuals**
- **Public Bodies**
- 59466 (Shepreth PC), 59718 (Environment Agency), 59880 (Fen Ditton PC), 59965 (Natural England),
- **Third Sector**
- 58197 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58294 (University of Cambridge), 60178 (Cam Valley Forum),
- **Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners**
- 57326 (Clarendon Land), 57343 (HD Planning Ltd), 58254 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58413 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58591 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons ltd), 58621 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 59830 (MCA Developments Ltd), 60293 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn site), 60300 (Miller Homes – Melbourn site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support Vision. But centric to sustainability of Cambridge and transport patterns for commuting and ignores rural settlements. Crucial rural areas meet local housing needs and reinvigorate and regenerate (NPPF paras 79, 62, 78).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59023 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Broadly support the vision and aims but question whether parts of Plan can achieve them, including:

nonsensical to claim that "a big decrease in our climate impacts" can be achieved through building thousands of new homes – strategy should start by addressing existing environmental challenges such as energy inefficient buildings

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57634 (Histon and Impington PC), 60739 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Conflict between scale and impacts of growth and:

- Environmental and social gains;

- Aspirations for environment, heritage and local communities;

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56800 (M Colville), 58197 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future),

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support vision and aims, general direction of development strategy, but concerned scale of development and continuing high levels of growth are driven by technical economic growth forecasts.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 660107 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Vision is contradictory, misconceived and undemocratic, unquestioning, unachievable, and based on inadequate evidence. Plan and consultation are premature.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60186 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Vision is unrealistic; deceptive to suggest accelerating growth is path to achieve zero emissions, improved wellbeing and social inclusion. History has shown economic growth led to increasingly unaffordable housing. Need to be more specific and prescriptive about outcomes in terms of placemaking over and above the specification of homes and locations.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58102 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The Plan should respond to the complex issues faced by Greater Cambridge in a more nuanced way, to meet the following goals: addressing the global climate and biodiversity emergencies, and the local/regional water emergency, while addressing social and environmental

inequality and protecting people's rights. Proposed revisions to the plan include:

- addressing varied disparities within Greater Cambridge
- prioritising environmental and social outcomes alongside economic outcomes, which are currently prioritised in the First Proposals
- Protecting areas and assets of particular importance (which we argue includes green belt land surrounding Cambridge, and the Cam chalk river system) 'provides a strong reason for restricting overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area (our emphasis, NPPF, Sustainable Development 11b).
- Put a severe brake on further development to avoid using up the carbon budget. Development on the scale proposed in the area is unsustainable, and is therefore potentially open to legal challenge
- Question impact on biodiversity. natural environment, water/rivers, energy demand, social and economic wellbeing for most disadvantaged.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59459 (Cambridge Labour Party Environment Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support development strategy, principles of plan-led, sustainable development, and general themes. Wording of many policies incomplete and the devil is in the detail - especially regarding Jobs, Homes and Infrastructure which have greatest impact on quality of local environment. Mitigating detrimental effects on rural communities needs to be managed. Welcome recognition of and need for reinforcement of distinctive character of villages.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59849 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support general thrust of Plan directing development to where it will have least environmental impact and provide opportunities for enhancements. Welcome recognition of challenges identifying long-term and interim solutions to water resource crisis. Support opportunities to deliver / contribute towards delivery of strategic green infrastructure. Additional work required to progress 'solutions' and demonstrate development can be delivered sustainably. 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 delivery of measures to address water resource issue and implement strategic green infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59964 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support the aims

Comments highlighting this issue

- Developers and landowners
- 57524 (H d'Abo), 58532 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners (Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell)), 58854 (bpha), 58938 (Endurance Estates), 59019 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 59260 (Croudace Homes),

Summary of issues raised in comments

TMLC strongly supports Great Places, Jobs and Homes aims.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58697 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Welcome approach to identify 7 key themes.

Suggest "connectivity" both within and beyond Greater Cambridge should be considered as an additional theme - 'golden thread' that runs through all key themes

Each theme will influence how you plan homes, jobs and infrastructure and ultimately where growth will be directed.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59693 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Excellent aims; hope prominence is given to climate change, biodiversity and green spaces, well being and social inclusion in addressing other four aims, and do not suffer attrition as translated into actions.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57697 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Pleased many of our comments at Issues and Options are reflected in First Proposals, helping to strengthen ‘big themes’ including climate change, biodiversity and green spaces, wellbeing and social inclusion.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59964 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Suggested additional aims:

- avoid extensive development in villages, and
- absolute preservation of Green Belt

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56800 (M Colville), 58719 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Climate change is the most important aim.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56872 (J Prince), 57062 (W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Climate change of paramount importance and any loss of natural biodiversity we have in our region should be guarded.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57848 (T Harrold)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Comments in relation to water including:

- Water efficiency MUST be a top priority for new developments;
- All house building in low lying Fen areas needs to be built to mitigate against flooding;
- Not enough consideration of deleterious impacts on bio-systems, chalk streams, predicted sea level rise;
- Overuse of natural water resources;
- Insufficient supply, Lincolnshire hasn't enough spare water;
- Stop excessive extraction from underground waters;

Review plan to secure safe, clean, unpolluted environment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57855 & 57856 (T Harrold), 59458 (C Amory), 60502 (A de Burgh)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58915 (Cambridge Water)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59969 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Create significant and preserved nature corridors from edge of city to rural belt and do not adopt an encircling approach.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57604 (A Radmore)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Agree with protecting green spaces. Very important for quality of life, protecting qualities that makes Cambridge City a great and unique place, particularly setting of historic centre, relationship with countryside with a network of green spaces to west complementing the built environment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57923 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Plan for making neighbourhoods conducive to encourage healthy lifestyles

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56852 (Sport England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

New housing developments must provide on-site facilities and opportunities for informal activity in line with Sport England's Active Design Guidance

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56852 (Sport England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Emerging Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy must identify where new facilities are needed and existing to be protected

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56852 (Sport England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Well-established connection between planning and health; include policies which reflect wider determinants of health and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well designed places.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59109 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Aims do not include what is most vital: how to maintain, enhance, and provide more equitable access to what makes Cambridge special, in face of combined challenges of growth and Climate Change. Should be key priority of Historic Environment Strategy which is required by NPPF but absent from First Proposals.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60186 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support focus on climate issues. Whilst it should lead to increase in quality of life, not for poorest or most socially disadvantaged. More to it than “good growth”. Lacking detail how addresses acute housing affordability, how match between jobs and homes helps given in migration, community benefits or infrastructure to support growth - how and when it will be funded and delivered. Consider implications on services, e.g. healthcare.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58810 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Development must be relevant to need, mindful of adequate infrastructure and in character with the area.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56859 (Bassingbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Whilst we believe in progress and the general development strategy, concerned about loss of village identity, destroying unique quality of landscape character, diminishing green belt separation and the change of our village design. Object to site; use brownfield not prime agricultural land in green belt.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57562 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Urge greater protection of village separation.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59258 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Fail to reflect importance of tourism, its role in economy and local employment. Highlight the significance of tourism, meeting demand for tourist accommodation, and how can support other aspects of economic strategy, adapting to flexible working post-Covid.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57190 (R Cowell)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Does not contemplate significant changes resulting from pandemic. Assess revised models and consider former office or retail brownfield sites.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57604 (A Radmore)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support Jobs and Homes aims. Achieving a balance spatially in location of jobs and homes, particularly relevant in sustaining economic growth and success of rural southern cluster.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58184 (SmithsonHill)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Overall aim should be to nurture Cambridge's development as national and global centre of excellence in education and research.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58294 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Essential to protect best agricultural land. Low-lying Fen Land will be flooded by 2100. Known as the "bread basket of England". Already import 40% food.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57858 (T Harrold)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Comments to Homes Aim include:

- Delivery of environmental objectives should not be to detriment of other elements of sustainable development;
- Be more ambitious to meet full affordable housing needs and boost supply (NPPF para 60);
- Include sufficient land and sites to meet needs, including affordable housing and sites in rural area;
- Crucial to plan for enough housing to support the area's considerable economic growth;
- Meet diverse needs in the communities where they arise to create thriving neighbourhoods and promote sustainable commuting;

Refer "to meet our needs, as a minimum".

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57147 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57163 (Deal Land LLP), 57189 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58254 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58648 (Deloitte LLP), 58854 (bpha)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Review positive and negative impacts of proposed housing development.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57604 (A Radmore)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Quotas of affordable housing MUST be adhered to.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57859 (T Harrold)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Build smaller independent homes, not blocks of flats.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57980 (E Osimo)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support Great Places and Homes aims. Aims should be applicable to every settlement class to fully achieve. Ensure rural areas are not overlooked and suitable sites are positively planned for.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59023 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Comments to Infrastructure Aim include:

- Add emphasis on serving existing communities as well as future growth;
- Include food and other shops in the facilities, recent developments permitted without provision or direct non-car access;
- Support aim to provide infrastructure, including educational facilities, in the right place at right time to serve growing communities, recommend a positive approach to new state funded education facilities;
- Definition of sustainable transport welcome but should be given greater prominence;

Add reference to development meeting Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 and other appropriate policies and measures.

Comments highlighting this issue

- **Individuals**
- 56674 & 57630 (J Conroy), 58099 (M Asplin), 57926 (F Goodwille)
- Public bodies
- 56922 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57474 & 57495 (ESFA (Department for Education), 59880 (Fen Ditton PC),
- Third Sector Organisations
- 57538 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support new development sites close to public transport nodes / corridors to ensure non-car travel options

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56570 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Welcome emphasis on active and public transport and sites where public transport is natural choice.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56922 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Going to be a challenge to deliver the required significant infrastructure in a sustainable way.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56922 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concerns over reliance on private car will lessen owing to uptake in electric / other fuels by 2035. May impact the strategy, particularly in respect of development within rural areas.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58621 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Understand wish to minimise reliance on car, most households still need a car or increased demand for taxis / home deliveries. Lack of fully integrated transport policy disappointing.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59258 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Welcome opportunity to input to better reflect existing and potential future use of non-motorised transport network. Very comprehensive with a lot of concern for biodiversity, historical sites, and conservation. Support policies that aim to protect, enhance, and develop rights of way network providing a network of routes. Circular routes or links with others are recommended. Need for accessible country parks. Needs a clear list of projects for NMU routes and public access which development should fund.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60823 (Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum)

Development Strategy

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

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.

Table of representations: Consultation format and approach

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59705 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59717 (Swavesey PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59858 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60250 (T Orgee), 58896* (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59545 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Democratic deficit in process and evidence basis. Engagement events planned at too short notice.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60240 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60240* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59436 (Anonymous)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

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 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59540 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- All offered response formats are inadequate. Consultation makes too many assumptions, and demands a formulaic response to a complex and interconnected series of issues.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59459 (Cambridge Labour Party Environment Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- All offered response formats are inadequate. Consultation makes too many assumptions, and demands a formulaic response to a complex and interconnected series of issues.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60209 (J V Neal)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Introduction should make the plan period more obvious

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56872 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59598 (M Lynch)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Misleading omission of housing proposed as part of Cambridge Biomedical Campus in Figure 4

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56963* (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Figure 33 not all of the annotations are correct. For example new allocations at Gt Shelford and Duxford should be purple.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59645 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Glossary - Please add Scheduled Monument and Registered Park and Garden, significance, and setting.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59688 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 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

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).

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 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 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.

The Development Strategy Update (2023) set out for members an update on the needs for jobs and homes, the objectively assessed need, development strategy principles and the development principles for strategic sites North East Cambridge, Cambridge East and Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The policy position and therefore the responses to reps in Appendix H supersedes in full, the policy position and reps in Appendix I the Update Strategy Chapter.

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

Summary of issues raised in Comments

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 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
- 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.
- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

Individuals

- 56480 (V Chapman), 56488 (D & B Searle), 56498 (W Grain), (RJ & JS Millard), 57061 (C Meadows), 57102 (J
- Francis), 57300 (AJ Johnson), 58145 (Mr James Manning), 58363 (D Moore), 58627 (R Grain), 58789 (S Grain), 60385 (David Wright), 60477 (P,J & M Crow),

Other Organisations

- 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners

- 56711 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57112 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 56894 (RWS Ltd), 56993 (Hastingwood 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 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)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

Individuals

- 57061 (C Meadows), 57102 (J Francis); 57300 (AJ Johnson), 58145 (J Manning),

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)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

Individuals

- 57061 (C Meadows), 57102 (J Francis); 58145 (J Manning)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners

- 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 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).

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

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).

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 58349 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 58851 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 60244 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 58529 (MacTaggart & Mickel)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• It is requested that jobs requirements in Policy S/JH are based on delivering the higher growth level option

Comments highlighting this issue

• 58709 (TWI)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 57329 (Clarendon Land and Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• OAN should be increased to at least 2,549dpa to align housing and economic growth and support the objectives of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 60322 (Daniels Bros (Shefford) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 60385 (David Wright)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 57249 (Deal Land LLP), 60270 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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

Comments highlighting this issue

• 60043 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 58661 (The Church Commissioners for England), 60567 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

• 57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments

• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
• Question the jobs numbers, whether gross or net, forecasts or projections.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59764* (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
• Concerned about how required housing has been assessed.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59258* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57221* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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;
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue
57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58958, 59108 & 59241 (Endurance Estates), 60608 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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. 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comment

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

Comments highlighting this issue

58659 & 58683 (Wates Developments Ltd), 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments

To provide for appropriate flexibility for unforeseen economic growth, a range of additional contingency site allocations should be included within the housing trajectory

Comments highlighting this issue

58659 & 58683 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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%

Comments highlighting this issue

58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 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

Comments highlighting this issue

59068 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59068 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59737 & 59738 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

As per para 10.19 of the October 2021 Housing Delivery Study (HDS), Waterbeach is assumed to deliver at 250dpa, but Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West are set to only deliver at 150dpa with the odd year of delivery rising to 200dpa. The clear evidence to justify this disparity in sites of a similar scale is unclear. Northstowe is consistently assumed to deliver 250 dpa but within the next 4 years is to deliver in excess of 300dpa. This approach would not appear to have been taken with regard to Table 18 of the HDS, which sets out that average build out rate of urban extensions delivering 2,000+ homes are 225-275. An expected delivery of over 300dpa for multiple years is highly optimistic and it is not clear from the evidence base how this is justified, to ensure no optimism bias this should be lowered to a more realistic average build out rate of 250dpa, which fits within the identified range above.

Comments highlighting this issue

60279 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
60667 (Mill Stream Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 Plan is unlikely to meet the specific housing needs of this part of Greater Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue
60667 (Mill Stream Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development should be focused towards existing employment clusters, such as Granta Park
Comments highlighting this issue
58709 (TWI)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
58527 (Martin Grant Homes), 60274 (Commercial Estates Group), 60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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].

Comments highlighting this issue

57543, 57546, 57552 & 57555 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Statements in paragraphs 6.37 and 6.38 of the ELR are contradictory, and it is not clear whether the ELR considers that the 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).

Comments highlighting this issue

58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

58556 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

58556 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59076 & 59318 (Newlands Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58958 & 59241 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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) 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

Comments highlighting this issue

57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58958, 59108 & 59241 (Endurance Estates), 60608 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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?

Comments highlighting this issue

60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Economic growth must be sustainable and it would be inappropriate to determine a level of need that is undeliverable, as advocated by the NPPF.

Comments highlighting this issue

57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

It is difficult to determine exactly how much employment need there is in the context of such a vibrant economy.

Comments highlighting this issue

57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

It is difficult to determine exactly how much employment need there is in the context of such a vibrant economy.

Comments highlighting this issue

57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57526 (H d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised in comments

There are issues with the conversion from homes:

• the baseline resident population used:

o ignores student housing entirely, which will have supported a considerable population.

o 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:

o 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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The economic variables used that are considered acceptable include unemployment rates, economic activity rates and double-jobbing.

Comments highlighting this issue
57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
56711 (KB Tebbit Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60244 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 employment space types and on this basis, we consider that the evidence in relation to jobs growth estimation lacks transparency and robustness.

Comments highlighting this issue

59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

60398 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59034 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The emerging Local Plan needs to consider updated evidence and to subsequently increase the employment supply across Greater Cambridge by allocating additional storage and distribution employment land of between 55.0 ha and 71.5 ha which is suitable, available and deliverable across the Plan period to 2041.

Comments highlighting this issue

59045 (Lolworth Development Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Agree that the Plan should formulate proposals based upon the forecast of the most likely level of new jobs

Comments highlighting this issue

60441 (Westley Waterless Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Principle of exceeding the standard method housing target is welcomed

Comments highlighting this issue

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 (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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supports ambitions for 44,000 new homes and 58,500 new jobs across all employment sectors.
Comments highlighting this issue
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the identified requirement for 44,400 new homes
Comments highlighting this issue
58601* (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58748* (Great Shelford -Ten Acres- Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
57315 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
57888 (C Schofield)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Due to the disparity between the different approaches to calculating homes and jobs numbers the Councils should take seriously the 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."

Comments highlighting this issue
59597 (M Lynch)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59597 (M Lynch)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60674 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 of scientific and technical undertakings in the fields of life sciences and health care.

Comments highlighting this issue
59597 (M Lynch)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
56851 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57635 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
59944 (L Frazer MP)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
60109 (C Blakely)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
59878 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Huntingdonshire District Council are not currently looking towards neighbouring authorities to assist in meeting their housing or jobs need.
Comments highlighting this issue
57315 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Why do you need each house to only accommodate 1.3 workers?
Comments highlighting this issue
56736 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58527 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
56711 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57513 (R2 Developments Ltd), 58253 (Bletsoes), 58527 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
59108 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
57513 (R2 Developments Ltd), 58527 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58273 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
Comments highlighting this issue
57513 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The general approach to identifying new rural allocations for housing is supported
Comments highlighting this issue
58881 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
58253 (Bletsoes), 58360 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms Hardington LLP), 58881 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
58428 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
59068 (A P Burlton Turkey’s Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58909 (Clare College, Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59850 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59850 & 59853 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60032 (S Fenn), 60235 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge City Council has declared a climate emergency, which this plan simply doesn't reflect. Request that it be rejected, rewritten and re-submitted for full public consultation

Comments highlighting this issue
60032 (S Fenn)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern about jobs led growth without any restrictions other than the market

Comments highlighting this issue
56964 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
Comments highlighting this issue
57644 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
57862 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
Comments highlighting this issue
56527 (C Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
Comments highlighting this issue
58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Employment land in the new settlements must be safeguarded and not lost to other uses.
Comments highlighting this issue
58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
GCSPS must work with other LAs to support the employment requirements of surrounding market towns.

Comments highlighting this issue
58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Homes should include all types, sizes and tenures, and include self-build
Comments highlighting this issue
56480 (V Chapman), 56488 (D & B Searle), 56498 (W Grain), 56516 (RJ & JS Millard), 58363 (D Moore), 58627 (R Grain), 58789 (S Grain)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
Comments highlighting this issue
59737 & 59738 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
60518 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to consider impacts on Green Belt for this amount of growth
Comments highlighting this issue
56511 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Figure of 2,111 new homes per annum mentioned here. Using pre-covid data and rejecting the Government standard models for development.
Comments highlighting this issue
59862 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need much higher standards for new developments
Comments highlighting this issue
56511 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
Comments highlighting this issue
56527 (C Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
Comments highlighting this issue
56860 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57644 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Important to reduce long distance commuting by car
Comments highlighting this issue
56571 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The existing allocations for employment must be fully utilised before any further release of land (eg S/CBC/A) is permitted.
Comments highlighting this issue
57932 (F Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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;
• 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
Comments highlighting this issue
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 (H Warnock), 60235 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60507 (R & K Whitaker), 60674 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.
Comments highlighting this issue
60076 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Review required after COVID/Brexit
Comments highlighting this issue
59122 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue

58368 (F Gawthrop)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59943 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The 2021 census will give a more accurate base for the actual numbers of houses needed to meet the total need in 2041.

Comments highlighting this issue

59943 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59943 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59943 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57785 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue
59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 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

Comments highlighting this issue
57785 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Other parts of the UK that may be better for growth than Cambridge – need to work with new department for levelling up

Comments highlighting this issue
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58351 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
57610 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No further allocations should be permitted until water supplies have been secured.

Comments highlighting this issue
57932 (F Goodwille), 60072 (R Evans)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59120 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

60248 (A Browne MP)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59498 (Babraham PC), 60072 (R Evans), 60229 (H Warwick)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Our sewerage system is inadequate and further development will put additional strain on it, increasing the risk of sewerage outflows into rivers.

Comments highlighting this issue

59498 (Babraham PC), 60035 (H Warnock)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

58235 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59716 (Swavesey PC), 60035 (H Warnock)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

58273 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 draft Local Plan and responders have insufficient information to base responses on.

Comments highlighting this issue

59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

We request that the Plan is rejected, rewritten, addressing the points made in our representations, then re-submitted for full public consultation.

Comments highlighting this issue

59498 (Babraham PC), 60235 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59128 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The cross-boundary impacts of developments also need to be considered, where NHS services often span multiple Local Planning Authority Boundaries

Comments highlighting this issue
59128 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
59128 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57610 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
57533 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
56676 (A Phillips)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Care needs to be taken when summarising consultation responses as there is an inherent bias in who responds to these consultations

Comments highlighting this issue
56802 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There appears to be a misinterpretation of consultation response evidence. 49% is not a majority of respondents

Comments highlighting this issue
58814 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59498 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59716 (Swavesey PC), 59850 & 59853 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
USS notes that the Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study recommends retaining the site allocation for the Clifton Road Industrial Estate.

Comments highlighting this issue
57267 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57300 (AJ Johnson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57315 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59860 (East Cambs DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

57012 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

58349 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 campus-style facilities in a predominantly rural, yet sustainable location.

Comments highlighting this issue

60260 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land at Slate Hall Farm, Bar Hill (J25 Bar Hill site) (HELAA site 40248)
Comments highlighting this issue
59034 (Lolworth Development Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land west of Long Lane, Fowlmere (HELAA site 40327)
Comments highlighting this issue
57329 (Clarendon Land and Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the north east of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40383) / Land to the south west of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40378)
Comments highlighting this issue
55711 (K.B. Tebbit Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston (HELAA site 40509)
Comments highlighting this issue
57012 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land east of Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote (HELAA site 51599)
Comments highlighting this issue
57472 & 57473 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham (HELAA site 40295)
Comments highlighting this issue
56894 (RWS Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
West Wratting Estate (HELAA site 56213)
Comments highlighting this issue
57526 (H d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Hall Farm, West Wratting Estate (new site 59388)
Comments highlighting this issue
57526 (H d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land adjacent to Babraham (HELAA site 40297)
Comments highlighting this issue
57543, 57546, 57552, 57555 & 58476 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land south of Old House Road, Balsham (HELAA site 40438)
Comments highlighting this issue
57647 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off The Causeway, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40228) & Land off Poplar Farm Close, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40230)
Comments highlighting this issue
57682 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land north of Cambourne (HELAA site 40114)
Comments highlighting this issue
57892 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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)
Comments highlighting this issue
58216 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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)
Comments highlighting this issue
58253 (Bletsoes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land east of Cambridge Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40414)
Comments highlighting this issue
58360 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms Hardington LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (HELAA site 40061)

Comments highlighting this issue
58504 (Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land west of London Road, Fowlmere (HELAA site 40116)
Comments highlighting this issue
58659 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the east of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 47757)
Comments highlighting this issue
58683 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land south of High Street, Hauxton (HELAA site 40283)
Comments highlighting this issue
58795 (Redrow Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land north of Barton Road and Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge (HELAA site 52643)
Comments highlighting this issue
58946 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land south of Addenbrooke's Road and east of M11, Cambridge South (HELAA site 40064)
Comments highlighting this issue
58954 (Jesus College working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings, a private landowner and St John's College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the north, east and south of Six Mile Bottom (HELAA site 40078)
Comments highlighting this issue
59075 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth (HELAA site 47353)
Comments highlighting this issue
59076 & 59318 (Newlands Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge Science Park, North East Cambridge (HELAA site 59390)
Comments highlighting this issue
60147 (U&I PLC and TOWN)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the north of St Neots Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40224) & Land between A428 and St Neots Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40550)
Comments highlighting this issue
60260 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land at Rectory Farm, Milton (HELAA site 54906)
Comments highlighting this issue
60262 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land at Rectory Farm, Milton (HELAA site 54096)
Comments highlighting this issue
60266 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land south of Fulbourn Road and north of Worts Causeway, known as Cambridge South East (HELAA site 40058)
Comments highlighting this issue
60270 & 60274 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off Shelford Road, Fulbourn (HELAA site 51610)
Comments highlighting this issue
60294 (Miller Homes - Fulbourn site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 47903)
Comments highlighting this issue
60301 (Miller Homes - Melbourn site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land east of Long Road, Comberton (HELAA site 40497)
Comments highlighting this issue
60546 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to north west of Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA site 40411)
Comments highlighting this issue
60562 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
East of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 47647) & West of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 40516)

Comments highlighting this issue
60567 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to rear of Fisher's Lane, Orwell (HELAA site 40496)
Comments highlighting this issue
60608 (Endurance Estates – Orwell site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land east of Redgate Road, Girton (HELAA site 40241)
Comments highlighting this issue
60623 (NIAB Trust – Girton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Whaddon Road, Meldreth (west of The Burtons) (HELAA site 55082)
Comments highlighting this issue
60667 (Mill Stream Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land South Of Milton, North of A14 (HELAA site 47943)
Comments highlighting this issue
60758 (U+I Group PLC)

H/RM: Residential moorings

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/RM: Residential moorings > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

2

Note

- The representation summaries for Policy H/RM: Residential moorings are included alongside the comments on the overall housing need made to S/JH: New jobs and homes as issues relating to housing need are referred to within them. The representation summaries for Policy H/RM: Residential moorings will also be included alongside the representation summaries for the other Homes Chapter policies when they are reported to a later JLPAG meeting.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There was support for addressing provision from Huntingdonshire DC. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight the need for engagement, and for provision of appropriate facilities.

Table of representations: H/RM – Residential moorings

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for extending the policy to the small proportion of River Great Ouse where the banks lie within South Cambridgeshire.

Comments highlighting this issue
57454 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Important to review successes and failures of existing policy to inform any necessary updates. Need to learn from previous consultations where proposals were met with fierce opposition.

Comments highlighting this issue
60806 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There are issues with existing provision that should be considered:

- new moorings should have appropriate pump out facilities,
- pontoons should be designed with a narrowboat in mind to ensure boats will fit, and

fixtures for moorings need to be designed with caution, and reflecting need for boats to be able to move as water levels change.

Comments highlighting this issue
60806 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

H/RC: Residential caravan sites

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/RC: Residential caravan sites > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

6

Note

- The representation summaries for H/RC: Residential caravan sites are included alongside the comments on the overall housing need made to S/JH: New jobs and homes as issues relating to housing need are referred to within them. The representation summaries for H/RC: Residential caravan sites will also be included alongside the representation summaries for the other Homes Chapter policies when they are reported to a later JLPAG meeting.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

The Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties raise concerns regarding sufficient provision of sites and the effective assessment of need. The Environment Agency highlight the importance of addressing flood risk.

Table of representations: H/RC – Residential caravan sites

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to review the vulnerability of tenure, which may be an issue.

Comments highlighting this issue
56782 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
57455 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Needs to distinguish between mobile home parks and caravans on farms used for seasonal workers.

Comments highlighting this issue
57754 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Annex C (Flood Vulnerability Classification) of the NPPF classifies caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for residential use as highly vulnerable, as if located adjacent to rivers they are at significant risk from being quickly inundated without sufficient warning or means of escape.
Therefore:
• Flood risk should be a key consideration in the policy criteria.
• Sequential test needs to be applied when considering sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
59730 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Deep concern for the policy, particularly given the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill, which targets Gypsy and Traveller communities and effectively criminalises their way of life.
This policy needs to safeguard these groups and provide sufficient pitches and plots to meet their needs.

Comments highlighting this issue
60246 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Essential that this policy is based on good evidence and on genuine consultation with the communities affected.
Concerned that the Accommodation Needs Assessment may have been unable to establish much contact with the communities affected.
The Local Plan should prioritise the delivery of sites for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities and ensure that they:
• Meet their needs
• Are sufficiently spacious and affordable
• Are in locations desirable to this community

Comments highlighting this issue
60807 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

H/GT: Gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

11

Note

- The representation summaries for H/GT: Gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites are included alongside the comments on the overall housing need made to S/JH: New jobs and homes as issues relating to housing need are referred to within them. The representation summaries for H/GT: Gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites will also be included alongside the representation summaries for the other Homes Chapter policies when they are reported to a later JLPAG meeting.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

A number of organisations highlight the importance of provision of sites, and ensuring those sites are suitable, such as having access to facilities, and appropriate foul drainage. Best practice examples are highlighted. One developer expresses concerns regarding the provision of sites as part of major developments.

Table of representations: H/GT: Gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for policy:
• Additional suitable sites should be provided, and unauthorised sites should be subject to the same planning processes as housing and residential caravan sites.
• There is a need for a traveller site to support members of the traveller community who need good access to the hospitals on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC).
• Provision for permanent and transit sites must be addressed, with a process to provide sites including on the edge of Major Developments.
• A diverse range of locations should be provided to ensure they offer choice and respond to the preferences of future residents.

Comments highlighting this issue
57755 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56783 (Croydon PC), 56999 (Trumpington Residents Association), 58287 (H Smith), 57456 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The principle of development being inappropriate in the Green Belt must be enforced for all.

Comments highlighting this issue
58296 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Opposed to proposed policy. Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is best provided through standalone Gypsy and Traveller site allocations or through windfall allocations.
If there is a requirement for this accommodation to be provided as part of larger developments, this should only relate to new settlements, and such requirements should be set out in the allocation policy for that site.

Comments highlighting this issue
57399 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The current policies are not working and have delivered too few sites.
Failings will be exacerbated by the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill.

Comments highlighting this issue
58573 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network), 60808 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should follow best practice as set out in the London Gypsies and Travellers "Best Practice for assessing the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers".
• This applies to consultation and needs assessment methodologies.
• Recent needs assessments have understated needs.

Comments highlighting this issue
58573 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network), 60808 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to allocate better quality sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
58573 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network), 60808 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The nature of Gypsy and Traveller sites means they should be treated as highly vulnerable, and flood risk should be a key consideration in any policy criteria.

Comments highlighting this issue
59731 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The existing site at Fen Road continues to be a source of ongoing local water quality and environmental health problems due to inadequate foul drainage provision. Policy H/GT should include requirements for mains foul drainage and protection of water quality as part of the policy criteria.

Comments highlighting this issue
59731 (Environment Agency)

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).

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. 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.

Tables of representations: S/DS: Development Strategy

Plan-wide development levels

Summary of issues raised in comments

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
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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* (Endurance Estates), 59032* (L&Q Estates Limited & Hill Residential Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

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
• 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
• 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?

Comments highlighting this issue:

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)

Public bodies

56737 (Croydon 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)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59719 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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 delivery of measures to address water resource issue and implement strategic green infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59964* (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Welcome recognition water supply is a 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59969* (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60457 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60496* (Cambridge Water)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58915 (Cambridge Water)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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?

Comments highlighting this issue:
58094* (Hills Road Residents' Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
No assessment of current growth and its cumulative impact or the success or failure of current Local Plan policies

Comments highlighting this issue:
60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
The 2018 Local Plan requires a rework due to the impact of the global pandemic.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58062* (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57819* (W Wicksteed)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Contingency sites should be included to ensure the plan is effective (deliverable over the plan period) as required by the NPPF.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58693 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Support for the level of employment and homes, if it is carefully located and is sustainable.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59141* (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
The overarching strategy should plan for more homes with the plan period spread across the settlement hierarchy.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57195 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Further consideration of sites suitable for potential development of specialist housing for older people (including Extra Care development) in sustainable locations should be undertaken.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58333 (Simons Developments Ltd), 59740 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Concern that further employment growth will continue to put pressure on housing. Suggestion to limit commercial development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57938 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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 brownfield sites so fewer will come forward in future
• Resist inappropriate development of gardens (contrary to NPPF para 71); inclusion in allowance will perpetuate trend

Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
2041 is an appropriate plan period, given uncertainty over major transport infrastructure projects including East-West Rail and Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57314* (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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

Comments highlighting this issue:
58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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

Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
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

Comments highlighting this issue:
58805 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 60541 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 less than one hectare to bolster supply in the first five years following adoption.

Comments highlighting this issue
60182 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59942 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the identified requirement for 44,400 new homes; 10% flexibility allowance; additional land for a minimum 11,640 homes is appropriate.

Comments highlighting this issue
58601* (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58748* (Great Shelford -Ten Acres- Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 entering into a Memorandum of Understanding.

Comments highlighting this issue
60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Spatial strategy thematic topics

Overarching

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broad support for the overarching strategy

Comments highlighting this issue
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
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 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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support strategy focused on strategic sites with better transport links, and with limited level of development proposed for villages.

Comments highlighting this issue
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support continued development of committed sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
57316 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for focus on brownfield sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for a blended strategy including a range of locations.

Comments highlighting this issue
58359 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for emphasis on dense settlements, including supporting new towns to be vibrant self-sustaining communities with good facilities.

Comments highlighting this issue
57709 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for strategy which addresses important issues, including needs, climate change, and making use of existing sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
56791* (J Kirkbride)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for focusing development in locations where infrastructure already exists.

Comments highlighting this issue
56861 (Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for focusing development in locations with existing and committed transport links.

Comments highlighting this issue
56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support weighted distribution towards most sustainable locations and key employment hubs.

Comments highlighting this issue
60219 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Areas around Cambridge are good, logical sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
58039 & 58041* (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support new homes that do not destroy the county and its waterways. Brownfield sites to be prioritised for development. Green Belt to be fully protected.

Comments highlighting this issue
59810* (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58001* (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58703* (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments regarding the overarching strategy, including:
• the need to protect green spaces and maintain Cambridge's character
• locating jobs close to homes to reduce travel
• ensuring new development has sustainable design and energy features
• placemaking and enhancing existing communities
• considering full lifecycle carbon benefits in the Sustainability Appraisal
• maintaining distinctive character of city, towns, and villages

Comments highlighting this issue
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
Strategy needs to tackle commuting patterns from outlying villages into the 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60641 (Bruntwood SciTech)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Note locations for development, with limited housing adjacent to Trumpington.

Comments highlighting this issue
56963* (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Many of the committed developments are unlikely to deliver sufficient high-quality

green infrastructure to meet new residents' needs without increasing pressure on existing ecological networks and designated sites. These issues need urgent attention during later plan stages.

Comments highlighting this issue
59966 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Emphasis should be given to placemaking and ensuring the character of existing communities is not harmed but rather enhanced.

Comments highlighting this issue
57709 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to locate jobs close to homes to reduce the need to travel.

Comments highlighting this issue
56572 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 development sites and supporting infrastructure including biodiversity and carbon benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue
60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Ensure the distinctive character of the City, towns, and villages are not adversely affected through new development, by exploiting opportunities to use brownfield land.

Comments highlighting this issue
60640 (TTP Campus Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development Strategy doesn't appear to include a balanced option for delivering

local housing needs for comparison, aligned with a transport strategy, and avoiding over-densification and the impacts of the S/NEC proposal.

Comments highlighting this issue
58106 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Growth should be dispersed across the settlement hierarchy.

Comments highlighting this issue
60310 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Emphasise the importance of a variety of growth locations and sizes to support housing delivery — new settlements, strategic extensions, and development in rural locations all play a role.

Comments highlighting this issue
60547 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Wrong Plan at wrong time given climate, biodiversity, and water emergencies. Prioritise social housing and environmental protection over economic development. Undermines the Government's "Levelling Up" and brownfield-first agendas.

Comments highlighting this issue
59500 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Breaches obligations for sustainable development; does not consider embodied carbon or car-borne emissions. Water supply and sewage infrastructure are inadequate.

Comments highlighting this issue
59945 (O Harwood)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Forward-thinking Vision is not matched by a development strategy predicated on growth that will increase carbon emissions. Inconsistent with the Government's Levelling Up agenda.

Comments highlighting this issue
59548 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
With the climate crisis, the Plan should start by planning for truly sustainable neighbourhoods that meet local needs and build resilient communities.

Comments highlighting this issue
56524* (C Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Better to have larger settlements less dependent on cars and closer to employment.

Comments highlighting this issue
56735* (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the vision, aims, and amount of development, but not for the proposed distribution and allocations.

Comments highlighting this issue
58387* (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Councils discourage new homes where car travel is easiest, yet villages with stations (e.g. Meldreth, Shepreth, Foxton) have no growth allocations. Meanwhile, Cambourne — with only a proposed station — has a 2,000-home allocation.

Comments highlighting this issue
58672* (Artisan (UK) Projects Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Too much farmland is allocated for development, threatening food and water security. Destroying prime farmland in the Cambridge area would damage UK food security.

Comments highlighting this issue
59492* (D Seilly)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Reference to “Place Standard” Survey by Cllr Sam Davies, Queen Edith’s, Feb 2020. GB1 & GB2 should not become isolated communities. Windfall residential development in Cambridge and elsewhere should have clear capacity limits from the outset.

Comments highlighting this issue
59770* (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment proposing revisions to ensure the Plan meets its aims, including:
• bringing sustainable transport initiatives from beyond Greater Cambridge
• evaluating current progress before further growth
• objecting to North East Cambridge allocation and WWTP relocation
• applying minimum growth option and focusing development at Cambridge East and Biomedical Campus

Comments highlighting this issue
57551 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Plan fails to assess environmental capacity, climate impact, and historic environment holistically. Lacks a clear vision for Cambridge’s future and who the city serves.

Comments highlighting this issue
60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
All policies must be rigorously enforced, not symbolic. The Plan must consider all proposed developments together to ensure full coordination.

Comments highlighting this issue
59061* (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Agreement with policy direction and Figure 6. Supports exclusion of new settlement at Six Mile Bottom and agrees that further new settlements should not be allocated.

Comments highlighting this issue
60442 (Late representation: Westley Waterless PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Notes expansion of Cambourne, ongoing development at Bourn Airfield, and mentions Mansel Farm, Oakington (20 homes near Beck Brook). Also references the 10% homebuilding buffer and 1,000 additional homes on Eddington site.

Comments highlighting this issue
59863 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Plan aligns with many CA's Suggested Spatial Vision points, including higher density, strategic sites, transport corridors, and connected nature networks.

Comments highlighting this issue
60519 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to act on the recommendations of the Climate Commission.

Comments highlighting this issue
60519 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
New development should include solar hot water and high insulation standards.

Comments highlighting this issue
56737 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Second and fourth paragraphs should acknowledge the importance of education access and opportunities for regeneration and enhancement.

Comments highlighting this issue
58502* (ARU)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposed housing expansion risks changing Cambridge's scale and character. Suggest focus on connecting the Biomedical Campus to outer residential areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
57984* (F Seregni)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council lie outside the defined coalfield. No specific comments made.

Comments highlighting this issue
59736* (The Coal Authority)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Non-substantive comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
57852* (T Harrold), 57860* (T Harrold)

Strategic influences and Duty to Cooperate

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59970* (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58655* (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59968 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
59971 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59601 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Important that site allocation policies include sufficient clarity (NPPF para 16d). Policy should identify assets on site/nearby, mitigation measures, reference HIA. Suggested wording.

Comments highlighting this issue
59602 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59313* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The location and form of new development should fully consider the principles of creating healthy environments.

Comments highlighting this issue
59114* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59859 (East Cambridgeshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59953 (Suffolk Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60460 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60233* (H Warwick)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60307* (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58640* (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Plan assumes coordination with OxCam Arc project, which is now under review by government.

Comments highlighting this issue
59540* (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Plan assumes influence by UK Innovation Corridor and Cambridge-Norwich Tech Corridor, which are projects driven by unelected business interests.

Comments highlighting this issue
59540* (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59851 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60519 (Cambridge Ahead)

Spatial directions for development

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposal that the plan should reflect more strongly the benefits of the Public Transport Corridors Spatial Option

Comments highlighting this issue
59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
56803 (M Colville), 58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57639* (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58896* (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the level of development focused in the southern cluster should be increased, to:
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue
58195 (Terence O'Rourke Ltd), 58503 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58188* (Smithson Hill), 60561 (W Garfit)

Summary of issues raised in comments
South West sustainable transport corridor should be given greater weight than relying on corridors where infrastructure projects are to be decided / proven deliverable.

Comments highlighting this issue
57343* (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
57340 (HD Planning Ltd), 58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Economy

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
57316 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58195 (Terence O'Rourke Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be governed by local need. Local jobs to reduce travel to work and be more sustainable.

Comments highlighting this issue
57639* (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60519 (Cambridge Ahead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern about the lack of clear information about where employment land is located and to categorise this land into different potential uses

Comments highlighting this issue
58561 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 60276 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58646* (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the plan should provide allocations to meet demand for warehouse and distribution centres for the following reasons:
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue
58585 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Address logistics needs and locational requirements (NPPF); good connectivity to strategic road network, on large flat sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
60215 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Plan does not demonstrate how it can meet future jobs targets or needs, particularly for mid tech.

Comments highlighting this issue
60685 (Trinity College)

Strategic and smaller scale development

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
56861 (Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth PC), 56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57316 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58309 (University of Cambridge), 58359 (Marshall Group Properties), 58523 (Phase 2 Plannning), 58808 (R Mervart), 58923 (Clare College, Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that all strategic sites need to:
• provide sufficient land for educational purposes, taking into account Cambridgeshire County Council's agreed school site sizes
• 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 highlighting this issue
56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
56803 (M Colville), 56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60044 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern that the strategy relies too much on large urban extensions to Cambridge City and new settlements in South Cambridgeshire, for the following reasons:
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56956 (J Swannell), 57301 (Mrs Ann Josephine Johnson), 58146 (J Manning), 57063 (C Meadows)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
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), 58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 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 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), 60580 (Martin Grant Homes), 60668 (Mill Stream Developments),

Summary of issues raised in comments

Objection to short lead in times assumed for the largest sites included 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

Comments highlighting this issue

58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Objection to assumptions regarding faster 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 increase

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56481 (V Chapman), 56499 (W Grain), 57063 (C Meadows), 57104 (J Francis), 57301 (A Josephine Johnson), 58146 (J Manning), 58639 (R Grain)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
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 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), 60580 (Martin Grant Homes),

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern about delivery rate assumptions for strategic sites:
• Disparity between sites of similar scale
• Inconsistent and contrary to Housing Delivery Study.
• Lower average build-out rate to 250dpa, with peak 300dpa in years 1 or 2 if it can be evidenced.
• Inconsistent with Lichfields Start to Finish evidence and past delivery

Comments highlighting this issue
60271 (Commercial Estates Group), 60323 (Daniels Bros – Shefford – Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60357 (H. J. Molton Settlement)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 (continued):
• Limiting such development could lead to increased pressure on larger sites and undermine delivery targets
• Small and medium sized sites can be delivered more quickly and flexibly than large strategic sites

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56518 (R Walker), 56990 (B Eaton), 57258 (S Brown), 57401 (M Spencer)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
57422 (KJ Smith Developments), 57435 (Landowner Group), 57488 (Local Housing Group), 57523 (Rural Development Partnership), 57610 (Cambridge Small Developers), 57855 (Community Land Trust), 57920 (Greenfield Homes), 58011 (Countryside Properties Ltd), 58234 (Rural Housing Alliance)

Water supply and drainage

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support recognition that water supply challenge is a serious issue to be resolved.

Comments highlighting this issue
59970* (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 agenda, democratic deficit in process and evidence base. Support Friends of River Cam objection.

Comments highlighting this issue
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), 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 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)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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?

Comments highlighting this issue

57833* (S Sinclair)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Plan does not satisfactorily address inadequate water supply

Comments highlighting this issue
60234 (P Blythe)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the approach taken to addressing water supply issues

Comments highlighting this issue
58882 (A Sykes), 59133 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Further development needs to be phased in line with public water supply availability, if the plan is to meet its environmental objectives.

Comments highlighting this issue
58970* (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58882 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the need for the delivery of new strategic water supply infrastructure

Comments highlighting this issue
58731 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The plan does not satisfactorily address issue of inadequate water supply; need to identify strategic water supply solutions and / or interim measures

Comments highlighting this issue
60188 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is insufficient capacity for utilities delivery (supply of water and waste water disposal);
• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59258* (Teversham PC), 60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 requirements can still be met within plan period and does not become continually delayed (PPG para 68-021)

Comments highlighting this issue
57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58359 (Marshall Group Properties), 58963 (Endurance Estates), 60171 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to consider how water will be provided for this amount of growth - the chalk aquifer is already being over abstracted

Comments highlighting this issue
56511 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern about water supply impacts of the plan, including the potential carbon impacts of any required water transfer.

Comments highlighting this issue
56523 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57316 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Transport and other infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that any unresolved issues regarding transport might have impacts on neighbouring districts.

Comments highlighting this issue
57316 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59872* (East West Rail)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
57035 (W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern regarding East West Rail including:
• Will cause environmental harm and planning blight
• Protect and enhance Green Belt

• 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

Comments highlighting this issue
57851* (T Harrold), 57853* (T Harrold), 57854* (T Harrold), 57857* (T Harrold), 57858* (T Harrold), 58256* (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59103* (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59691 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59436* (Anonymous)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment noting:
• Lack of information on transport links required, ensure they are brought forward concurrently
• Insufficient provision of public transport

Comments highlighting this issue
60188 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
58650 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
56791* (J Kirkbride)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58359 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that coordination with every organisation involved in transport strategy is absolutely essential.

Comments highlighting this issue
59133 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60051 (Cambridge Connect)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The plan should focus on public transport and cycle connections.

Comments highlighting this issue
57980* (E Osimo)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59258* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57583* (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Relying on planned public transport links will leave the Plan vulnerable to challenge if projects are delayed. Focus more on existing infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue
57342* (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60073 (National Highways)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60075 (C de Blois)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
60255 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment on the need to deliver timely infrastructure including public transport, broadband, social facilities, retail in new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
57645 (Histon & Impington Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that Transport Evidence assumes a massive increase in Park & Ride spaces, which could harm landscape and Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue
58241 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Ensure faster delivery of existing new settlements does not impact infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
57314* (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green Infrastructure must be delivered before, or alongside new development.

Comments highlighting this issue
56572 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No new cultural or provision for other ‘city-scale’ needs which will put the city centre under even greater pressure.

Comments highlighting this issue
60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57834* (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The plan does not meet the infrastructure needs of new residents.

Comments highlighting this issue
59030* (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59114* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59134 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The plan should consider education and hospital needs in greater detail.

Comments highlighting this issue
58882 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is insufficient infrastructure (roads, schools and hospitals in particular) to support delivery of the strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue
59258* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60175* (Home Builders Federation)

Justification for/presentation of the development strategy

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the policy should include greater clarity about the full list of allocations including for employment, and their relationship with adopted allocations.

Comments highlighting this issue
57340 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the plan does not include a trajectory setting out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58237 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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'.

Comments highlighting this issue
58899 (Axis Land Partnerships), 59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58694 (LVA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern that the rationale for proposing some allocations in the rural area and for rejecting other available and suitable village 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

Comments highlighting this issue
56713 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57346 (Clarendon Land), 58534 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 59252 (Croudace Homes), 60568 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Lack of information how extra housing will impact the city/wider area. Proceed slowly until more information is available.

Comments highlighting this issue
60673 (Anonymous)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the plan should show for reference the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP).

Comments highlighting this issue
58106 (M Asplin)

Spatial strategy sources of supply

Cambridge urban area, including brownfield sites

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
58053 (Trinity Hall), 58668 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58808 (R Mervart), 59048 (Emmanuel College), 57709 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
58922 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Brownfield development should be prioritised

Comments highlighting this issue
58325* (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Agree that brownfield development should be prioritised and in locally-agreed not nationally targeted locations. Development “around” villages is not considered sustainable.

Comments highlighting this issue
59851 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Plan does not follow ‘brownfield first’ approach; it should encourage urban intensification.

Comments highlighting this issue
59945 (O Harwood)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Take opportunities to reuse brownfield land to ensure protection of other more sensitive locations in the countryside.

Comments highlighting this issue
60640 (TTP Campus Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the proposed approach however this should focus sustainable development on under-utilised previously developed sites

Comments highlighting this issue
58907* (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Existing buildings should be re-used wherever possible before new building is considered.

Comments highlighting this issue
60677 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to focus on densification, noting:

- potential harm to quality of life and that it is not in keeping with the objectives of Wellbeing & Social inclusion and Great Places
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue
57798 (M Starkie), 57638 (J Conroy), 57766* (T Elliott), 57582* (C Maynard)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
57150 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57195 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58676 (The Church Commissioners for England), 58693 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57938 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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
- provide opportunities to connect with the surrounding countryside to improve mental and physical health

Comments highlighting this issue
58963 (Endurance Estates), 59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58923 (Clare College, Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No mention of Covid and city centre opportunities from potential radical changes in retail and office working.

Comments highlighting this issue
60236* (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60148 (U&I PLC and TOWN)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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’.

Comments highlighting this issue
60444 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for NEC but object to lack of consideration for accommodating displaced commercial uses.

Comments highlighting this issue
60762 (U&I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
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
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58400 (Trinity College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
59040 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
56523 (C Martin), 58106 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58381 (F Gawthrop)

The edge of Cambridge, and Green Belt

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the approach of limiting development on the edge of Cambridge beyond already approved sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
56965 (Trumpington Residents Association), 58241 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the delivery of sites on edge of Cambridge given they are sustainable locations to existing jobs, services, infrastructure, and transportation.

Comments highlighting this issue
58731 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59258* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for limited release of Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
57502 (Cambridgeshire County Council - as landowner)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
56965 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58166* (Dr S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that edge of Cambridge greenfield sites can deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that exceptional circumstances exist to justify release of land from the Green Belt in all parts of Greater Cambridge affected by the designation, for reasons including:

- 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

Comments highlighting this issue
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 Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58629 (Hill Residential), 58731 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58929 (Carter Jonas), 58950 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment regarding the reasonable options needing to be explored before considering whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, including:

- 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

Comments highlighting this issue
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)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development on Green Belt is not generally acceptable, but release of a small site from the Green Belt which in parallel secures greatly enhanced biodiversity and some informal rural public access is a factor weighing heavily in favour of the release.

Comments highlighting this issue
60561 (W Garfit)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for releasing Green Belt land in Shelford.

Comments highlighting this issue
58815 (Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for releasing Green Belt land in Sawston.

Comments highlighting this issue
57376 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for releasing Green Belt land in Coton.

Comments highlighting this issue
60580 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Don’t build on Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue
57980* (E Osimo)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the plan should include even less focus on the Green Belt and villages.

Comments highlighting this issue
58808 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to proposed development in the Green Belt, in particular at villages. Place greater focus on new settlements/communities and expansion of existing sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
56803 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to proposed busways to new settlements as they would harm Green Belt, landscape, ecology, and heritage.

Comments highlighting this issue
58241 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59273 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Oppose proposals to remove further land from Green Belt, particularly Babraham and Hinxton. Inconsistent with purposes of Green Belt in Great Places Aim.

Comments highlighting this issue
59595 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
60310 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern about the amount of Green Belt land likely to be destroyed, particularly through relocating WWTW to Honey Hill.

Comments highlighting this issue
60677 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the provision of additional housing on existing allocated land at Eddington.

Comments highlighting this issue
58297* (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge East represents the largest and most sustainable opportunity to realise this potential.

Comments highlighting this issue
58335* (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that development at Cambridge East can support cross-city connectivity through the provision of a transformational transport strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue
58359 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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.

Comments highlighting this issue
58961 (Jesus College (working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings), a private landowner and St John's College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support proposed allocation for Campus. CBC Limited will support landowners deliver a Vision 2050 compatible scheme.

Comments highlighting this issue
58247* (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the need for growth and to concentrate that growth in sustainable locations. Cambridge Biomedical Campus is one of the best locations to sustainably address future needs.

Comments highlighting this issue
58251* (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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, with a provision that this is offered as tied accommodation to create genuine affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
59770* (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to inclusion of S/CBC/A area for housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
57933 (F Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to proposed Green Belt release at Cambridge Biomedical Campus, for reasons including:

- Scale of proposal
- 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 highlighting this issue
56965 (Trumpington Residents Association), 58090 (D Lister), 58167 (Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments about growing the Cambridge Biomedical campus include concerns about:

- Impact on quality of life of residents
- Unclear whether infrastructure will support growth
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue
57628* (M Polichroniadis), 58307 & 58322* (D Lynch)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Releasing Green Belt 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
59028* (R Stone)

New settlements

Summary of issues raised in comments
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

Comments highlighting this issue
56803 (M Colville), 56965 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for continuing development at the new settlements of Northstowe, Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield allocated in previous plans.

Comments highlighting this issue
56481 (V Chapman), 56489 (D & B Searle), 56499 (W Grain), 56517 (RJ & RS Millard), 58639 (R Grain)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Northstowe, Waterbeach, Bourn and Cambourne are unproven employment markets with demand remaining in and on edge of Cambridge, encouraging unsustainable travel patterns.

Comments highlighting this issue
60281 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 freestanding new settlements tested at stage one, with the Cambourne to Cambridge public transport scheme and East West Rail included
• Opportunity to co-locate homes and jobs near major public transport routes
• It is a location capable of higher self-containment and where reducing reliance on private cars is most achievable
• Builds upon an existing settlement with services and facilities already in place and potential for new ones
• One of the largest and most sustainable settlements in Greater Cambridge
• East West Rail will provide a sustainable new travel option contributing to achieving net zero carbon

Comments highlighting this issue
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
Comment that the delivery of additional employment land at Cambourne must be part of any strategy to make it more vibrant.

Comments highlighting this issue
58585 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that there is little evidence that travel behaviour in Cambourne will shift significantly with the delivery of a railway station, given the limited uptake of employment units in its business park and its limited high street offer.

Comments highlighting this issue
59082 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the Councils should plan for a significant extension or new settlement within the Cambourne area.

Comments highlighting this issue
58676 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that no decision on development at Cambourne should be taken until there is confirmation regarding East West Rail.

Comments highlighting this issue
59153 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the policy for Cambourne should state that planning permission will not be granted until work commences on Cambourne Station, and that no new homes should be occupied until the station and East West Rail services are operational.

Comments highlighting this issue
59153 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that Cambourne was the best performing in transport terms of the freestanding new settlements 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 must be well linked to the existing community to improve access to services and reduce potential transport impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue
56923 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Suggestion that the plan should provide greater clarity about the location of growth at Cambourne, and that development could come forward ahead of East West Rail, supported by the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Cambourne to Cambridge Public Transport Scheme.

Comments highlighting this issue
57893 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern raised about the assumed trajectory at Cambourne, given uncertainty over East West Rail delivery and timing.

Comments highlighting this issue
58879 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposal for additional new settlements to support the aim of significantly boosting housing supply.

Comments highlighting this issue
58622 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Rural area

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for limits on rural development proposed in the plan, for the following reasons:

• Protecting existing villages
• Protecting the rural nature of the area
• 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 the existing road network
• Villages have already absorbed significant growth

Comments highlighting this issue
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 (Guilden Morden PC), 60110 (C Blakeley), 59710 (Caldecote PC), 56521* (R Smith)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Villages have endured significant development recently with no supporting infrastructure or facilities.

Comments highlighting this issue
58039 & 58041* (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Enabling infill development within smaller villages is supported, as this will sustain rural services, the vitality and viability of villages, and their shops and services, contributing to overall sustainability.

Comments highlighting this issue
59691 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for inclusion of allocations for housing and employment in the rest of the rural area as part of the proposed development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue
58196 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 58255 (Bletsoes), 58952 (Varrier Jones Foundation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for recognition in policy DS 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.

Comments highlighting this issue
57374 (Colegrove Estates), 59056* (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that the strategy for the rural area should also reflect the merits of planned public transport provision, as this strengthens the sustainability of villages.

Comments highlighting this issue
57310 (Deal Land LLP), 57650 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site), 58647 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that affordable housing in locations requiring car ownership is not genuinely affordable.

Comments highlighting this issue
58183 (Cllr N Gough)

Summary of issues raised in comments
More housing in rural areas should be allowed through redevelopment of windfall sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
59056* (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment that Foxton is a more sustainable village given its rail station.

Comments highlighting this issue
57516 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment noting 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

Comments highlighting this issue
57348 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58567 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58900 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58952 (Varrier Jones Foundation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Note the improvement to connectivity in Caxton Village created by the proposed Cambourne East West Rail station.

Comments highlighting this issue
56481 (V Chapman), 56489 (D & B Searle), 56499 (W Grain), 56517 (RJ & RS Millard)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to the 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.”
Respondents argue that high-quality development at lower densities can also achieve carbon neutrality, provide enhancements for nature and wildlife, and offer other benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue
58668 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to the limits placed on small new housing sites in and around smaller settlements.

Comments highlighting this issue
56557 (Bonnel Homes Ltd), 58600 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58644 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58694 (LVA), 58899 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Request that the development strategy increases its provision of housing for rural areas where redundant farm buildings exist.

Comments highlighting this issue
59080 (A P Burlton Turkey’s Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The list of permitted categories in the rural area should be amended to include ‘horticulture and garden centres’.

Comments highlighting this issue
58852 (Dobbies Garden Centres Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support settlement hierarchy policy as a means of directing development towards the most suitable and sustainable locations. Concern about speculative applications.
Suggestion to remove the word ‘indicative’ to strengthen and clarify policy.
Support for the reclassification of Cottenham and Babraham villages.

Comments highlighting this issue
6011 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for inclusion of Babraham Research Campus in the Plan, to provide additional space for life science businesses to cluster and grow.

Comments highlighting this issue
58087 (Babraham Research Campus Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Provisos needed for Babraham Institute being released from the Green Belt.
Reference made to “How Many Homes” by CPRE Devon, which claims ONS population projections are overestimated by 40%.
Concerns that residents oppose further housing, that the Green Belt is under pressure, and that high employment levels mean no need for additional associated housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
59501* (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for inclusion of Mingle Lane, Great Shelford within the plan, for the following reasons:
• Close proximity to employment opportunities and good accessibility by sustainable modes of transport

• Good range of local services and facilities
• Exceptional circumstances relating to housing need justify Green Belt release
• Supports vitality of rural communities
• Supports a range of housing types and sizes
• Opportunity to address identified local housing needs, including affordable housing unmet by other means

Comments highlighting this issue
57301 (Mrs Ann Josephine Johnson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to site S/RRA/MF in Oakington, for the following reasons:
• Removal of Green Belt unjustified, harming separation between Oakington and Northstowe
• Harm to heritage and landscape
• Flood risk in the vicinity

Comments highlighting this issue
56873 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern that development at village sites such as Melbourn will worsen existing problems.
Melbourn has already seen significant development with no infrastructure or facilities, increasing pressure on schools and roads.

Comments highlighting this issue
58041* (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for approach taken to meeting logistics sector needs along the A14, including:
• Locating logistics facilities close to urban centres for electric fleet and cargo bike use in last-mile deliveries
• High accessibility to the strategic network
• A14 corridor is served by large-scale residential development providing a nearby labour pool
• Policy S/DS should support further development in this location

Comments highlighting this issue
59053 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for excluding any development in Little Linton and the land between Little Linton and Linton.
The two settlements have distinct identities and should remain separate.
Development here would disrupt the historic open landscape and damage local character.
Directing growth to more sustainable locations is appropriate and will preserve village identity.

Comments highlighting this issue
57914* (H Lawrence-Foulds), 59432* (J Pearson)

Sites not included in the First Proposals

Summary of issues raised in comments
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 affordable housing unmet by other means
• Supports development of underutilised land and buildings
• Limited contribution to Cambridge Green Belt purposes
• Contributions development will make to local infrastructure and facilities
• Will be supported by planned public transport provision
• Can meet identified employment sector needs
• Helps maintain smooth delivery of housing throughout the plan period
• Supports A10 Cambridge to Waterbeach corridor as a focus for growth
• Contributes to NPPF paragraphs 69 & 79
• Performs equitably or better than allocated sites
• Provides choice in location, size, type, and tenure of housing
• Meets evidenced need for logistics land

Comments highlighting this issue

Individuals
57063 (C Meadows), 57014 (J Francis), 58146 (J Manning)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
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 (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 Planning), 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 Developments Ltd), 58651* (Wates Developments Ltd), 60561 (W Garfit)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for rejection of specific sites promoted to the plan, for the following reasons:
• Strain on local infrastructure
• Traffic concerns
• Worsening flooding impacts

Comments highlighting this issue
56789 (Shudy Camps PC), 56965 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to perceived incorrect assessment of a site within the Strategy topic paper and HELAA.

Comments highlighting this issue
57015 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Request for clarity regarding whether a specific site is included within the housing commitments identified in the First Proposals.

Comments highlighting this issue
57076 (R Wilson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comment identifying the need to proactively plan for educational facilities when sites are actively being sought — specifically to provide a site for Cambridge Maths School.

Comments highlighting this issue
57477 (ESFA – Department for Education), 57494 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to the proposed reclassification of Cottenham to Minor Rural Centre, due to its good services and facilities.

Comments highlighting this issue
57114 (Cambridge District Oddfellows

S/SH: Settlement hierarchy

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 98

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There was broad support for the settlement hierarchy policy approach from across the range of respondents. There were mixed views on the approach to limiting the scale of development according to the classification of settlement within the hierarchy. Suggestions for an alternative approach included taking into consideration 'made' Neighbourhood Plans, the context of the local area and available services and facilities and public transport, how settlements interact and support each other, supporting local communities and services, and that it should include business premises as well as housing.

There were mixed views on development thresholds with some supporting the proposed approach, some seeking higher thresholds and others wanting the thresholds removed or replaced. Concerns included that the thresholds are arbitrary, or that the proposed limits were not explained or justified and should better reflect the NPPF ambitions for making best use of land. There was also concern that the thresholds only applied to individual sites and not the cumulative impacts and overall scale of development permitted within a village. Suggestions for alternative approaches included allowing development within settlement boundaries, using the thresholds as a guide but allowing more development on sustainable sites, replacing the limits with something in line with calculated windfall allowance, allowing more development in smaller villages where it would secure improved services.

A number of representors made village specific comments, including a number of Parish Councils generally supporting their village's classification and several developers suggesting changes to village classifications to a higher tier and greater flexibility on the scale of development permitted, with a number of developers promoting a range of sites for development.

Table of representations: S/SH: Settlement hierarchy

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support Policy

Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals
57036 (Dr W Harrold), 58109 (M Asplin), 60648 (P Fletcher)

Public Bodies
56862 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57318 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57887 (Ickleton PC), 59468 (Shepreth PC), 59812 (Dry Drayton PC), 59852 (Barrington PC)

Third Sector Organisations
56667 (The Ickleton Society), 58244 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Other Organisations
60445 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
58238 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 59834 (MCA Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Indicative maximum scheme sizes should include business premises as well as housing.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56862 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support the continuation of a threshold of 30 units of housing developments in minor rural centres.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56573 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

This policy should place limits on the size of individual windfall schemes. These should be:

- in line with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan for the rural centre in question
- considered within context of the local area
- in aggregate of total impact

Comments highlighting this issue:
56804 (M Colville), 57705 (J Pavey), 57832 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The settlement hierarchy review appears to assess each settlement in terms of the services located within Parish boundaries rather than considering how different settlements interact and support each other (in line with paragraph 79 of the NPPF). For example, the village of Meldreth is closely supported by the facilities of Melbourn.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57339 (HD Planning Ltd), 60311 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

This approach fails to take account of situations where it is demonstrated there is a need for a larger amount of growth to support villages and local communities. The sustainability credentials of Group Villages should therefore be further reviewed, and a greater level of development allowed at and adjoining these villages.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57375 (Colegrove Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites. The site size limits for each category of village should be deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57503 (Cambridgeshire County Council, as landowner)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The size of individual developments should be subject to limits until the effects of unprecedented growth already in the pipeline can be evaluated in relation to the provision of local services and facilities. Limits could be specified in line with the Windfall allowance calculated.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57553 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57641 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Confusion over the use/definition of village and town (simply not a matter of size and facilities which are undefined). Concern over the legal definition and suggested ambition of being designated a Town.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57646 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

S/SH should also recognise and control within the hierarchy brown field sites that require Green Belt land take.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58109 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Allow development in smaller villages with permission conditional on the provision of better services which often have excellent schools better suited to expansion than Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58168 (Dr S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The village hierarchy must reflect the provision of quality public transportation that provides a reasonable option to the car to and from places of work and study. That public transportation needs to be assessed by reference to frequency, hours of operation, and speed (relative to the car).

Comments highlighting this issue:
58177 (Cllr N Gough)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Several sewage treatment facilities upstream from Cambridge are unable to cope during periods of high rainfall (discharging raw sewage) contributing towards failing water quality. A policy is needed to ensure development in any villages served by such sewage treatment works should be conditional upon improvements to those facilities.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58244 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Settlement hierarchy should be reconsidered in terms of the roles that settlements play in terms of service provision for neighbouring settlements and a settlement's proximity to other settlements that offer a range of services. Rural settlements should be considered for housing allocations proportionate to the size of the settlements.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58246 (Bletsoes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support new settlements. Villages and minor rural centres should be the last resort in hierarchy of development which have already taken more than their share, to the detriment of community, character and infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58361 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The approach to the scale of development in villages needs revisiting. The approach controls the size of individual developments, but not the overall scale of development at a village. E.g., in a Minor Rural Centre, 2 schemes of 29 dwellings are acceptable, but one of 31 is not. There is no logic or justification for such an arbitrary approach to the scale of development of individual sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58479 & 58495 (Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Proposed settlement hierarchy is ineffective at delivering required levels of growth to support the vitality of rural villages and gives insufficient weight to the sustainability of villages with railway stations. Current settlement boundaries are drawn too tightly preventing meaningful growth. A more flexible/relaxed approach to settlement boundaries is needed. These villages are not recognised as being considerably more sustainable than other locations despite the clear influence a station has on sustainable commuting patterns.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58593 (Artisan -UK- Projects Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The settlement hierarchy methodology and tiers are generally supported. Decisions on the status of specific settlements (excluding Cambridge and new settlements) should wait until the spatial strategy has been finalised.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58625 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Object to policy that will limit the size of schemes within minor rural centres, group villages and infill villages. To set an indicative maximum scheme size fails to recognise the full potential of a site in such locations nor the potential benefits of such schemes in ensuring existing services remains sustainable into the long term. A more appropriate approach would be to reflect paragraph 124 and 125 of the NPPF to make the most effective use of land whilst taking into account housing needs, market conditions, infrastructure and services as well as the character of the area.

Comments highlighting this issue:
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
58656 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 60170 (Home Builders Federation), 60220 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60311 (Gladman Developments), 60324 (Daniels Bros -Shefford- Ltd), 60543 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60548 (Thakeham Homes Ltd Land at Comberton Road, Comberton - HELAA site 40497)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The proposed limit of housing for settlements identified in the hierarchy should be reviewed with a view to increasing the development threshold and serve as a guide, with the relative sustainability of the site/settlement providing a basis for increasing the development threshold of a site.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59095 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The size of individual developments should be subject to limits, specified in line with the windfall allowance calculated. The Vision & Aims of the Local Plan are at risk should there be no limit on the size and scale of schemes brought forward and approved.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59886 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Growth levels attributed to Infill Villages too restrictive.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58714 (LVA)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The definition of Group Villages should be reinforced to restrict exceptional development of up to 15 dwellings only on brownfield sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59852 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Caxton, a highly sustainable location for growth with the proposed new railway station should have no limit on the scale of individual developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56482 (V Chapman), 56490 (D & B Searle), 56500 (W Grain), 56518 (RJ & JS Millard), 58645 (R Grain), 58714 (LVA)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Development in Teversham – a Group Village - would help facilitate a shift away from car use, and certainly reduce any journey times by car. However, no sites are proposed for allocation within the village.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56896 (RWS Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

West Wickham Parish Council supports the infill village designation for West Wickham and Streetly End and the indicative maximum scheme size.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56908 (Cllr. D Sargeant)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Babraham a proposed 'Group Village' has a primary school consistent with infrastructure in other Group Villages. The school is currently full to its capacity of 0.5FE/84 places and operates with four classes (it operates a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 12). The school's site and context mean that it has previously been determined that there is no scope for significant expansion beyond its current size. Some children currently attend from within Sawston catchment, so displacement of places back to Sawston should be borne in mind with development at Babraham.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56924 (Cambridgeshire County Council - Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Melbourn & Meldreth should be allocated as a Rural Centre. The villages are performing the role already and should be moved up the hierarchy. High Quality Public Transport links and good range of shops, services/ education facilities and employment opportunities.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57041 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The fourth bullet point restricts ‘Minor Rural Centres’, such as Linton to an ‘indicative maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings’. This is not explained and unjustified. It should have this bullet point removed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57073 (R Wilson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The status of Cottenham in the settlement hierarchy should remain as a Rural Centre. Cottenham is capable of providing larger schemes of more than 30 dwellings.

Comments highlighting this issue
57115 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57151 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57197 (European Property Ventures -Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to Waterbeach being identified as a ‘Minor Rural Centre’. Given the growth to the north and the sustainable pedestrian and green links between the settlement and the new town. Existing settlement of Waterbeach can provide larger schemes of +30 dwellings. Should be treated as a new town.

Comments highlighting this issue
57151 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57197 (European Property Ventures -Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Hardwick should be a Minor Rural Centre because of its location on the public transport corridor between Cambridge and Cambourne, proposed investment in East West Rail and Scotland Farm Park and Ride. Development here would fulfil more policy objectives. The limit on size of development schemes should be based on individual site circumstances.

Comments highlighting this issue
58298 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The former Papworth Hospital Site provides an opportunity to deliver a healthcare

development, +30 dwellings, in the form of a healthcare use (C2). Papworth Everard should be identified as a 'Rural Centre'.

Comments highlighting this issue
58339 (DLP Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
With existing and emerging considerations including facilities, services and infrastructure including sustainable transport improvements, Hauxton should be re-assessed and placed higher in the settlement hierarchy.

Comments highlighting this issue
58380 (Bridgemere Land Plc)

Summary of issues raised in comments
We support that Sawston and Great Shelford with Stapleford are proposed to be identified as Rural Centres due to their good access to employment, services and facilities. Stapleford, in the Settlement Hierarchy Review should be amended to reflect that Great Shelford with Stapleford will have two stops on Phase 2 of the SE Cambridge Transport Route.

Comments highlighting this issue
58386 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cottenham should be identified as a Rural Centre to allow consideration for the merits of any future residential proposals towards the village's sustainability.

Comments highlighting this issue
58491 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Fowlmere's continued identification as a Group Village over and above an infill village. Not clear why the level of housing to come forward has a ceiling of 8 units or exceptionally 15.

Comments highlighting this issue
58548 (Croudace Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Councils should adopt a highly flexible approach to directing growth to the edge of sustainable villages, especially the Rural Centres. Histon & Impington have sound and robust sustainability credentials.

Comments highlighting this issue
58549 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the identification of Cambourne as a new town within the emerging settlement hierarchy.

Comments highlighting this issue
58678 (The Church Commissioners for England), 59156 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection: Whittlesford should be a Minor Rural Centre. The settlement hierarchy methodology should increase scoring of locations with excellent public transport, access to the City of Cambridge, employment and services; reinforcing its suitability as a sustainable location for growth.

Comments highlighting this issue
58706 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Bassingbourn and Kneesworth should be recognised as a single settlement within the Settlement Hierarchy due to their functional relationship and physical proximity.

Comments highlighting this issue
58943 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern over the rate of growth of Cambourne. Landscape and habitat should be significant factors in the assessment of developments in group villages.

Comments highlighting this issue
59812 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Steeple Morden, a group village remaining in this category.

Comments highlighting this issue
59996 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Guilden Morden, a group village remaining in this category.

Comments highlighting this issue
60078 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Fulbourn has a wide range of services & facilities and scores highly on the factors assessed. It should be re-classified as a Rural Centre.

Comments highlighting this issue
60298 (Miller Homes - Fulbourn site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Melbourn has a wide range of services & facilities and scores highly on the factors assessed. It should be re-classified as a Rural Centre.

Comments highlighting this issue
60305 (Miller Homes - Melbourn site)

Table of representations: S/SH: Settlement hierarchy – site related comments

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the north east of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40383) / Land to the south west of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40378)
Group Villages are capable of accommodating housing growth by virtue of their service provision and status in the settlement hierarchy. Orwell village has access to a number of facilities enabling residents to access services for their day-to-day needs. Orwell is an established sustainable settlement capable of accommodating proportionate levels of new housing growth to assist in preparation of a balanced and

varied housing supply which in turn will support the economic growth of Greater Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
56715 (K.B. Tebbit Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
44 North End and Land at Bury End Farm, North End, Meldreth (HELAA site 40284)
Meldreth is a Group Village – Agree Few development opportunities within the settlement boundary for sites of 8 dwellings or more. Only small sites for one or two dwellings. Meldreth is a Group Village. Site size thresholds for category of village are largely irrelevant and ineffective. Available sites fall below the threshold where affordable housing is required e.g. less than 10 dwellings.

Comments highlighting this issue
56998 (Hastingwood Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the west of Malton Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40324)
A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites. The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages, including at Orwell.

Comments highlighting this issue
57052 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off Fenny Lane, Meldreth, Royston (HELAA site 40036)
A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites.
The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Meldreth.

Comments highlighting this issue
57072 (Elbourn Family)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off Hall Lane, Great Chishill (HELAA site 47879)
A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites.
The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Great Chishill.

Comments highlighting this issue
57096 (RO Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
1-3 Lodge Road, Thriplow (HELAA site 47379)
A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites.
The site size limit for each category of village should be deleted or marked as indicative so that the policy is sufficiently flexible.

Comments highlighting this issue
57214 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off High Street, Little Eversden (HELAA Site 40211)
The current adopted Local Plan (2018) identifies Little Eversden as an Infill Village, and this classification is to be carried forward through the GCLP.
Little Eversden should be considered for modest scale housing allocations. To help deliver a broader range of housing stock including affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
57309 (Bletsoes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land to the east of Ridgeway and Old Pinewood Way, Papworth Everard (HELAA site 40439)

A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites.

The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Papworth Everard.

Comments highlighting this issue

57350 (Bloor Homes Eastern)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land to the south-east of Cambridge Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40408) / Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40412)

The proposed mixed-used development at Site HELAA Ref 40408 will continue to strengthen the village's employment offerings and support the wider rural economy. The scale of residential development proposed at Site HELAA Ref: 40412 is appropriate to the size of the village and would support the long term vitality of the village and provide the local community with housing choice.

Comments highlighting this issue

57519 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land adjacent to Babraham (HELAA site 40297)

We support this policy. We note that the emerging Plan seeks to classify Babraham as a ‘Group Village’ as it has a primary school. We consider Babraham has a pivotal role to play in promoting opportunities for employment in the southern cluster and that homes should be located adjacent to such opportunities. We consider that the Local Plan should seize this opportunity to co-locate employment opportunities and housing and allocate the subject site for mixed use development, as per the proposed development at this site. The boundary has not changed.

Comments highlighting this issue

57573, 57574, 57575, 57576 & 58487 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the east of Ridgeway and Old Pinewood Way, Papworth Everard (HELAA site 40439)
A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites.
The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Balsham.

Comments highlighting this issue
57652 (Endurance Estates - Balsham Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off The Causeway, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40228) & Land off Poplar Farm Close, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40230)
A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites.
The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Bassingbourn.

Comments highlighting this issue
57685 (Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off Station Road, Willingham (HELAA site 40527): Object
A capacity assessment is needed for all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites might be deliverable or developable during the plan period to 2041, and the number of dwellings that might be delivered from each of those sites.
The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in

conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Willingham.

Comments highlighting this issue
58147 (J Manning)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land at Pitt Dene Farm, Meadow Drift, Elsworth (HELAA site 40351)
The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Elsworth.

Comments highlighting this issue
58190 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land between Balsham Road and Horseheath Road, Linton (HELAA site 40302) - Pembroke College
Land north of Cambridge Road (A1307), Linton (HELAA site 51721) - Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Linton benefits from a breadth of services and facilities
The Cambridge South East Transport project seeks to provide better connections between Linton and Cambridge. Linton should therefore be a Rural Centre. New development can support improvement to existing services.

Comments highlighting this issue
58260 (Pembroke College), 60511 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land west of Linton (HELAA Site 51047)
Few opportunities for 30 dwellings within existing Minor Rural Centres settlement boundaries; Linton is an example where there are no opportunities within the boundary for sites of 30 dwellings or more.
The site size limits for each category of village are deleted and replaced with a general policy that supports development within existing settlement boundaries, in conjunction with a revised development strategy that allocates suitable sites on the edge of existing sustainable villages including at Linton.

Comments highlighting this issue
58511 (Bloor Homes Eastern)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Papworth Everard, a minor rural centre, is highly sustainable and has real growth potential. Should be allowed to grow, in a sensitive manner, to provide new services and support and improve existing services.

• Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (HELAA (2021) Site Reference: 48096) would have excellent transport links and could provide a Rural Travel Hub to optimise and maximise the use of those links, making sustainable travel modes easier and more attractive than car travel for site residents and residents of Papworth Everard more generally.

Comments highlighting this issue

58544 (MacTaggart & Mickel)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land east of Cambridge Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40414)

Based on a current assessment, Hardwick Village should be re-classified as a ‘Minor Rural Centre’ within the Settlement Hierarchy.

If the future development potential of the village is to be taken into consideration (as per Waterbeach New Town and Bourn Airfield New Village), then Hardwick Village should be identified as a ‘Rural Centre’ and a key location for sustainable development.

Our proposed development site at land east of Cambridge Road (Site No. 40414) provides a strategic opportunity for the future sustainable development of the settlement.

Comments highlighting this issue

58597 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms -Hardington- LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land west side of London Road, High Street, Fowlmere (HELAA site 40116)

Development should be assigned across settlement hierarchy. Policy direction includes restrictions on indicative maximum scheme sizes for each settlement tier. Coupled with overall development strategy for only small number of allocations within rural area, ability for sustainable developments to come forward is overly restrictive and unjustified.

Fowlmere is “Group Village”. Concerned by lack of assessment in terms of its ability to accommodate growth.
Failure of evidence base to consider all modes of transport and Fowlmere’s connectivity to surrounding settlements.
To ensure employment growth is supported by sufficient housing, Fowlmere should accommodate housing sites, to meet criterion c) NPPF Paragraph 8.

Comments highlighting this issue
58686 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land South of Newington, Willingham would offer the opportunity for a site that benefits from sustainable travel opportunities, in addition to service and facilities within the village.

Comments highlighting this issue
59154 (Silverley Properties Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
East of Horningsea Road (HELAA site 47647) / West of Ditton Lane (HELAA site 40516)
The adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan was supported by the Village Classification Report (2012). At this stage it appears that no similar assessment has been prepared to support the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. It is considered that an updated assessment must be undertaken to support the emerging Plan and to ensure it is both justified and effective.

Comments highlighting this issue
60569 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 40489)
The village of Melbourn remains as a Rural Centre within this emerging Local Plan and is supported having regard to the acknowledgement that the Council’s recognise the role that the village can play in accommodating new development and in particular the allocation for a mixed use site on the eastern side of Melbourn Science Park.

Comments highlighting this issue
60643 (Bruntwood SciTech)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 40490)
Development should be assigned across settlement hierarchy. Policy direction includes restrictions on indicative maximum scheme sizes for each settlement tier. Coupled with overall development strategy for only small number of allocations within rural area, ability for sustainable developments to come forward is overly restrictive and unjustified.
Support Melbourn as a 'Minor Rural Centre'.
Object to restriction on quantum of dwellings for this tier in Settlement Hierarchy, which contradicts its position and identification as largest district within the south west of the district.

Comments highlighting this issue

58695 (Wates Developments Ltd)

S/SB: Settlement boundaries

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section: 100

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Broad support was expressed for the principle of the settlement boundaries policy. Elements commended by Parish Councils and individual respondents included the preservation of the character of village settlement edges, preservation of agricultural land and the policy’s prevention of encroachment of settlements into the countryside. Suggested improvements to the policy included desire to increase the number and variety of permitted exceptions: garden centres, modern concepts of development such as co-housing and self-build, and employment areas. Additionally, there were aspirations to include minimum green separation between settlements (boundaries) and include parish councils in the development of the policy due their local knowledge.

Criticisms to the policy included suggestions that the policy is not compliant with the NPPF (para 69, 78 & 79). Some suggested that the policy wording needed tightening to avoid ambiguity as to when a settlement boundary would be drawn when building new settlement. Some developers had concern over the lack of inclusion of proposed sites within the settlement boundaries of many villages and asked that the Cambridge settlement boundary be expanded to accommodate possible future expansions at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge East. Other developers suggested a change of approach to create greater flexibility and growth in sustainable village edge locations, including within the Green Belt, with support for a criteria-based assessment and/or undertaking a capacity assessment of all villages to determine potential additional allocations.

Table of representations: S/SB: Settlement hierarchies

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support/Strongly support policy, for the following reasons:
• relating to preserving the character of village settlement edges, as these are being eroded by inappropriate development
• Important to reference role of Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Guides.
• helps preserve agricultural land and prevents unsustainable development in the countryside.
• control of development in villages
• difficult to prevent the encroachment of settlements on the countryside without policy.
• Flood plains to be respected.
• Support tightly drawn development boundaries to reduce encroachment.
• Policy work should include Parish Councils at an appropriate stage in the development of the Policy because of their local knowledge and data.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, The Ickleton Society, Gamlingay PC, Cllr D Sargeant, J Conroy, J Pavey, Ickleton PC, Linton PC, Cambourne TC, Steeple Morden PC, Guilden Morden PC, C Blakeley

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Objects to Policy
• lacks detail on the point at which a new settlement boundary will be drawn which would allow for boundaries to be vague and subject to expedient drift.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Save Honey Hill Group

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Policy S/SB would not comply with the aims of the Framework (para 78 NPPF), Policy 79.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Bonnel Homes Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Approach overly restrictive and not accord with paragraph’s 69 and 79 of the NPPF
• Not allowing sufficient land within settlement boundaries for windfall sites is contrary to Paragraph 69 c) of the NPPF.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Endurance Estates – Orwell sites

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Amend policy text to insert ‘garden centres’ to permitted exceptions outside settlement boundaries (at bullet point 3 in first proposals).

Comments highlighting the issue:
Avison Young

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Amend policy: Employment areas in the Countryside should be referenced under the terms of this policy, clearly identify Granta Park.
• Include Policy map with Settlement boundaries drawn with draft submission.

Comments highlighting the issue:
BioMed Realty

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Policy wording: When developments meet ‘sufficient certainty regarding their exact boundaries, new settlement boundaries will be drawn’ – careful wording is needed to clarify at what point certainty is attained.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Fen Ditton PC

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Policy wording: policy S/SB should refer to rural exception sites and first homes exception sites to maintain consistency with policy HE/S.
• await the detailed maps.
• consider the implications of any changes in national policy.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Home Builders Federation, Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Implications for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2021) Policy 5.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Cambridgeshire County Council

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Settlement boundaries are essential for controlling development around villages.

Comments highlighting the issue:
R Pargeter

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Want permitted development rights restricted in countryside so changes of use become conditional; other uses in the countryside require a planning application.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Cambridge Past, Present & Future

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• clear green separation between settlement boundaries. A minimum separation should be given.

Comments highlighting the issue:
MA Claridge

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Comprehensively review settlement boundaries.
• Allow for limited additional growth.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Bonnel Homes Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Hinders sustainable development at the edge of villages. Growth in village locations contributes to housing delivery and the settlement boundaries policy should provide flexibility.

Comments highlighting the issue:
J Swannell

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Approach is acceptable.
• Consider altering the parish boundaries between Sawston and Babraham, at development on the eastern edge of Sawston currently lies in Babraham parish but forms part of the village of Sawston.

Comments highlighting the issue:
KWA Architects

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• The way Settlement Boundaries have been used historically is out of date, provided an unnecessary restraint on development,
• Maximise flexibility to future land supply do not apply settlement boundaries in sustainable locations – Minor Rural Centre and above.
• consider development in context of the overall suitability of the site when assessed against wider plan policies, not whether inside a settlement boundary.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Endurance Estates

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Periodic reviews may need to be made to the policies map to ensure that the boundaries remain up to date in the event of windfall or rural exceptions development.
• small clusters of buildings, isolated properties and hamlets should not be provided with a settlement boundary and should be considered as countryside.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Huntingdonshire DC

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• development boundaries should be removed and replaced with a criterion-based assessment
• will add flexibility to the policy and allow for individual sites to be judged on their own merits
• Flexible approach to allow for the sustainable credentials of each site to be evaluated rather than preventing development completely just because a site falls outside of a boundary line
• Policy should take a flexible approach to development and growth within and on the edge of villages.

Comments highlighting the issue:
HD Planning Ltd, Croudace Homes, Gladman Developments

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• a more flexible and tolerant approach is needed towards development in the rural area.
• The logical approach is to allocate further sites on the edge of sustainable villages.
• Ensure maximum flexibility provided to ensure a pragmatic approach is adopted in drafting of settlement boundaries.

Comments highlighting the issue:
C King, Southern & Regional Developments Ltd, European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire, C Sawyer Nutt, F.C. Butler Trust

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• policy severely restricts growth outside settlement boundaries

Comments highlighting the issue:
Artisan (UK) Projects Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• policy direction should not preclude growth in sustainable locations, which may include sites well related to settlements previously outside of settlement boundaries
• past settlement boundaries have been drawn too tightly, and do not provide for many (if any) windfall opportunities

Comments highlighting the issue:

Endurance Estates - Orwell site

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• consider modern concepts of development that can be permitted outside of settlement boundaries, such as co-housing and self-build.

Comments highlighting the issue:
LVA

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Employment areas in the Countryside should be referenced under the terms of this policy or in supporting text

Comments highlighting the issue:
TWI

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• No coalescence of settlements
Comments highlighting the issue:
Dry Drayton PC

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Review settlement boundaries of Minor Rural Centres (Gamlingay) and the provision of additional sites that have been put forward through the call-for-sites.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Bonnel Homes Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Green belt villages are relatively more sustainable, particularly Gt Shelford.
• Identify safeguarding land.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Settlement boundary of Sawston should be amended to include land adjacent Spring House, Church Lane, Sawston. Currently the settlement boundary cuts through client's land.
Comments highlighting the issue:
H Kent

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• review of settlement boundaries, draw around properties that are considered to part of a village.
• Fowlmere along the west side of Chrishall Road. Appleacre Park, the development of 16 approved entry level houses, Lanacre along Chrishall Road, and properties to the west of these properties, should all be included within the settlement boundary of Fowlmere.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Colegrove Estates

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Extend settlement boundary at Orwell to include built out development as identified in our main representation, (S/3870/18/RM), (S/2379/13/FL).

Comments highlighting the issue:
K.B. Tebbit Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Settlement boundary along Bourn Road at Caxton is out of date. Redraw to include the land to the west of the Telephone Exchange and wrap around the new replacement dwelling of 30 Bourn Road to match the houses on the northern side of Bourn Road. (S/4069/19/FL), (S/4023/18/FL), (21/02839/CLUED).

Comments highlighting the issue:
D & B Searle

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Cottenham settlement boundary should be redrawn to include changes taking place to the west of the settlement, development under construction should be included, (S/2413/17/OL and S/1606/16/OL).

Comments highlighting the issue:
S & D Jevon & R

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Amend Melbourn settlement boundary to include the 'Birchwood site' (S/2941/18/FL) already granted, north of Melbourn Science Park.

Comments highlighting the issue:
TTP Campus Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Create looser settlement boundaries, to include small sites promoted for development on the edge of villages.
• settlement boundaries need to be drawn more loosely, beyond outer Green Belt, to allow for speculative development.

• Land to East Side of Cambridge Road offers sustainable location for residential growth Melbourn (HELAA site 47757).
• Land West of London Road Fowlmere lies adjacent to existing settlement boundary is suitable Fowlmere (HELAA site 40116)
• discourage development of less suitable sites and assist in delivery of affordable housing, such as in Linton
• Such as Teversham (HELAA site 40250)
• Tight settlement boundary for Orwell artificially constrains development. HELAA site 40496 abuts Orwell settlement boundary and site forms a logical extension.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Artisan (UK) Projects Ltd, Wates Development Ltd, Endurance Estates, H. J. Molton Settlement, The Critchley Family, Stephen & Jane Graves, D Wright, P, J & M Crow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• settlement boundary for Steeple Morden is unsound, not justified and not consistent with national policy Steeple Morden (HELAA sites 40440 and 40442).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Daniel Brothers (Shefford) Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Development outside of the settlement boundary should be considered via a series of criteria allowing development proposals to be assessed on its respective merits, and therefore consider Cottenham (HELAA site 59409).

Comments highlighting the issue:

BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners (Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support broad development strategy of bringing jobs and homes closer together.
• Support the allocation of mixed-use development on east side of Melbourn Science Park, Melbourn (HELAA site 40490)

Comments highlighting the issue:

Bruntwood SciTech

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Object to the 'high risk' development strategy, dependent upon the delivery of some strategic, complex sites. Strategy should allocate sites that can deliver policy-compliant levels of affordable housing, Teversham (HELAA site 40250).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Cheffins, The White Family and Pembroke College

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Limits the opportunity for suitable sites on the edge of settlements to meet the needs of Extra Care developments for which there is a current and future unmet need which helps tackle the affordability. Comberton (HELAA site 40261), Gamlingay (HELAA site 40030).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Endurance Estates, Wheatley Group Development Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Land south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c include within the revised Sawston boundaries, Sawston (HELAA site 40509).

Comments highlighting the issue:

KWA Architects

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Supports defined settlement boundaries.

• In defining the settlement boundary on the Eastern edge of Cambridge, consider safeguarding land east of Airport Way, in order to accommodate for the relocated park & ride and allow for any future expansion of Cambridge East. Cambridge (HELAA site 40306).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Marshall Group properties

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Objection to the Settlement Boundary for Linton, Linton (HELAA site 40044).

Comments highlighting the issue:

R Wilson

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham, RWS Ltd, advocate including site within settlement boundary, Teversham (HELAA site 40295).
• Fig 4, page 22 of the Plan identifies the locations of proposed new housing development for the years 2021 to 2041, wants written confirmation that client's site at Bartlow Road Linton is included within the figure (HELAA site 40044).
• Greater Cambridge Local Plan map shows layer 'settlement hierarchy Adopted 2018 Local Plan' with blue notation across the majority of Linton and boundaries to coincide with the settlement boundary which excludes site north and south of Bartlow Road, Linton (HELAA site 40044).
• Change or modify Plan to revise the settlement boundary around Linton as shown by the green pecked line in Appendix 8, include Linton (HELAA site 40044).

Comments highlighting the issue:

R Wilson

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Include site within the settlement boundary of Hauxton for the provision of either a significantly increased quantity of housing, employment or a mixture of both. Hauxton (HELAA site 59400).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Bridgemere Land Plc

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Sawston (HELAA site 40547) and Stapleford (HELAA site 40368) include within the respective settlement boundaries, as agree with proposed policy direction to define the boundaries based on "the present extent of the built-up area as well as planned new development".

Comments highlighting the issue:

Deal Land LLP

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Settlement boundary should be amended to include this Site Impington (HELAA site 40061).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Hill Residential Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Adapt approach to include obvious development opportunities, such as large-scale farm buildings contiguous with existing settlements (HELAA site 40208).

Comments highlighting the issue:

A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Include site within Settlement Boundary for Willingham (HELAA site 59349).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Silverley Properties Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Submission demonstrates expansion to the SE and SW of the Addenbrookes Campus achieved without undermining Green Belt, and new boundaries for Cambridge set would enhance southern edge (HELAA site 40064).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Jesus College (and Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings), a private landowner and St John's College

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Case for the settlement boundary amendment at Steeple Morden to include site within the development framework, (HELAA Site 40054).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Steeplefield

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Site should be included within the settlement boundary of Linton (HELAA site 51721).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Release site from Green Belt and include within settlement boundary of Fen Ditton as part of the allocation, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 47647), (HELAA site 40516).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton Site

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Amend Horningsea village development framework to include site, Horningsea (new site 59410).

Comments highlighting the issue:

M Asplin

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• No objection to principle of settlement boundaries. Existing boundaries have remained largely unchanged, some cases to consider site allocations. Villages development opportunities limited by constraints such as heritage assets.
• Undertake capacity assessment of all villages in South Cambridgeshire to determine which potential housing sites.
• No council assessment of capacity land within the existing settlement boundaries of villages undertaken. Should seek to allocate suitable sites on edge of sustainable villages and adjust settlement boundary.
• If capacity assessment does not identify sites, then additional allocations should be made on the edge of those villages to deliver sufficient housing to meet the affordable housing need. Meldreth (HELAA Site 40284), Orwell (HELAA Site 40234), Meldreth (HELAA site 40277), Great Shelford (HELAA site 40529), Great Chishill (HELAA site 47879), Fen Ditton (HELAA site 48148), Fulbourn (HELAA site 40523), Fulbourn (HELAA site 40522), Papworth Everard (HELAA Site 40439), Balsham (HELAA site 40438), Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40230), (HELAA Site 40228) and (HELAA Site 40227), Willingham (HELAA site 40527), Linton (HELAA site 40411), Elsworth (HELAA site 40514), Orwell (HELAA site 47890), Linton (HELAA Site 51047), Orwell (HELAA site 40324), Foxton (HELAA site 40159).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Individuals: C Meadows, Elbourn Family, J Francis, J Manning
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners: MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd, Hastingwood Developments, CEMEX UK Properties Ltd, Shelford Investment, RO Group Ltd, KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family, Bloor Homes Eastern, Cambridgeshire CC (landowner), Endurance Estates – Balsham site, Endurance Estates - Bassingbourn Sites, Hill Residential, Enterprise Residential Developments and Davison Group, Hawkswren Ltd, Bloor Homes Eastern, Hill Residential Ltd

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Include ‘Honey Hill’ where a large commercial development planned (CWWTPR), area between Fen Ditton and Horningsea.
• Described in the NECAPP.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Save Honey Hill Group, J Pratt, Fen Ditton PC

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support the expansion of the Cambridge City settlement boundary for growth of Cambridge Biomedical Campus, including land identified to the south of the Campus as the potential Major Area of Change.

Comments highlighting the issue:

CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support for the expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to the south.
• Support for protecting Green Belt beyond this boundary.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Cambridge Biomedical Campus Limited (CBC Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Request to consider more flexible boundaries to allow for possible future development.
• Concerns over potential impact on Green Belt if boundaries are too restrictive.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Local residents and landowners in the southern fringe of Cambridge.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support for including new development sites within the boundaries of major settlements to help meet housing needs.
• Suggestions to update boundaries to reflect existing development.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Various district councillors and planning consultants.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Concern that proposed boundaries exclude sites that have potential for sustainable development.
• Requests for further assessment of sites on the edge of settlements.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Environmental groups and local community organisations.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Suggest the plan should encourage development of brownfield sites before greenfield.
• Emphasize the importance of protecting the character of rural villages.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Local conservation societies and parish councils.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Concerns about infrastructure capacity to support new development within settlement boundaries.
• Need for better integration of transport planning with housing growth.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Transport authorities and infrastructure providers.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Requests to clarify policy wording around windfall sites and exceptions outside settlement boundaries.
• Suggest more detailed maps and clearer criteria for boundary changes.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Planning consultants and developers.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support for maintaining strong controls on development in the countryside to prevent urban sprawl.
• Highlight importance of floodplain protection and environmental safeguards.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Environmental agencies and local authorities.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Request to review settlement boundaries regularly to reflect changes in housing needs and development patterns.
• Support for flexible approaches that consider site-specific circumstances.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Local planning groups and developers.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Concern that tight settlement boundaries may restrict affordable housing opportunities on village edges.
• Suggest inclusion of rural exception sites and policies supporting first homes.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Housing associations and community advocates.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Call for clearer guidance on the point at which new settlement boundaries should be drawn based on development certainty.
• Request for policy to explicitly recognize neighbourhood plans and village design guides.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Parish councils and planning policy experts.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support for protecting agricultural land and preventing unsustainable countryside development.
• Emphasis on the role of Parish Councils in policy development for their local knowledge.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Rural interest groups and local government representatives.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Objection to the vagueness in policy regarding when new settlement boundaries will be drawn, risking arbitrary changes.
• Concern that current policy might not align with national planning framework requirements.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Save Honey Hill Group, Bonnel Homes Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Criticism that policy is overly restrictive and does not allow enough land for windfall sites.
• Suggest adding ‘garden centres’ to the list of permitted exceptions outside settlement boundaries.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Endurance Estates – Orwell sites, Avison Young.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Request to explicitly reference employment areas in the countryside and include specific sites like Granta Park.
• Call for inclusion of detailed policy maps with settlement boundaries in the draft submission.

Comments highlighting the issue:
BioMed Realty.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Need for careful wording in policy to clarify when certainty about development boundaries is attained.
• Suggest policy should include rural exception and first homes exception sites for consistency.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Fen Ditton PC, Home Builders Federation.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Awaiting detailed maps and considering impacts of changes in national policy on settlement boundaries.
• Note implications for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2021) Policy 5.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Ltd, Cambridgeshire County Council.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Settlement boundaries are essential to control village development and prevent encroachment.
• Support for restricting permitted development rights in the countryside to require

planning applications for changes of use.

Comments highlighting the issue:

R Pargeter, Cambridge Past, Present & Future.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Call for clear green separation between settlements with minimum separation distances.
• Request comprehensive review of settlement boundaries and allowance for limited additional growth.

Comments highlighting the issue:

MA Claridge, Bonnel Homes Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Concern that current approach hinders sustainable development on village edges, limiting housing delivery.
• Suggest settlement boundary policies should provide flexibility to support growth.

Comments highlighting the issue:

J Swannell.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Consider altering parish boundaries where development lies outside but functionally part of the village.
• Note that historical use of settlement boundaries may unnecessarily restrain development.

Comments highlighting the issue:

KWA Architects, Endurance Estates.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Suggest periodic reviews of policy maps to keep boundaries current with windfall and rural exception developments.
• Small clusters and isolated properties should be treated as countryside without settlement boundaries.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Huntingdonshire DC.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Propose removing settlement boundaries in favor of criterion-based assessments for development proposals.
• Advocate a flexible policy approach that assesses sustainability of sites rather than strict boundary lines.

Comments highlighting the issue:
HD Planning Ltd, Croudace Homes, Gladman Developments.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Call for tolerance and flexibility in rural development policy, including allocation of sites on sustainable village edges.
• Emphasize the need for pragmatic settlement boundary drafting to maximize development opportunities.

Comments highlighting the issue:
C King, Southern & Regional Developments Ltd, European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire, F.C. Butler Trust.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Concern that policy severely restricts growth outside settlement boundaries.
• Recommend that growth in sustainable locations, including outside current boundaries, should be allowed.
• Note that past boundaries are often too tight and don’t allow for windfall sites.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Artisan (UK) Projects Ltd, Endurance Estates - Orwell site.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Suggest modern development types (like co-housing, self-build) should be permitted outside settlement boundaries.
• Employment areas in the countryside should be explicitly referenced.

Comments highlighting the issue:
LVA, TWI.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Stress on no coalescence of settlements to maintain separation.
• Call to review boundaries of Minor Rural Centres and add sites from call-for-sites process.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Dry Drayton PC, Bonnel Homes Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Green belt villages seen as relatively sustainable, especially Great Shelford.
• Identify safeguarding land for future use.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Request amendment to Sawston's settlement boundary to include land adjacent to Spring House, Church Lane, currently split by the boundary.

Comments highlighting the issue:
H Kent.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Suggest reviewing settlement boundaries to include properties considered part of villages.
• Specific examples include Fowlmere's west side along Chrishall Road with several developments that should be included.

Comments highlighting the issue:
Colegrove Estates.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Propose extending Orwell's settlement boundary to include built-out developments referenced by planning applications.

Comments highlighting the issue:
K.B. Tebbit Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• State that Caxton's settlement boundary along Bourn Road is out of date and should be redrawn to include new developments and dwellings.

Comments highlighting the issue:
D & B Searle.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Cottenham's settlement boundary should be redrawn to include ongoing developments to the west of the settlement.

Comments highlighting the issue:

S & D Jevon & R.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Amend Melbourn's settlement boundary to include the 'Birchwood site' already granted permission north of Melbourn Science Park.

Comments highlighting the issue:

TTP Campus Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Propose looser settlement boundaries to allow small promoted sites on village edges and to permit speculative development beyond the outer Green Belt.

• Specific sites mentioned for sustainable residential growth include land on the east side of Cambridge Road (Melbourn) and west of London Road (Fowlmere).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Artisan (UK) Projects Ltd, Wates Development Ltd, Endurance Estates, H. J. Molton Settlement, The Critchley Family, Stephen & Jane Graves, D Wright, P, J & M Crow.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Settlement boundary for Steeple Morden is unsound, not justified, and inconsistent with national policy (HELAA sites 40440 and 40442).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Daniel Brothers (Shefford) Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Development outside settlement boundaries should be assessed by criteria allowing individual merit evaluation, referencing Cottenham (HELAA site 59409).

Comments highlighting the issue:

BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support broad strategy to bring jobs and homes closer, supporting mixed-use development on east side of Melbourn Science Park (HELAA site 40490).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Bruntwood SciTech.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Object to 'high risk' development strategy dependent on complex strategic sites; call for allocations that deliver affordable housing, referencing Teversham (HELAA site 40250).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Cheffins, The White Family and Pembroke College.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Limits opportunity for suitable edge-of-settlement sites for Extra Care developments needed to address affordability, mentioning Comberton (HELAA site 40261) and Gamlingay (HELAA site 40030).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Endurance Estates, Wheatley Group Development Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Suggest including land south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c within revised Sawston boundaries (HELAA site 40509).

Comments highlighting the issue:

KWA Architects.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support defined settlement boundaries and suggest safeguarding land east of Airport Way in Cambridge to allow for relocated park & ride and future expansion (HELAA site 40306).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Marshall Group Properties.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Object to settlement boundary for Linton (HELAA site 40044).
Comments highlighting the issue:
R Wilson.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Advocate including land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham within settlement boundary (HELAA site 40295).
Comments highlighting the issue:
RWS Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Request confirmation that site at Bartlow Road, Linton is included in housing development plan for 2021-2041 (HELAA site 40044).
Comments highlighting the issue:
R Wilson.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Recommend revising Linton settlement boundary to include excluded sites north and south of Bartlow Road as shown in Appendix 8 (HELAA site 40044).
Comments highlighting the issue:
R Wilson.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Propose including Hauxton site within settlement boundary for increased housing, employment, or mixed use (HELAA site 59400).
Comments highlighting the issue:
Bridgemere Land Plc.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Suggest including Sawston (HELAA site 40547) and Stapleford (HELAA site 40368) sites within respective boundaries, consistent with policy to define boundaries by built-up area and planned development.
Comments highlighting the issue:
Deal Land LLP.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Settlement boundary should be amended to include site in Impington (HELAA site 40061).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Hill Residential Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Recommend including large-scale farm buildings contiguous with settlements as development opportunities (HELAA site 40208).

Comments highlighting the issue:

A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Request inclusion of site within Willingham settlement boundary (HELAA site 59349).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Silverley Properties Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Expansion around Addenbrookes Campus achieved without harming Green Belt; new boundaries would improve southern edge of Cambridge (HELAA site 40064).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Jesus College (and partners).

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support settlement boundary amendment at Steeple Morden to include site within development framework (HELAA site 40054).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Steeplefield.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Request site inclusion within Linton settlement boundary (HELAA site 51721).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Propose releasing site from Green Belt and including it within Fen Ditton settlement boundary as part of allocation (HELAA sites 47647 and 40516).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton Site.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Amend Horningsea village development framework to include new site (site 59410).

Comments highlighting the issue:

M Asplin.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• No objection to settlement boundaries principle; suggest village development opportunities limited due to constraints like heritage assets.
• Recommend capacity assessments of all South Cambridgeshire villages to identify potential housing sites within and outside existing boundaries.
• Suggest additional allocations at village edges if capacity inside boundaries insufficient.
• Examples of sites mentioned include Meldreth, Orwell, Great Shelford, Great Chishill, Fen Ditton, Fulbourn, Papworth Everard, Balsham, Bassingbourn, Willingham, Linton, Elsworth, Foxton, among others.

Comments highlighting the issue:

Various individuals and developers.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Include ‘Honey Hill’ where a large commercial development is planned (area between Fen Ditton and Horningsea).

Comments highlighting the issue:

Save Honey Hill Group, J Pratt, Fen Ditton PC.

Summary of issues raised in comments:

• Support expansion of Cambridge City settlement boundary for growth of Cambridge Biomedical Campus including land south of the campus identified as a Major Area of Change.

Comments highlighting the issue:
CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council, and a private family trust.

Sites and Policy Areas

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

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.

Table of representations: Cambridge urban area

Summary of issues raised in comments

Generally and broadly support these developments.

Comments highlighting this issue

58043 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 58364 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

58314 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59469 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59469 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support for proposals making use of brownfield sites, as this will reduce pressure on rural areas. However, need to ensure have character and are not just blocks of flats that do not match the surrounding area.

Comments highlighting this issue

59247 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Agree new neighbourhoods should be delivered on brownfield sites such as North East Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue

57320 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

59247 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Huge challenge to balance wildlife vs people in the urban area. More gardens (rather than relying on parks) are needed to support wildlife.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59247 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59247 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Support any potential for change of use of existing buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59899 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Support for good designed, active compact new developments, reuse of brownfield land, and continued development of larger neighbourhoods where possible.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60113 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:

Cambridge urban area needs to be sympathetically developed before considering greenfield sites in South Cambridgeshire.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56722 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:

The urban area should be the focus for new homes (alongside new settlements).

Comments highlighting this issue:
56805 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57320 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58252 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60189 (J Preston), 60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58252 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:

Capacity issues need to be tackled, and only if they can be resolved should additional growth be allowed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60189 (J Preston), 60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58716 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59041 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59247 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised: The term ‘unnecessary private car use’ is very subjective, would recommend a clearer definition.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:

Need to link to Cambourne and East West Rail to maximise the benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:

Need to recognise that some private car use will still be needed. Need to recognise the difference between car ownership and car usage. Try to discourage car usage, but accept there will be car ownership.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57648 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57648 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58314 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
No reference to the pandemic and opportunities for city centre residential and other uses resulting from changes in retail.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60189 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59140 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59140 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Essential that all development is synchronised with the relevant infrastructure.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59150 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
57928 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59599 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:

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 environmental, economic and social drivers without undermining its economic identity" is not supported by evidence.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:

Green Belt assessment ignores historic environment designations.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58091 (R Wallach)

Summary of issues raised:

No new cultural provision included, or other city scale uses, therefore greater pressure on existing uses.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60189 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised:

The map in Figure 14 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58110 (M Asplin), 58112 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Should refer to ‘regenerating or enhancing’ rather than just ‘regenerating’ parts of the city that are not fulfilling their potential.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58346 (ARU)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
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

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.

Table of representations: S/NEC – North East Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised:
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
• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
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 Estate), 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 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)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58353 (C Lindley), 57499 (A Martin), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58891 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59269 (Trinity College)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60763 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60264 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58365 (Linton PC)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57499 (A Martin), 58063 (Horningsea PC), 57649 (Histon & Impington PC), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 59551 (CPRE), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised:
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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57608 (J Pratt), 57499 (A Martin), 56469 (A Martin), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 57499 (A Martin), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
The map shown in the plan does not show the destruction of the Green Belt that the WWTP will have.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58063 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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).

Comments highlighting this issue:

58063 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised:

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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
This allocation may cause the plan to be vulnerable to challenge at Examination stage.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to the assumed housing trajectory lead in time and build out rates for NEC.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58063 (Horningsea PC), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Unsustainable as demolition of an operational sewage plant is not included in the sustainability appraisal.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59551 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
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 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). 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Climate change)

Summary of issues raised:
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy CC/NZ.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy CC/CS
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59551 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
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 opportunity to incorporate mains drainage connection into the Fen Road site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59720 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59720 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised:
Since the site selection 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 57471 (C Martin), 57649 (Histon & Impington PC), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59282 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 58282 (H Smith), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Natural England's ANGSt would require NEC to have a 100ha site within 5km.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policies: • BG/GI • BG/RC • BG/PO • BG/EO
Comments highlighting this issue:
57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59282 (National Trust), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Highly likely that 20% on site biodiversity net gain will be unachievable and will be dependent on off-site land acquisition or biodiversity credits.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised:
Allocation policy wording needs explicit objectives, or clear links to other policies on BNG and environmental design.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58984 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59900 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Formal sports pitches are required onsite
Comments highlighting this issue:
58282 (H Smith)

Summary of issues raised:
Cemetery provision is required
Comments highlighting this issue:
58282 (H Smith)

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

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

Summary of issues raised in comments

S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy WS/HS

Comments highlighting this issue

57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Great places)

Summary of issues raised:
The site is too high in density with large scale overdevelopment of housing focused on a relatively small site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57499 (A Martin), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59551 (CPRE), 60190 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised:
High density and heights are unprecedented in the Cambridge area raising significant challenges in terms of townscape impacts and the site's ability to deliver sustainable development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58967 (Endurance Estate), 59282 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
The development appears characterless and lacking in a practical base for a thriving community, so close to the expanded A14.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59551 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policies:
• GP/LC
• GP/GB
• GP/QP
• GP/HA
Comments highlighting this issue:
57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
This has potential to be a showcase development if done right. The plan should create high-density dwelling with plenty of green space (of varied kinds), recreation and entertainment facilities. The co-location of retail and dwelling provision should be used to enhance vibrancy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57711 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised:
Care is needed to ensure mistakes of the development around Cambridge Rail Station are not repeated.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56806 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised:
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 generates exciting new places.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)

Summary of issues raised:
It will be important that the policy ensures the protection and enhancement of the historic environment including the conservation areas, river corridor and wider cityscape. 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. Ensure Historic environment considerations are included in policy, including recommendations of HIA. On-going discussions in relation to detail.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59603 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
[No specific comment reference provided]

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57643* (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy should consider a "Plan B" with fewer dwellings, less commercial space especially as the policy also fails to consider the changed working and living conditions resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56474 (M Starkie), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Can’t assume everyone will work from home.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57649 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Working and living patterns were different before the global pandemic and so should be considered in the plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58063 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Acknowledgment that the Local Plan will not have included projected new employment numbers on recently acquired sites west and east of Milton Road.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58565 (Brockton Everlast)

Summary of issues raised:
Early residential phases provide opportunity to meet identified need for commercial uses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)

Summary of issues raised:
Support densification of existing employment uses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59900 (Fen Ditton PC)

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

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support delivery of homes at North East Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57643* (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
How many dwellings in Cambridge are a) student accommodation and b) vacant investment properties? If either of these figures are significant and/or increasing, the Local Plan should consider ways to restrict both moving forward. If investors and colleges snap up a high percentage of property within Cambridge, that pushes residents out and drives the need to build more.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58065 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support high density development approach within North East Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58565 (Brockton Everlast)

Summary of issues raised:
DCO process is likely to negatively impact on affordable housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58967 (Endurance Estate), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Early residential phases provide opportunity to meet identified need for mixed tenure, Build to Rent housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)

Summary of issues raised:
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 local authorities.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59900 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Should offer a residential opportunity for those employed in the technology sectors around Cambridge, including a significant component of affordable housing for market sale, market rent, shared ownership, and social housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60046 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60763 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57603 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised:
Support a bus and rail network for convenient use.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56567 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Road access to Fen Road, Chesterton should be safeguarded.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58282 (H Smith)

Summary of issues raised:
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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56927 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57476 (ESFA - Department for Education), 57493 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
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. Alternatively, any new development has to commit to reducing the car mode share for existing developments in the area to give new developments some headroom to generate some car trips, albeit overall car mode share will be significantly less than current mode shares. The issue is how new developments control travel patterns and what mechanism in planning permission secures this.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised:
Question of practical monitoring and enforcement of the vehicular trip budget. The monitoring would be technically complex, and if the trip budget is exceeded, how would the system identify the responsible development?

Comments highlighting this issue:
58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised:
Trip budget applies to the pre-Covid conventional weekday AM and PM peak hours. Whether this remains appropriate given changed working patterns post-Covid is

debated. The Department for Transport has advised on using an 'Uncertainty Toolkit' to assess future travel demand scenarios, but neither the Local Plan transport evidence base nor the NECAAP consultation mention this toolkit.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised:
Development here combined with committed development at Waterbeach will put enormous pressure on existing infrastructure in the area.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59282 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
It is strange that proximity to the existing Guided Busway is given as a positive factor. Are residents expected to commute to St Ives? From Milton, the busway ceases and buses run on city streets.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59551 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
Given its proximity to the existing railway, East West Rail Company requests inclusion of a requirement to ensure development does not prejudice the preferred East West Rail route alignment or delivery.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59870 (East West Rail)

Summary of issues raised:
Without significant interventions such as those possibly delivered by Cambridge Science Park North (HELAA site 40096), reducing vehicle trips at CSP sufficiently to allow delivery of the wider NECAAP will be difficult.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60687 (Trinity College)

S/AMC: Areas of Major Change

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

21

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the identified Areas of Major Change Cambridge urban area, with some suggesting modifications to the approach. These include the inclusion of F1 (education uses) proposed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education. Another comment indicated the need for the policy guidance of these areas to be informed by the impact of both existing and committed housing development.

There was strong opposition from Fen Ditton PC regarding the offsetting of development with a country park on productive, carbon sequestrating farmland. Equally, one member of the public objected to the omission in Figure 16: Map showing proposed Areas of Major Change in Cambridge urban area not displaying reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for **North East Cambridge (Policy S/NEC)** in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost or should exclude both until DCO approved. One member of the public questioned why Cambridge Local Plan Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change, with its important safeguards, was not being brought forward. Equally, another member of the public supported Policy 18 not being taken forward. East West Main Line Partnership's current proposal to approach Cambridge from the South is based on the opportunity for major developments throughout the Southern Fringe, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change limiting such development.

Station Areas West and Clifton Road (S/AMC/Policy 21) was supported, however Trinity Hall and Jesus College objected to the current boundary which should be reviewed to include land to the north of Station Road and south of Bateman Street. Historic England noted the area and surrounding area contained several heritage assets and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change (S/AMC/Policy 12) was supported with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Historic England noted the area was within the Kite conservation area and there were several listed buildings in this area. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

South of Coldham's Lane (S/AMC/Policy 16), one member of the public supported the area's development. Historic England noted the Mill Road conservation area adjacent to the north west boundary of the site and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Table of representations: Policy S/AMC - Areas of Major Change

Summary of issues raised:
Supports the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56865 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Continuation of Areas of Major Change (AMCs) noted.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56928 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the proposal not to carry forward the Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56967 (Trumpington RA)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57406 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58366 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
AMCs should allow the potential inclusion and acceptability of F1 (formerly D1) uses. Education use within these policies would create a more positive policy context for education provision.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57478 (ESFA - Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
Consideration of the impact of existing/committed housing in the urban area should inform the policy guidance established for AMCs.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57665 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to the suggestion that mitigation involves turning irreversibly the "Proposed

Area of Major Change" into some kind of greenwashed country park. This appears to be an underhand attempt at carbon offsetting on much needed, productive, carbon sequestrating farmland.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59901 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Map Fig 16 should also display for reference the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for the S/NEC Policy in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost, or should exclude both until DCO approved.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58116 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Question why Policy 18 southern fringe is not being brought forward; no explanation provided. Is this because GCSP considers its job done and/or is this picked up by the brought forward Policy 17, relating to the biomedical campus (now proposed as Policy S/CBC)?

Comments highlighting this issue:
58889 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised:
Support Policy 18 southern fringe not being brought forward. East West Main Line Partnership's current proposal to approach Cambridge from the South is based on the opportunity for major developments throughout the Southern Fringe, contrary to the revised policy of limiting such development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59173 (M Berkson)

S/AMC/Policy 21: Station Areas West and Clifton Road

Summary of issues raised:
Support the carry forward of this site.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59110 (Pace Investments)

Summary of issues raised:
Clifton Road Industrial Estate (HELAA site 48068); USS is preparing a strategy for the delivery of the redevelopment of the Clifton Road Industrial Estate and supports the site as an AMC.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57268 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to policy wording; the boundary of the AMC should be reviewed to include the land to the south of Bateman Street to ensure its long-term future is properly considered to best support the Cambridge Station Area as part of a coordinated and considered AMC.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58054 (Trinity Hall)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to policy wording; the boundary of the AMC should be reviewed to include the land to the north of Station Road to ensure its long-term future is properly considered to best support the Cambridge Station Area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59066 (Jesus College)

Summary of issues raised:
Parts of this area are located within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. Cambridge Station is also listed at Grade II. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, it is recommended to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). The recommendations of the HIA should inform the policy wording. Any development would need to preserve or, where appropriate, enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Development should conserve, sustain, or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).
Comments highlighting this issue:
59604 (Historic England)

S/AMC/Policy 12: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change

Summary of issues raised:
Areas of old-fashioned retail, like the Beehive and the Grafton Centre, should be used for housing as they are currently very underutilized for retail purposes.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56719 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
There is a high chance of change regarding Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton as the Grafton Centre has an uncertain future.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57651 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Parts of this area lie within the Kite Conservation Area. There are several listed buildings including the Grade II* Arts Theatre Workshop and Store, and 38 Newmarket Road and 17 Fitzroy Street, both Grade II listed. Nearby listed buildings also exist. Development of this site may impact heritage assets and their settings. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is recommended, with findings used to inform policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59605 (Historic England)

S/AMC/Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the site's development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58058 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets on site, but the Mill Road Conservation Area lies adjacent to the northwest boundary. Development may impact heritage assets and their settings. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is recommended, with findings used to inform policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59606 (Historic England).

S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section

38

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the identified Opportunity Areas in Cambridge. Those who supported included Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, Cambridgeshire County Council, Croydon PC and Cambridge Past, Present & Future. The policy was also supported along with public realm improvements by Trinity Hall, Jesus College and Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen. One member of the public also suggested these sites include passivhaus housing, more green spaces and smaller shops.

Histon & Impington PC questioned the evidence to support the Plan's claim that there is already sufficient land assigned for job creation is in the correct place. They noted the business park to the North of Waterbeach on the A10 is still only partially occupied several years after it was opened: many businesses consider the location that far out of Cambridge to be unacceptable. One member of the public objected to the omission in Figure 17: Map of proposed opportunity areas in Cambridge urban area not displaying reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for **North East Cambridge (Policy S/NEC)** in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost or should exclude both until DCO approved. Jesus College indicated Land to the North of Station Road, Cambridge is also a potential allocation for employment in the Local Plan.

Newmarket Road Retail Park (S/OA/NR) was supported by Railpen with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted the site is within the St. Matthew’s Primary School catchment and is a restricted site and cannot expand. The intention to ‘improve… infrastructure delivery’ in the OAs could enable longer-term solutions for the school’s needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the

holistic approach outlined. The Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education states the site should allow the potential inclusion of F1 (education use). One member of the public stated any replacement uses should ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population. Cambridge Past, Present & Future stated Land at Cheddars Lane should be included in the Opportunity Area. Historic England noted the proximity of several designated heritage assets and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Fen Ditton PC noted Newmarket Road retail and Beehive areas both fulfil an important function for residents and questioned why the Tesco site had been excluded. The sites' accesses should also be investigated due to road congestion. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties agreed that Newmarket Road Retail Park and the Beehive Centre are not the best use of this land. The retail park model places great emphasis on access by car, disadvantages small independent businesses, and contributes to the decline of high streets. They supported redevelopment of these areas to meet identified needs.

Beehive Centre (S/OA/BC) was supported by Railpen with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted the site is within the St. Matthew's Primary School catchment and is a restricted site and cannot expand. The intention to 'improve… infrastructure delivery' in the OAs could enable longer-term solutions for the school's needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the holistic approach outlined. The Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education states the site should allow the potential inclusion of F1 (education use). One member of the public stated any replacement uses should ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population. Historic England noted the site is immediately adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Abbey Stadium (S/OA/AS) is supported by Grosvenor Britain & Ireland as an Opportunity Area, however the Plan needs to provide a solid planning policy framework to secure the future of the Club either on site or at a relocation site. Fen Ditton PC assumed a Green Belt relocation site would include worse access links. The RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area had no opinion about Abbey stadium as an opportunity site but had significant concerns regarding any relocation of the stadium to a site near the A14 J.35 with regards to potential adverse impacts on Little Wilbraham Fen SSSI; and noted no such proposed allocation within the First

Proposals document. One member of the public noted Abbey Stadium as an opportunity for sustainable development and use of new cycle path access. While another member of the public had concerns about additional access routes into the site, as there is already access from Newmarket Road and Cut Throat Lane. Historic England noted several designated heritage assets immediately opposite the site and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties noted Abbey Stadium provides community support and is popular with local residents, however the stadium's location results in significant impact to local residents on match days. Any proposed change of use should consider the entire local impact of the new proposed change of use, specifically how visitors are likely to travel to the site, and how public transport use can be integrated into any change of use.

Brydell Partners indicated **Shire Hall/Castle Park (S/OA/CH)** should not be overly restrictive and include flexibility. Historic England noted the site includes a variety of designated heritage assets including Cambridge Castle Mound, a scheduled monument, Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording. Cambridgeshire County Council, the landowner clarified the extent of the site being vacated and marketed.

Historic England noted **Mitcham's Corner (S/OA/Policy 22)** includes parts of the Central and Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Regarding **Eastern Gate (S/OA/Policy 23)**, a member of the public voices their concern to see the north area of St Matthew's Piece and the allotments on New Street identified as 'opportunity areas'. As protected open spaces there should be no question of any 'opportunity' to build on these valuable green spaces. For the avoidance of doubt these areas need to be removed from the classification of an 'opportunity area' and re-classified as untouchable protected open space for the health and well-being of the local community. Metro Property Unit Trust support the continuation of the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and recommends the SPD is updated to reflect developments that have since come forward, and to confirm the St Matthews Centre site as a proposed site.

The Friends of St Matthew's Piece require the provisions of the **Eastern Gate (S/OA/Policy 23)** to explicitly protect and preserve the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and its invaluable trees. This area still lies within the boundary of the 'Eastern Gate Opportunity Area'. Any ambiguity must be explicitly removed for both for the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and Abbey Ward's New Street Allotments (there are no allotments at all within Petersfield). Reassurances are sought to acknowledge these crucial points have been heard and understood by the Local Plan Team as part of your consultation. Historic England noted the site includes parts of contains parts of the Riverside and Stourbridge Common and Mill Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen supported the proposed retention of **Mill Road Opportunity Area, Mill Road (S/OA/Policy 24)** including the Travis Perkins site on Devonshire Road. The policy should however explicitly attach positive weight to development that helps to meet aims of the Opportunity Area policy. Historic England noted the site includes parts of the Mill Road, Kite and Glisson Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

This policy approach in **Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre (S/OA/Policy 25)** was supported by Trinity Hall, Jesus College and Pace Investments. Historic England noted the site includes parts of the Central and New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Areas and is adjacent to the Botanic Gardens and Emmanuel College. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

The University of Cambridge questioned why the Old Press Mill Lane site was designation as an Opportunity Area under **Old Press/Mill Lane (S/OA/Policy 26)** and as a site allocation. Historic England noted the many listed buildings on site and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Table of representations: Policy S/OA – Opportunity Areas in Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56866 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56929 (Cambridgeshire County

Council), 58326 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58665 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)

Summary of issues raised:
Support housing development at the identified sites.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56529 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised:
Newmarket Road Tesco site appears underutilised.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56529 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised:
Request to consider Passivhaus standards, incorporate more green spaces, and include smaller shops in the design.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56529 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised:
Outdated/old-fashioned areas should be fully developed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56721 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment provided.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57323 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58369 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Questioning evidence that existing land assigned for job creation is in the right location, noting partial occupation of business park north of Waterbeach as a concern.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57653 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support including public realm improvements.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58055 (Trinity Hall), 58665 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen), 59071 (Jesus College)

Summary of issues raised:
Request to display Waste Water Treatment Works relocation site on Map Fig 17 for proper context or exclude both sites until DCO approval.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58119 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Potential allocation of land north of Station Road, Cambridge, for employment in the Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59164 (Jesus College)

S/OA/NR: Newmarket Road Retail Park

Summary of issues raised:
Support for this Opportunity Area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59051 (Railpen)

Summary of issues raised:
Areas of old-fashioned retail, such as the Beehive and the Grafton Centre, should be repurposed for housing due to underutilisation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56719 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Site lies within the restricted St. Matthew's Primary School catchment; infrastructure improvements could enable longer-term solutions such as new-build or relocation for the school.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56929 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Site should allow inclusion of F1 (formerly D1) uses; education uses can complement retail by increasing footfall.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57479 (ESFA - Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
Leisure and retail amenities should be maintained for the growing population when considering redevelopment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58248 (M Tansini)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Cheddars Lane is proposed to be included in the Opportunity Area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58326 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within site boundary, but nearby Grade I and II listed assets and conservation areas exist; recommended preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to inform policy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59610 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Newmarket Road Retail and Beehive areas serve important functions; excluding the Tesco site is questioned; access and congestion issues at Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane should be investigated.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59902 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Agreement that Newmarket Road Retail Park and Beehive Centre are not the best land use; car-focused retail parks disadvantage small businesses and harm high streets; welcome proposals to redevelop these areas to meet needs.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60680 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

S/OA/BC: Beehive Centre

Summary of issues raised:
Support for this Opportunity Area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59051 (Railpen)

Summary of issues raised:
Areas of old-fashioned retail, like the Beehive and the Grafton Centre, should be used for housing as they are currently underutilised for retail purposes.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56719 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The site is within St. Matthew’s Primary School catchment, which is restricted and cannot expand. Improving infrastructure delivery in Opportunity Areas could enable longer-term school solutions, including new-build or relocation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56929 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Site should allow potential inclusion and acceptability of F1 (formerly D1) uses. Education uses can complement retail areas by increasing footfall.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57479 (ESFA - Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
Ensure leisure and retail amenities remain available for a growing population when considering any redevelopment or replacement work.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58248 (M Tansini)

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within the site; however, it lies adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area. Development could impact heritage assets and their settings; a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is recommended to inform policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59611 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Newmarket Road Retail and Beehive areas serve important functions; excluding the Tesco site is questioned. Interaction with the City Centre and other retail centres is complex, and access/congestion issues on Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane should be investigated.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59902 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The retail park model (Newmarket Road Retail Park and Beehive Centre) places emphasis on car access, disadvantages small independent businesses, and contributes to the decline of high streets. Proposals to redevelop these areas to meet identified needs are welcomed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60680 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

S/OA/AS: Abbey Stadium

Summary of issues raised:
No additional access routes should be created into the site, as there is already access from Newmarket Road and Cut Throat Lane.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58092 (S Schwitzer)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the identification of an "Opportunity Area" at the Abbey Stadium, but the Plan needs to provide a solid planning policy framework to secure the future of the

Club either on site or at a relocation site.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58259 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised:

Abbey Stadium is a great opportunity for sustainable development that can make use of new cycle path access.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58861 (M Tansini)

Summary of issues raised:

No opinion about Abbey Stadium as an opportunity site. However, significant concerns regarding any relocation near A14 J.35 due to potential adverse impacts on Little Wilbraham Fen SSSI and its sensitive priority species (including rare breeding birds). Pleased that no such allocation is proposed.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58990 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised:

No designated heritage assets within the site boundary. Several designated heritage assets immediately opposite (Grade II listed: The Round House PH, former The Globe PH; close to Grade I listed: Chapel of St Mary Magdalene). Site is near Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area. Development could impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend preparing a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to inform policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59612 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:

Abbey Stadium relocation appears to assume a Green Belt site with worse access links.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59902 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Abbey Stadium supports community individuals and organisations and is popular locally. Match days cause significant impact to residents. Any change of use should consider local impact, travel methods, and integration of public transport use.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60680 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

S/OA/CH: Shire Hall/Castle Park

Summary of issues raised:
Policy should not be overly restrictive and should include flexibility to:
• allow for improvements/enhancements of buildings and spaces and redevelopment, to be brought forward in different parts of the Opportunity Area on different timescales;
• make the best use of existing buildings/infrastructure;
• encourage a creative approach to enhancing identity.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58680 (Brydell Partners)

Summary of issues raised:
The site includes a variety of designated heritage assets including Cambridge Castle Mound (a scheduled monument), the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area, and the grade II listed Caretaker's House and Social Service Department.
It is also near other designated assets: Castle Brae, The Castle Inn, several grade II listed buildings on Castle Street, and grade II* churches of St Peters and St Giles.
There may be non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments.
Castle Mound is a key vantage point across the city; access should be maintained and enhanced.
A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is recommended, and its findings should inform policy wording. Welcomes reference to heritage assets on p.66.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59613 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
The extent of the site being vacated and marketed by the County Council is limited to the southern part of the area shown in Figure 21.
For clarity, it only includes the land within the redline shown on the original submission site plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60602 (Cambridgeshire County Council - landowner)

S/OA/Policy 22: Mitcham's Corner

Summary of issues raised:

This site includes parts of the Central and Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Areas and is very close to the grade II listed Victoria Bridge, Jesus Green Lock and Bridge, Jesus Green Lock House as well as a pair of K6 telephone Kiosks. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and

their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59614 (Historic England)

S/OA/Policy 23: Eastern Gate

Summary of issues raised:
Very concerned to see the north area of St Matthew's Piece and the New Street allotments identified as 'opportunity areas'. These are protected open spaces and should not be considered for development. They should be reclassified as untouchable protected open space for the health and well-being of the community.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56672 (L Tubb)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the continuation of the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area. Suggests that the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) should be updated to reflect recent developments and confirm the St Matthews Centre site as a proposed site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58941 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
The site includes parts of several conservation areas and listed buildings, including:

- Riverside and Stourbridge Common and Mill Road Conservation Areas
- Grade II listed Church of St Andrew the Less
- Cluster of Grade II listed assets near Abbey House
- Grade II listed 247 Newmarket Road (Seven Stars Pub)
- Grade II listed Cambridge Gas Company War Memorial (outside Tesco)
  Any development could impact heritage assets and their settings. An HIA is recommended to inform policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59615 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Request for Policy 23 in the new Local Plan to explicitly protect the northern half of St Matthew’s Piece and its trees. The site, while partly 'Protected Open Space', still lies within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area, leading to potential ambiguity about its development potential. The following protections are sought:

1. Northern half of St Matthew's Piece should not be a potential development site (superseding the 2011 SPD).
2. Retain or reduce maximum building heights along New Street (2+1 storeys).
3. Retain all protected open space within the 2018 Eastern Gate Opportunity Area footprint.
   Also requests reassurance that these points are acknowledged and understood by the Local Plan Team.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60212 (Dr J. V Neal)

S/OA/Policy 24: Mill Road

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the proposed retention of the Mill Road Opportunity Area. Travis Perkins site on Devonshire Road continues to fall within the boundary. Policy should explicitly give positive weight to development that supports the aims of the Opportunity Area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58665 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)

Summary of issues raised:
The Mill Road Opportunity Area includes parts of the Mill Road, Kite, and Glisson Road Conservation Areas. It also contains two grade II listed buildings/structures (a gas lamp and the Cambridge City Branch Library) and part of the grade II Registered Park and Garden at Mill Road Cemetery. Development could impact heritage assets and their settings. An HIA is recommended to inform the policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59616 (Historic England)

S/OA/Policy 25: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the Opportunity Area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58055 (Trinity Hall), 59071 (Jesus College), 59117 (Pace Investments)

Summary of issues raised:
The site includes parts of the Central and New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Areas and numerous listed buildings, including the Grade II* Church of Our Lady and the English Martyrs, Wanstead House, and over 20 Grade II listed

buildings. It also lies adjacent to the Botanic Gardens and Emmanuel College, both Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens. Development could harm the significance of these assets through impact on their settings. An HIA is recommended to inform policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59617 (Historic England)

S/OA/Policy 26: Old Press/Mill Lane

Summary of issues raised:
It is unclear why the Old Press Mill Lane site is identified both as an 'Opportunity Area' and as a site allocation.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58324 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
The site is in the Central Conservation Area and includes over a dozen Grade II listed buildings. It is opposite the Grade I listed Pembroke College and Chapel, the Grade I Church of St Botolph, and adjacent to the Grade II* Little St Mary's Church. The area is close to other listed buildings and the Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Queens College. Development could harm the significance of these assets. An HIA is recommended to inform policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59618 (Historic England)

S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge > 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 Cambridge urban area heading as the comments

were specific to S/C/SCL: Land south of Coldham's Lane. 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

Executive Summary

Comments generally support the proposed approach to site allocations in Cambridge. However, Croydon PC suggest that more homes should be identified in Cambridge to reduce the homes identified in rural areas, whereas Save Honey Hill Group suggest that fewer homes should be identified in the urban area in light of the pandemic and need for more personal and recreational space. Site promoters' highlight that existing adopted allocations should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward, and Huntingdonshire DC highlight assurance is needed that additional sites will be found to meet housing need if the two allocations with uncertainty in delivery are carried forward. Support for the rejection of specific sites and de-allocation of sites from an individual and a residents association, and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Consideration of heritage assets, the protection of the mature tree on the edge of the site, and the impact on water/sewerage capacity are highlighted as issues for the new housing allocation at **Garages between 20 St Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge (S/C/SMS)**.

Objection to employment allocation at **Land south of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge (S/C/SCL)** from The Wildlife Trust as includes development on a City Wildlife Site. Comments suggest site should be used to provide accessible green space. Comments highlight need for flexibility in the uses proposed to enable complementary uses to be provided. Support from the landowner/developer. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties have highlighted a number of concerns to be considered in the policy.

Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as issues for the carried forward allocations at **Willowcroft, 137-143 Histon Road, Cambridge (S/C/R2)**, **Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road, Cambridge (S/C/R4)**, **Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot, 137-139 Ditton Walk, Cambridge (S/C/R5)**, **Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge (S/C/R9)**, **Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road, Cambridge (S/C/U3)**, **Police Station, Parkside, Cambridge**

(S/C/M4), **Fen Road, Cambridge (RM1 and Policy H7)**, **315-349 Mill Road and Brookfields, Cambridge (S/C/R21)**, **Clifton Road Area, Cambridge (S/C/M2)**, **82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street, Cambridge (S/C/M5)**, **Station Road West, Cambridge (S/C/M14)**, **Betjeman House, Cambridge (S/C/M44)**, **Old Press / Mill Lane, Cambridge (S/C/U1)**, and **New Museums Site, Downing Street, Cambridge (S/C/U2)**.

Site promoter is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge (S/C/R9)** as consider it appropriate for a mix of uses and a higher number of dwellings.

Landowner is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **Police Station, Parkside, Cambridge (S/C/M4)** to allow flexibility for a mix of uses. Also challenging the Building for Local Interest status.

Site promoter supports continued allocation of **Clifton Road Area, Cambridge (S/C/M2)** and would like to work with the Councils to gather evidence of deliverability.

Landowner is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street, Cambridge (S/C/M5)** to include additional land.

Landowner is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **Betjeman House, Cambridge (S/C/M44)** so that it is for commercial uses only.

Landowner supports continued allocation of **Old Press / Mill Lane, Cambridge (S/C/U1)** and **New Museums Site, Downing Street, Cambridge (S/C/U2)**, and requests that **1 and 7-11 Hills Road, Cambridge (E5)** is carried forward and not de-allocated.

Landowner requests that **Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane, Cambridge (R11)** and **Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road, Cambridge (R16)** are carried forward and not de-allocated.

Table of representations: S/LAC – Other site allocations in Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Site allocations in Cambridge should be increased to reduce sites needed in the rural area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56717 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree in principle with the allocations.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56855 (Save Honey Hill Group), 56867 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Low carbon methods such as conversions of buildings rather than demolition/new builds should be used.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56855 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Number of dwellings should be reduced in light of post-Covid working practices and the need for personal and recreational space.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56855 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Allocations proposed to be carried forward from the adopted Local Plans should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward. There is a need to ensure deliverability and viability to provide a reliable supply of sites throughout the plan period. New allocations are needed to replace those that have already been delivered.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57156 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57206 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
Other small to medium sites within the surrounding larger settlements are needed to ensure housing provision is not limited to a single form, and to maintain housing delivery.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57156 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57206 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
The map in Figure 22 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58123 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
No comments.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58372 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:
• Other small to medium sites are needed within the surrounding larger settlements to ensure variety and maintain delivery
• Need to focus on Cambridge as the most sustainable location
• To support ambitions to regenerate brownfield land
• More allocations are needed within Cambridge
• To enable clustering and transformation of specific parts of Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
57156 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57206 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 57506 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 59050 (Emmanuel College), 59212 (Jesus College), 60659 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 58945 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

New allocations – housing

S/C/SMS: Garages between 20 St Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area and grade II listed buildings. Development has the potential to harm the significance of adjacent heritage assets through development within their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59619 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Need to protect and fully preserve the mature tree at the eastern edge of the site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60214 (JV Neal)

Summary of issues raised:
Need to take account of increased stress created by this development on water and drainage/sewerage.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60214 (JV Neal)

New allocations – employment

S/C/SCL: Land south of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Proposed use for commercial will not impact on existing education plans for the area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56930 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Within Mineral Safeguarding Area for chalk, but as a former landfill site assumed that the mineral has already been extracted.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56930 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Objection to allocation of the site as it allocates development on a City Wildlife Site. Potential to provide accessible greenspace.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57069 (The Wildlife Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Encourage flexibility in the policy as a range of complementary uses can often benefit industrial areas. Plan should support densification of industrial areas as a sustainable way of meeting increased demand for these uses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57266 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised:
Retention of significant green spaces within developed areas is vital for mental and physical wellbeing – site should be used for greenspace.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57612 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised:
Close to land identified as an opportunity for ecological development – risk of harm from pollution and traffic if this area is developed for large intensive commercial units.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58883 (M Tansini)

Summary of issues raised:
Concerns about supporting infrastructure if developed for industrial uses, as will add lorries to roads.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59247* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support proposed allocation for commercial uses and open space, and have recently submitted a planning application in accordance with the direction of the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60508 (Anderson Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Previously objected to planning application for this site due to concerns over understanding of impacts (traffic, congestion, pollution, flooding, negative impact on biodiversity) and insufficient information on management and funding of proposed urban country park. Policy will need to address these issues.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60681 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/C/R2: Willowcroft, 137-143 Histon Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on the Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59620 (Historic England)

S/C/R4: Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
No objection to the principle of development on this site. However, it lies within a Conservation Area, adjacent to another Conservation Area, and opposite the river. Due to this sensitive location, development has the potential to impact the historic environment. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is recommended to inform the policy wording. The policy should reference the historic environment and include: “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the

significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset)".

Comments highlighting this issue:
59621 (Historic England)

S/C/R5: Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot, 137-139 Ditton Walk, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to a Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact the Conservation Area and its setting. It is recommended that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is prepared to inform the policy wording. The policy should reference the Conservation Area and emphasize the need for "Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting."

Comments highlighting this issue:
59622 (Historic England)

S/C/R6: 636-656 Newmarket Road, Holy Cross Church Hall, East Barnwell Community Centre and Meadowlands, Newmarket Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:

This site is identified as having uncertainty in delivery. Need assurance that additional sites will be found to meet housing need if this site is not carried forward.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57324 (Huntingdonshire DC)

S/C/R9: Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the continued allocation of this site, with a recommendation for a mixed-use allocation that can accommodate more dwellings and commercial uses. Emphasis on the importance of providing all types of commercial space in locations well served by public transport. No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but the site is adjacent to a Conservation Area. Development may impact the Conservation Area and its setting. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is recommended to inform policy wording. Policy should highlight the need for "Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting."

Comments highlighting this issue:
58673 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
59623 (Historic England)

S/C/U3: Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Site is within a Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact the Conservation Area and its setting. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is recommended to inform the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and emphasize the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting.”

Comments highlighting this issue:
59624 (Historic England)

S/C/M4: Police Station, Parkside, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Supports continued allocation of the site for redevelopment but suggests amending wording to allow for a mix of uses (beyond just housing) due to its central location. Proposed uses could include hotel, apart hotel, or offices. The Building of Local Interest status is challenged.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58209 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

Summary of issues raised:

Site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to grade II listed buildings. Welcome reference to retention of Building of Local Interest. Development has the potential to impact on nearby heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the nearby heritage assets and “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset)”.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59625 (Historic England)

RM1 and Policy H7, Fen Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:

Wish to know more about the archaeological potential of this site and its potential significance before providing comments on suitability of the site, especially as any remains will not be able to be retained in situ. Site is adjacent to Conservation Areas. Development has the potential to affect heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59626 (Historic England)

Continuing existing allocations – mixed use

S/C/R21: 315-349 Mill Road and Brookfields, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:

Part of site within Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59627 (Historic England)

S/C/M2: Clifton Road Area, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support for continued allocation of the site due to its highly sustainable location, good public transport connections, and proposed link to Cambridge Rail Station. Stakeholders are preparing a strategy for redevelopment delivery and seek collaboration with the Council to provide evidence of delivery by 2041.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57266, 57269 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised:
This site is identified as having uncertainty in delivery. There is a need for assurance that additional sites will be found to meet housing need if this site is not carried forward.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57324 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59628 (Historic England)

S/C/M5: 82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support for continued allocation of the site for commercial led mixed uses, but it should also include 90 Hills Road. Important to have all types of commercial space in locations well served by public transport.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58060 (Trinity Hall)

Summary of issues raised:
Site is within Conservation Area and adjacent to grade II* Registered Park and Garden. Development has potential to impact on nearby heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the nearby heritage assets and “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).”.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59629 (Historic England)

S/C/M14: Station Road West, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Majority of site is within a Conservation Area and includes grade II listed railway station. Development has the potential to impact on nearby heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the heritage assets and “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).”.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59630 (Historic England)

S/C/M44: Betjeman House, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support for allocation of the site, but wish for it to be a commercial allocation only (with retention of Flying Pig). Proposed land uses should recognise key opportunities that can be provided by this site.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59125 (Pace Investments), 59404 (Pace Investments)

Summary of issues raised:
Site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to grade II* Botanic Gardens, and grade II listed war memorial and milestone. Potential to affect the significance of these assets through development within their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59631 (Historic England)

S/C/U1: Old Press / Mill Lane, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support the continued allocation of the site - development will come forward during the plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58337 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Site within a Conservation Area, includes grade II listed buildings, and is adjacent to other listed buildings and Registered Park and Garden. Potential to affect the significance of these assets through development in their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59632 (Historic England)

S/C/U2: New Museums Site, Downing Street, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support the continued allocation of the site - development will come forward during the plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58337 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Site within a Conservation Area and includes grade II listed buildings, and is adjacent to other listed buildings. Potential to affect the significance of these assets through development in their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59633 (Historic England)

Allocations not proposed to be carried forward – housing

R11: Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments

Requests this allocation is carried forwards – can be made available for residential development within the plan period as it has been declared surplus to operational requirements.

Comments highlighting this issue

60660 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

R14: BT Telephone Exchange and Car Park, Long Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:

Support for deallocation of this site due to uncertainty about availability

Comments highlighting this issue:

56968 (Trumpington Residents Association)

R16: Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Support for deallocation of this site due to uncertainty about availability.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56968 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
Requests this allocation is carried forwards – can be made available for residential development within the plan period as current temporary consent for office uses expires in 2026 and building is nearing the end of its economic life.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60661 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Allocations not proposed to be carried forward – employment

E5: 1 and 7-11 Hills Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support the de-allocation of this site – 7-9 Hills Road has the potential for redevelopment during the plan period once the existing lease has expired, and 1-3 Hills Road will be brought forward for redevelopment in the early part of the plan period.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58337 (University of Cambridge)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:
Bellerbys College, Arbury Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40172) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57506 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised:
Hawthorn Community Centre, Haviland Way, Cambridge (HELAA site 40166) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60659 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised:
St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge (New site 59405) – should be allocated for mixed use education and student accommodation facilities
Comments highlighting this issue:
58945 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Emmanuel College Sports Ground, 15 Wilberforce Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40380) – should be allocated for residential development and open space
Comments highlighting this issue:
59050 (Emmanuel College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land on north side of Station Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40133) – should be allocated for employment uses
Comments highlighting this issue:
59212 (Jesus College)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised:
Emmanuel College Sports Ground, 15 Wilberforce Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40380)
• Support for rejection as protected open space.
• Comments made on HELAA assessment in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity, flood risk, landscape and townscape, and historic environment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57935 (E Davies), 57975 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
Triangle Site, Stacey Lane, Cambridge (HELAA site 40396)
• Support for rejection as protected open space.
• Comments made on HELAA assessment in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity, flood risk, landscape and townscape, and historic environment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57935 (E Davies), 57975 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off The Lawns, Cambridge (HELAA site 40425)
• Support for rejection as protected open space.
• Comments made on HELAA assessment in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity, flood risk, landscape and townscape, and historic environment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57935 (E Davies), 57975 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of 8–10 Adams Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40391)
• Support for rejection as development would affect the Conservation Area and bird sanctuary, and would be out of context with surrounding area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57935 (E Davies)

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

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.

Table of representations: The edge of Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Generally and broadly support these developments.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56575 (Gamlingay PC), 58043 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 58374 (Linton PC), 59903 (Fen Ditton PC), 60115 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
Too few sites allocated to meet long term demand – more land must be allocated if growth is to be effectively enabled for the wider benefits of residents and the economy.
Comments highlighting this issue:

58753 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College)

Summary of issues raised:
Encroachment into the Green Belt must be minimal.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58374 (Linton PC), 59471 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Preservation of semi-rural quality of West Cambridge and Green Belt between the Backs and M11 is vital for unique setting of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57940 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for completion of new neighbourhoods on the edge of Cambridge as well as bringing forwards new opportunities for sustainable developments.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58343 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56931 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59145 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59145 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:

Traffic congestion could prevent those in villages reaching education and work in Cambridge, therefore must be part of an integrated public transport system.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58374 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58391 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
Over reliance on proposed development on the northern edge of Cambridge compared to existing and proposed developments to south of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58724 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised:
Concentrating development in northern and eastern quadrants will have significant local benefits.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59182 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
Concerned about over development of the eastern edge of Cambridge and impacts on Teversham.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59251 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Green Belt assessment ignores historic environment designations and landscape character constraints.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60191 (J Preston), 60682 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58328 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60191 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58328 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Green Belt function of preventing urban sprawl to protect the setting of Cambridge is irreconcilable with continued development on the edge of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60682 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Councils should be committed to completing the new developments, with continued support beyond s106 funding to ensure community development and youth services.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56969 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
No limit set out for individual scheme sizes on edge of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57981 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57981 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Developments should be of a sufficient size to cater for daily needs and with good access to public and active transport.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60115 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
Would like assurances that affordable housing in these new developments will include real social housing and key worker housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59251 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Although no significant growth in the Green Belt surrounding Coton, the destruction of the rural environment and way of life of 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:
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue:
57800 (Coton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The map in Figure 25 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58126 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57325 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
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
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:
North of Barton Road Landowners Group proposals for development of south west Cambridge (HELAA site 52643) – should be allocated for urban extension
Comments highlighting this issue:
58343 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
58739 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land East of Impington (HELAA site 40096) – should be allocated for employment uses
Comments highlighting this issue:
60684 (Trinity College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Gazelle Way and west of Teversham Road (HELAA site 40250) – should be allocated for housing and employment uses
Comments highlighting this issue:
60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
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

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.

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

Summary of issues raised:
Support in general, for the proposed policy direction and relocation of the existing airport uses to Cranfield Airport to allow for:
• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
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 & 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)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58391* (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
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’.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59229 (Wates Development Ltd.), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd.)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60296 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn site)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern for the relocation of the Airfield, particularly:
• 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
575158 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57217 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 57336 (HD Planning Ltd), 60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57607 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised:
Council should provide more of a range of smaller and medium sites to come forward at faster rate than strategic sites of this size.

Comments highlighting this issue:
575158 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57217 (European Property Ventures)

Summary of issues raised:
In the case that Marshalls Airfield does not relocate, alternative sites should be identified and reserved in the plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57327 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Contingency sites should be included at this early stage in the plan process to ensure deliverability over the plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59229 (Wates Developments Ltd.), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd.)

Summary of issues raised:
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
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue:
60683 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Oppose any larger release of land in the Green Belt; the Airport site is large enough for significant development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57844 (D Lister), 58127 (M Asplin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Climate Change)

Summary of issues raised:
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).

Comments highlighting this issue:
60231 (H Warwick)

Summary of issues raised:
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill will have carbon impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56514 (C Martin)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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).

Comments highlighting this issue:
56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57666 (J Conroy), 58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Relocation of the WWTP provides opportunity to deliver green infrastructure in Cambridge East including improved connectivity to recreation and open space.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56473 (M Starkie), 57607 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised:
Recreational disturbance will cause significant risk to important species and designated nature conservation sites.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
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 NGOs.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58995 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge East should benefit local people with good quality green and community spaces.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60683 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Important to include space to grow food.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60231 (H Warwick)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge East should be a distinct place with its own character.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
Opposed to development due to loss of Green Belt.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59088 (F Gawthrop)

Summary of issues raised:
Should retain/maintain/extend the character of surrounding areas including:
• Teversham village
• The Green Belt (inc. at Honey Hill)
• Eastern Fens
• Fen Ditton
Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised:
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)
Comments highlighting this issue:
59634 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
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)
Comments highlighting this issue:
59634 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill is too close to conservation areas and new development of Marleigh and Airport site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56514 (C Martin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised:
Employment uses need to reflect post-Covid working and living conditions.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56473 (M Starkie)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the new development enhancing access to services, facilities and employment opportunity of Teversham and RWS Ltd's site Land at Fulbourn Road.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56898 (RWS Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Where will skilled engineering staff from the existing airport find employment?
Comments highlighting this issue:
59553 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern that the move of the Airport will result in a reduction in the range of job opportunities.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60251 (Tony Orgee)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
Delivery of 2,900 homes out of proposed 7,000 by 2041:
• is unambitious
• should deliver more housing in the plan period.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56473 (M Starkie), 56514 (C Martin), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57468 (C Martin), 57666 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59229 (Wates Development Ltd.), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd.), 59060 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised:
Homes built ahead of 2041 should prioritise affordable and social housing to ensure housing available for the employment mix proposed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56473 (M Starkie)

Summary of issues raised:
Housing should be provided that is suitable for a range of users, including:
• young workers
• key workers.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum), 60231 (H Warwick)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57666 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57657 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern for the existing local infrastructure, transport connections and use of public transport on access roads due to:
• resulting traffic/congestion
• 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)?
Comments highlighting this issue:
57657 (Histon & Impington PC), 59771 (B Hunt), 60231 (H Warwick), 59088 (F Gawthrop), 56477* (M Mckenzie-Davie)

Summary of issues raised:
What public transport solutions will be provided to link new housing at Cambridge East to employment centres like CBC to reduce private car use on roads at

capacity?

Comments highlighting this issue:

57844 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised:

Transport network should include provision of accessible and cheap public transport for essential car use e.g., people with disabilities.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59218 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

59771 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised:

Should consider access links in the North East corner of the Airport site to have direct access to the roundabout and avoid congestion.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59904 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Some complicated scenarios relating to education provision to be considered.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56931* (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

56932 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:

Need for adoption of an up-to-date AAP for the Cambridge East development to:

• allow for coordination of delivery of education infrastructure

Comments highlighting this issue:

56932 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59218 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge East should be connected directly to the City Centre, Biomedical Campus, North Cambridge and the Science Park, Eddington, and West Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
County Council Highways Committee determined that a separate and integrated policy should be created for Mill Road to prevent volumes of traffic and accidents. This should be noted in the policy on development to the East of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60074 (C de Blois)

Summary of issues raised:
Opportunity to connect to the Wicken Fen Vision Area and create high quality green infrastructure, delivering high level ambitions of the Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59285 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Why would Cambridge not need its own airport providing national and international travel for significant international business?
Comments highlighting this issue:
59553 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
The new wastewater plant will be able to support the water recycling needs of the mix of employment uses, services and retail.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Other)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58404 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Continue to work with Marshalls, Hill and South Cambridgeshire DC to develop the community at Marleigh.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59903* (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Is Teversham going to remain a village and be screened from the noise and pollution generated by this development?
Comments highlighting this issue:
56477* (M Mckenzie-Davie)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
60231 (H Warwick)

Summary of issues raised:
CE/R45: Land north of Newmarket spatial extents unresolved.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59904 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Should link S/AMC/Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane to S/CE: Cambridge East
Comments highlighting this issue:
58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to moving Newmarket Road Park & Ride as an alternative Green Belt site will be needed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59904 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Wish to engage throughout progression of the Local Plan and development of Cambridge East.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Site is alongside A14 causing a problem with noise and pollution.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57468 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised:
Green Belt is being imposed on with the WWTP.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57468 (C Martin), 58127 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Capital carbon / climate change impacts.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58127 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge East is more suitable in size and can provide sufficient and suitable housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58127 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to moving WWTW to Green Belt as open space will become important to future residents.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59904 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
No comments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58375 (Linton PC)

S/NWC: North West Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section

13 (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 North West 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

Executive Summary

There were a mix of views on the proposed policy direction. For those that opposed concerns were expressed over whether the site could accommodate the additional housing, air pollution created by the development and its visual impact on local residents and the character of the area.

The potential infrastructure needs generated by additional development at Eddington were highlighted by a number of respondents. These included early years, day care and schools provision with requests for co-location and the provision of free plots of serviced land or purpose-built buildings. Green infrastructure and medical and pharmacy needs were also referenced. Confirmation was sought regarding whether the University would continue with the water efficiency measures that had been used on the site.

Cambridge University owns the site and support the allocation of additional housing on site although not the single site approach suggested in the policy direction. The

position on affordable housing was supported, and they would be updating their needs assessments.

Table of representations: S/NWC – North West Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Supports additional housing, confirms there is sufficient capacity and will continue to develop this site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58354 (University of Cambridge), 58343* (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Reflects Cambridge's specific strengths.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59903* (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the policy direction for a minimum 50% key worker housing provision. The University's housing needs assessment will be updated in order to support the evidence base for the new Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58354 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support the single policy approach with West Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58354 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
There is little basis to conclude that the site can accommodate the amount of additional homes identified. It is surprising at this stage of Plan making that the capacity of the site has not yet been tested before consultation with the public.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58630 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The loophole in the First Proposals document whereby if need is not evidenced the minimum 50% affordable housing stated in Policy S/NWC will reduce to the 40% required in Policy H/AH should be removed. All new developments over a certain size should provide a minimum of 50% affordable housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Further major development in this area is unwise as:
• It will cause development to completely dominate this green space between

Huntingdon Road and the M11, important for existing residents and the character of the area.
• The area will be polluted by the M11 and A14 and their major intersection.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59554 (Council for the Protection of Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
The intensification of the site will place additional demands on infrastructure, and on the associated contributions to deliver it.
• It may be necessary for a 2-3 form entry primary school, with on-site early years provision.
• It will also be necessary to allocate and market additional sites suitable for full day care provision.
• Provision of strategic GI, including natural greenspace, as it is highly likely that the current on-site provision will represent a significant shortfall with the increased population.
• A medical centre and pharmacy (imperative also for the existing population).

Comments highlighting this issue:
56933 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57060 (The Wildlife Trust), 60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Where possible, the Council would:
• encourage the co-location of education establishments to promote partnership working.
• actively encourage developers to provide free plots of serviced land or purpose-built buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56933 and 56934 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Would like:
• evidence on whether Eddington is succeeding in maintaining water usage to 100 litres/person/day.
• information on how greywater will be managed and how much land use will be required to support an increase in 1000–1500 housing units.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan applies as most of the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel and the southeast section is nearly all within a MSA for chalk and is within the

settlement boundary.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56933 and 56934 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:

No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to two Conservation Areas, several Grade II* listed buildings/structures and Grade I listed park and gardens. Any development has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Given the proposal to increase the number of dwellings, the HIA should also explore issues of capacity, height and density with careful consideration of landscape, townscape and heritage impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59635 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:

This development site contains an ancient tree. Appropriate measures should be taken to retain and protect the tree and its root system; i.e. by putting in place appropriate buffering around the tree.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58999 (Woodland Trust)

Summary of issues raised:

Clarification required on the status and proposed use of the area generally described as an ecologically sensitive area (known as 19 acre field). If this area is to be opened for public access, safeguards are required to prevent any resultant threats to the wildlife or environment e.g. a decline in the condition of the habitat.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:

The relocation of Madingley Road Park and Ride needs to be seriously considered.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57658 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Eddington – development for Colleges and keyworkers. Total of 4,500 homes on the M11 side.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59864 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57328 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58377 (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

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.

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

Summary of issues raised:
Support
Comments highlighting this issue:
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:
Reflects Cambridge's specific strengths.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59903* (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58753* (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised:
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 early 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
Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised:
Support with caveats, including:
• importance of providing Green Belt enhancement in neighbouring areas
• expansion should not go beyond Granham's Road
• there should still be a 'green edge' to Cambridge
• water remains a potential 'show-stopper'
• Lime Kiln Road issues need addressing
• activities must be monitored to avoid inappropriate development
• CBC should include Queen Edith's Community Forum in its liaison group
• discussions should begin with CBC and southern campuses to explore life-sciences accommodation in south-east Cambridge
• site design must limit impact on landscape and natural environment
• CBC should explore collaboration models with incoming businesses
Comments highlighting this issue:
57058 (The Wildlife Trust), 57667 (J Conroy), 58382 (Linton PC), 59774 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised:
Considers the loss of Green Belt to be justified and the loss can be offset by public environmental and biodiversity gains.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the proposal not to build south of Granhams Road.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57667 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58250 (S Davies)

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

Summary of issues raised:
No development due to concerns about sustainability issues, including:
• Carbon emissions from construction
• Loss of biodiversity
• Effect on national food security
• 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'
Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised:
No development due to concerns including:
• Impact on views
• Impact on Green Belt and weakening of urban/rural divide
• Area should be designated as a country park; Nine Wells LNR must be protected
• Nature access areas pushed beyond walking reach of Queen Edith's
• Commercial gain from Green Belt release not a strong enough justification
• Site Assessment Survey deems site suitability as 'RED'
• Contradicts Policy 17 and 18f) of 2018 Local Plan
• Ninewells homes were sold as being at city boundary
• Piecemeal development due to GB1, GB2, and Ninewells approvals
• Contradicts Council's Green Belt and city entrance policies
• Commercial structures unsuitable for area
• Would undermine Cambridge's 'special character'
• Soft edge of city should be defended
Comments highlighting this issue:
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 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)

Summary of issues raised:
Object due to reasons including:
• Brownfield sites in north Cambridge would be more suitable
• Spreading services would reduce travel burden; airport area suggested
• Undermines government's 'levelling-up' policy
• Not developing site reduces pressure on other sites
• Development could be redirected elsewhere in the city
Comments highlighting this issue:
57153 (J Nilsson-Wright), 58042 (F Waller), 58144 (D Brian), 58768 (J Lister), 59739 (S Steele), 60400 (V F Bolt)

Summary of issues raised:
Object due to reasons including:
• Concern about poor quality housing
• Existing traffic issues and lack of transport planning
• Lack of civic facilities, amenities for campus users, and school provision
Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised:
Object due to reasons including:
• Wealthier residents may leave, prompting further development
• Plan will negatively affect residents' lives
Comments highlighting this issue:
56814 (R Sorkin), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57584 (M Jump), 57589 (J Jump), 57699 (S Wilkie), 58089 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised:
Object due to reasons including:
• Increasing tech use undermines need to expand
• No demonstrated need for development beyond CBC boundary
• Campus expansion should be limited; consider new campus elsewhere
• Question necessity of co-locating facilities
• Existing employment sites should suffice
• CBC should optimise existing space first
• Proposed growth exceeds projections
• Research buildings are underused
• Brexit, not housing, is bottleneck for growth
• Unclear development plans
• Land smaller than CBC's 2050 vision—where is the limit?
• Southern Green Belt already reduced in 2006 and 2018 Plans
• Hospital buildings not prioritised in Vision 2050
• No indication of these changes in 2018 Plan
Comments highlighting this issue:
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), 58120 (P Edwards), 58144 (D Brian), 58164 (S Kennedy – 2nd comment),

58342 (F Goodwille), 58352 (R Edwards), 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58419 (S Marelli), 58450 (F Gawthrop), 58768 (J Lister), 58916 (A Sykes), 59046 (Great Shelford PC), 59254 (C Goodwille), 59267 (M Berkson), 59555 (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 59816 (A Thompson), 60230 (Heather Warwick)

Summary of issues raised:
Why should we trust an organisation – CBC – which has consistently failed to plan their campus.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58342 (F Goodwille), 59254 (C Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58164 (S Kennedy – 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58077 (S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised:
There has been a lack of consideration for residents' views / a democratic deficit in the process and evidence-base / an appreciation of how the proposal will impact residents.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57629 (M Polichroniadis), 58030 (K Rennie), 58042 (F Waller), 58095 (A Hobbs), 59816 (A Thompson), 60400 (V F Bolt), 60559 (J Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58077 (S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised:
I support the letter of objection sent to you by Friends of the Cam.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58042 (F Waller)

Summary of issues raised:
Need to sort out other problems before developing and pursuing Ox-Cam Arc.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60230 (Heather Warwick)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57885 (M Brod), 58095 (A Hobbs)

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

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

Summary of issues raised:
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue:
57335 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
There needs to be an assessment of whether the expansion is needed in the post-Covid context.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58095 (A Hobbs), 58342 (F Goodwille), 59254 (C Goodwille), 59739 (S Steele), 59774 (B Hunt), 59816 (A Thompson)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57596 (C Maynard)

Summary of issues raised:
You have already allocated extra land on Dame Mary Archer Way, and that has been accepted. If more land is definitely required, that area could be extended round Ninewells, which would have to be carefully landscaped.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60559 (J Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised:
If campus expansion is deemed to be inevitable, there would appear to be 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58144 (D Brian)

Summary of issues raised:
Who will judge whether the existing CBC site (including its current allocations) has been properly utilised before releasing development land at S/CBC/A?

Comments highlighting this issue:
58342 (F Goodwille), 59254 (C Goodwille)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58916 (A Sykes), 59254 (C Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised:
The masterplan document is key. It should:
• Coordinate in time and space with all the local and regional transport, housing and industrial proposals
• Cover the whole Campus and the effects on the surrounding region

Comments highlighting this issue:
59267 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
A revised 2050 document is needed. It should:

• Begin with the hospitals and set out their renovation and expansion plans, including timing and funding
• Identify clinical areas that support further expansion
• Review other employment sites in Appendix H of the Economic Development and Employment Land Evidence Study and justify why they cannot be used
• Be scaled back to reflect allocations in SCDC's Local Plan and First Proposals
• Be led by the hospitals

Comments highlighting this issue:
58916 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised:
Attached in their representation, the commenter included a list of tasks needed to deliver the site, including an environmental strategy and placemaking strategy. They offer to formalise this approach with the Council.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58790 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59129 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd.)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59129 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd.)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
The site allocation contains factual inaccuracies, including:
• Incorrectly stating there are no priority habitats
• Underestimating impact on trunk/local roads
• Incorrect distances to City Centre and transport hubs

Comments highlighting this issue:
58342 (F Goodwille), 59254 (C Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised:
If the Campus must be extended, it should be done in-line with the present permission on Dame Mary Archer Way to the south, creating a park around Ninewells and maintaining and adding to existing greenery.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57313 (J Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised:
If the proposal is brought ahead, other features could include enhancing sustainable access routes towards the Gog Magog Hills.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57058 (The Wildlife Trust)

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

Summary of issues raised:
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill will have carbon impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56514 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised:
The area between the Ninewells estate and Granham’s Road is prone to significant flooding which presents challenges to development in this area.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56814 (R Sorkin), 56966 (C Archibald)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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”.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59493 (J Hunter), 58342 (F Goodwille), 59254 (C Goodwille), 59816 (A Thompson)

Summary of issues raised:

Ideally for biodiversity, the proposed housing between Worts Causeway and Babraham Road should be an extension to the Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59493 (J Hunter)

Summary of issues raised:

Land should be set aside to protect Nine Wells Reserve / the area should be designated a country park / the Reserve should be restored.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56797 (R Elgar), 57126 (R Cushing), 58352 (R Edwards), 58916 (A Sykes), 60742 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56962 (J Meed), 57058 (The Wildlife Trust), 58042 (F Waller), 58214 (J Meed – 2nd comment), 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60230 (Heather Warwick)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56814 (R Sorkin), 56962 (J Meed), 57699 (S Wilkie), 58042 (F Waller), 58214 (J

Meed – 2nd comment), 58342 (F Goodwille), 59254 (C Goodwille), 60559 (J Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56962 (J Meed), 58042 (F Waller), 58214 (J Meed – 2nd comment), 58342 (F Goodwille), 59254 (C Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised:
A walk within a development is not the same as walking in a green field with open views.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58342 (F Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised:
Should instead create a green wildflower meadow between Cambridge centre and Magog Down.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58342 (F Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised:
Habitat creation is harder work than maintaining existing habitat. Retaining the existing fields would be a less risky option.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56962 (J Meed), 58042 (F Waller), 58214 (J Meed – 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised:
Development would likely entail rerouting of helicopter which would lead to visual and noise pollution of green spaces around site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58342 (F Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58144 (D Brian)

Summary of issues raised:
The area could better be enhanced by increasing the green infrastructure either side of the railway line and towards the Shelfords.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58144 (D Brian)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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 prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59607 (Historic England), 59636 (Historic England – 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59637 (Historic England – 3rd comment)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to policy S/CBC/Policy M15 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59638 (Historic England – 4th comment)

Summary of issues raised:
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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59639 (Historic England – 5th comment)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59640 (Historic England – 6th comment)

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

Summary of issues raised:

There is a sufficient supply of employment land elsewhere, as detailed in the Employment Land and Economic Evidence Base (Appendix H).

Comments highlighting this issue:

56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:

Benefits that come from life science jobs will outweigh the cons.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59774 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised:

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. There is concern that the Council's preferred jobs forecast assumes

lower jobs growth for life sciences to 2041 than was achieved between 2001–2017. A common set of growth projections for the CBC needs to be agreed to inform the next stages of Local Plan preparation.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58453 (University of Cambridge)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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

Comments highlighting this issue:
60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton site), 60611 (CALA Group Ltd), 60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site), 60564 (Countryside Properties), 60634 (NIAB Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
A proper plan for hospital infrastructure needs to support expected housing and economic growth and the ageing population in the region.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59267 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
Given land is constrained in this area, we question whether there should be any housing; healthcare, research, and technology uses should be prioritised.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58916 (A Sykes), 60047 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57210* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised:
A high proportion of Key Worker accommodation for the Addenbrooke's site is

needed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57659 (Histon & Impington PC), 58144 (D Brian), 58740 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 59774 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised:
Appropriate housing is needed. Is there no aim to build a new settlement in this area similar to Northstowe or Cambourne?

Comments highlighting this issue:
56807 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised:
The proposed use of this land is for employment space. Won't this intensify the imbalance between jobs (too many) and housing (too little)?

Comments highlighting this issue:
56814 (R Sorkin)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56814 (R Sorkin)

Summary of issues raised:
The previous expansion of the CBC and Addenbrooke's has negatively impacted surrounding communities, particularly through increased illegal parking, smoking, and traffic. CBC cannot manage the unintended consequences of their growth. Expansion should not proceed without robust preventative measures. Suggested improvements include:
• Signage to direct footfall/vehicles away from RedCross Areas

• Modal filters to slow through traffic
• Signage prohibiting motorbikes through cycle paths
• Additional Park & Ride with cycle route into CBC
• Rerouting cycle path around Ninewells to avoid Greenlands
• No waiting or parking in RedCross Area
• Multi-agency approach to address issues
• CCTV installation
• Better staff communication and policy enforcement by CBC
• Funding for community rangers to manage traffic issues

Comments highlighting this issue:
60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
A significant number of people cannot use bicycles or walk easily and must be provided for.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59267 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
A redesigned masterplan should provide:
• All necessary campus facilities before further land allocation
• Improved cycle and pedestrian permeability to the new station and busway
• Safer walking routes with better lighting and bollards
• Adequate smoking areas to prevent spillover into neighbouring areas
• Extension of Ninewells cycle path around the development
• Adequate on-site parking to discourage illegal parking
• Better signage
• Consideration of past design mistakes
• A comprehensive, rapid, accessible, and affordable public transport network operational before further development

Comments highlighting this issue:
59254 (C Goodwille), 59267 (M Berkson), 58144 (D Brian), 60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
CBC needs a station.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
Consult with neighbours who will be impacted by infrastructure changes.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
If the CBC site is expanded, an alternative busway along the A1307 would better serve CBC and minimise ecological damage compared to the CSET proposal.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59046 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Schemes such as the light rail concept proposed by Cambridge Connect offer attractive benefits for the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59046 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Closing Granham's Road to through traffic as part of CBC expansion would be damaging to Great Shelford and Stapleford and should not be pursued.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58916 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised:
Better signposting is needed on the campus for cycling paths.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58916 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised:
Expect workable, affordable transport solutions before major development. Charging for access to Cambridge may benefit the Council but not residents. A real commitment to a top-class transport system is needed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60559 (J Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised:
Expansion will increase trips from North Hertfordshire and potentially impact Royston. North Hertfordshire needs data from GCSP to understand pressures and requests that Royston's role be recognised in the Local Plan, including contributions to sustainable travel projects.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58663 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Welcome further discussions on potential long-term cross-boundary issues as both Greater Cambridge and North Hertfordshire plans progress.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58663 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
An efficient, high-density development is more effective than sprawl. Reduce space for car parks and keep cars off the Campus more effectively.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58164 (S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised:
(Minerals and Waste) Most of the 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 Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for chalk and parts are within an MSA for sand and gravel.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56935 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60564 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to CBC, HELAA 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. 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60611 (CALA Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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 could benefit from the Cambridge South Station. Growth in this area would ensure sustainable travel to the CBC, especially due to its proximity to Cambridge South Station via Shepreth, which is a short cycle from Orwell.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to CBC, the site 'Land East of 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton Site)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to CBC, the 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60634 (NIAB Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to CBC, as with the release of Green Belt land at Babraham (Policy S/BRC), Anglian Water considers the role of the Green Belt should be re-assessed and modified where necessary to enable crucial services and public functions to continue, expand and be delivered when location options are constrained.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

S/WC: West Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/WC: West Cambridge > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

13 (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 West 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

Executive Summary

The University of Cambridge support the continued development of the site as an Innovation District. They do not consider the policy should include residential development. Cambridgeshire County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council identified that housing should be considered. There was some support for a single policy approach with North West Cambridge. Historic England highlight the need for continued consideration of the historic environment. The university state that they recognise the need for the site to provide good walking and cycling connections. North Newnham Residents Association expressed concern about whether linkages would be provided.

Table of representations: S/WC – West Cambridge

S/EOC: Other existing allocations on the edge of Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Supported.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57668 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
Will continue to develop this site as an Innovation District as per the existing outline planning permission with a mix of complementary uses to support research activities, including a Shared Facilities Hub with a high-quality urban environment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58461 (University of Cambridge), 58343* (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
The forthcoming outline planning permission for West Cambridge does not include the development of additional residential units, and that part of policy should be deleted. The University is focusing its delivery of housing at North West Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58461 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Reflects Cambridge's specific strengths.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59903* (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy does not appear to acknowledge the East-West rail route and its consequences.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56716 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
West Cambridge is considered a suitable site to capitalise on the employment uses associated with its aim as an innovation district.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
It is essential that the balance of residential to employment use is carefully considered to ensure that the aim of the site as an innovation district is not compromised.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
The addition of housing to West Cambridge is supported in principle as allowing affordable housing for key workers to reduce commuting, traffic congestion and carbon emissions. This would be especially beneficial to those who are most affected by lower wages who have to live further away.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Recommend a plan to incorporate likely dwelling numbers and density at an early date.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56936 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Affordable housing would be especially beneficial to key workers who are most affected by lower wages associated with the site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Innovation District planned by University – Eddington would be the closest place to employ people from, so could even more growth or density be expected?
Comments highlighting this issue:
59814 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the single policy approach with West Cambridge as this would help ensure social and community infrastructure assets, including early years and education provision, are included as necessary and shared across sites of a similar community character.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56936 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
The Grade II* listed Schlumberger Gould Research Centre is located within the West Cambridge site. There are two adjacent Conservation Areas and their associated listed buildings. Any development has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Any policy for the site should refer to the need to conserve and enhance the significance of these assets including any contribution to that significance by settings.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59641 and 59608 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
It is not adequately responding to off-site locations or neighbouring context. The development must:
• Integrate
• Enhance neighbouring communities
• Acknowledge the character of the West Cambridge Conservation Area
• Improve pre-consultation with communities
The existing West Cambridge development is self-centred, ignoring residents and changing the road network without understanding the Conservation Area and capacity issues, causing visual harm to Madingley Road – an historic approach road.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57131 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
Development of West and North West Cambridge and proposed densification of West Cambridge makes it more important than ever that the intervening pattern of remaining green spaces with the views and vistas they afford on the way in and out of the historic centre and the Conservation Area are preserved from development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57942 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised:
A small part of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for chalk. Within settlement boundary.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56936 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Recognise that the development should provide high-quality walking and cycling connections and maximise the opportunity for public transport improvements, e.g., the proposed Greater Cambridge Partnership Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and the proposed Comberton Greenway.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58461 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Existing section 106 obligations have not been implemented, for example, providing a dedicated cycle route east from the site to Grange Road. Realistic commitments to new dedicated cycle infrastructure to deal with the massively increased traffic flow should be a priority in a new Section 106 agreement.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57131 and 57877 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
No comments.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58384 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the expansion of Cambourne as a sustainable location for an enhanced public transport hub. It is a sustainable location for an East-West Rail station. If East-West Rail does not happen, however, there is still a need for Cambourne to be a public transport hub to serve its residents and the residents living in the rural hinterland.
Comments highlighting this issue:

56577 (Gamlingay PC)

Policy S/EOC: Other site allocations on the edge of Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/EOC: Other site allocations on 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

30

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Comments from Parish Councils outline need to prevent urban sprawl and that any new developments must be sensitive to the landscape and natural environment. Site promoters' highlight that existing adopted allocations should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward, and that sustainable villages on the edge of Cambridge should be considered for more growth. Site promoters' comments also highlight the problems of focussing on large sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters. Historic England set out need to consider any heritage assets.

Specific concerns raised for **Darwin Green (S/EOC/R43 & S/EOC/SS/2)** in relation to access, drainage and loss of green space. Specific concern raised for **land south of Wort's Causeway (S/EOC/GB2)** in relation to trees and hedgerows. Comment highlights need for new student accommodation at **Bell School (S/EOC/R42d)** to take account of local area and new standards. Specific concerns raised for **Fulbourn Road East and Fulbourn Road West 1 & 2 (S/EOC/E/3 and S/EOC/GB3 & GB4)** in relation to loss of highly productive farmland and traffic problems. Comment highlights need for continued support for residents at **Cambridge Southern Fringe (R42a: Clay Farm, R42b: Trumpington Meadows, and R42c: Glebe Farm 1 & 2)** to ensure they become part of an integrated community.

Table of representations: S/EOC – Other existing allocations on the edge of Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:
Danger of creating urban sprawl around Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56733 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Strategy for edge of Cambridge is focused on strategic allocations and ignores sustainable villages located in this area. Growth of more sustainable villages should be part of the development strategy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57106 (J Francis), 57637 (Dudley Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Allocations proposed to be carried forward from the adopted Local Plans should be

reviewed. If they have not already been developed, there may be some issues with viability, and therefore they should not be relied on to meet housing need.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57159 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57220 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:

No comments.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57347 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:

Support for limited release of land on the edge of Cambridge – as most are already included in adopted plans. However, need to allocate some smaller greenfield sites that can be built out faster.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57507 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 60656 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised:

Policy needs clarifying – Policy S/CE is shown on the map but there is no detail on the proposed development. Important to include these developments to prevent encroachment into the Green Belt and to retain the character of Teversham.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57611 (J Pratt), 57783 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:

Support proposals which exclude any development in the area of Little Linton. The settlements of Linton and Little Linton have distinct identities and new development would harm this. Directing development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57840 (S Nickalls), 57869 (A Nickalls), 57894 (S Foulds), 57920 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57944 (C Mackay)

Summary of issues raised:

The map in Figure 31 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58129 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:

Developments must be sensitive to the landscape and impact on natural environment.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58385 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Key parts of the strategy include the delivery of complex developments that require transport and community infrastructure, reducing provision of affordable housing. Housing delivery rates on these sites are challenging. Sufficient residual value in greenfield sites on the edge of Cambridge to support planning obligations and policy requirements in full, including affordable housing. Exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt – need for affordable housing and housing to support economic growth.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58960 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Principle of development of these sites has already been established. For any sites carried forward that have heritage assets on site or nearby, these assets should be referred to in the policy and supporting text. HIA may be needed, depending on heritage sensitivity.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59642 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Broadly supportive but would object if any of these developments further encroach into the Green Belt or endanger the character of the surrounding villages of Fen Ditton, Horningsea or Teversham.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59906 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:
• strategy for edge of Cambridge should include the sustainable villages in this area
• need to allocate some smaller greenfield sites that can be built out faster
• aspirations for development accord with the goals of the Local Plan
• site can be developed within the first five years of the plan period
• sufficient residual value in greenfield sites on the edge of Cambridge to support policy requirements in full, including affordable housing
• exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt
• insufficient sites to meet housing needs

Comments highlighting this issue:
57106 (J Francis), 57507 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 57637 (Dudley Developments), 58742 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58960

(North Barton Road Landowners Group), 58980 (Scott Properties), 60656 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 57159 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57220 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/EOC/R43 & S/EOC/SS/2: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge (Darwin Green and Darwin Green 2/3)

Summary of issues raised:
Plan for access into Darwin Green from Cambridge Road, Impington (not Histon Road, Cambridge as often stated) is inadequate and such a simple junction so close to the Kings Hedges junction will cause traffic disruption.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57660 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Drainage from Darwin Green development must be designed so that the baseflow in existing drains is not diminished. Reduced baseflow would cause environmental harm.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57729 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised:
Concerned about retention of two allocations at Darwin Green as they are significant areas of green space which help with the integration of Cambridge with its rural surroundings.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59556 (Campaign to Protect Rural England – CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
No heritage assets on this site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59609 (Historic England)

S/EOC/GB2: Land south of Wort's Causeway, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:

Should ensure that the green hedgerow and tree lined footpath along Worts Causeway is maintained through this development.
Comments highlighting this issue:

57846 (D Lister)

S/EOC/R42d: Bell School, Babraham Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised:

New student accommodation, if delivered, should be sensitive to the evolving local area and meet the standards of the new plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57846 (D Lister)

Continuing existing allocations – employment

S/EOC/E/3 and S/EOC/GB3 & GB4: Fulbourn Road East and Fulbourn Road West 1 & 2

Summary of issues raised:

Concerned about further development at Fulbourn Road East on highly productive farmland.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59556 (Campaign to Protect Rural England – CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:

Concerned about amount of development proposed in this area and potential for traffic problems, especially when considered alongside Cambridge East development. Full assessment of impact of traffic is needed.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59775 (B Hunt)

Allocations not proposed to be carried forward – housing

R42a: Clay Farm, R42b: Trumpington Meadows, and R42c: Glebe Farm 1 & 2

Summary of issues raised:

Text refers to developments in Trumpington being built out and so do not need a policy framework. Construction work is still underway and there is need for continued support for residents to ensure that these developments become part of an integrated community.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56971 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:

Land at Ditton Lane at junction with High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 48148) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
57106 (J Francis)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Chandos Farm, Shelford Bottom (HELAA site 40141) – should be allocated for employment uses

Comments highlighting this issue:
57507 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Newbury Farm, Worts Causeway (HELAA site 40139) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60656 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Cherry Hinton Caravan Club, Limekiln Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40528) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
57637 (Dudley Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge Science Park North (HELAA site) – should be allocated for employment uses

Comments highlighting this issue:
57863 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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

Comments highlighting this issue:
58742 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Barton Road and Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge (HELAA site 52643) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
58960 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the east of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 40217) – should be allocated for specialist accommodation for older people and open space

Comments highlighting this issue:
58980 (Scott Properties)

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

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.

Table of representations: New settlements

Summary of issues raised:
Broadly supportive as Northstowe, Waterbeach, Cambourne and Bourn are major opportunities to meet growth aspirations with good or potential sustainable travel opportunities.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59907 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
New settlements are the best way of achieving an increased housing stock.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56808 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58684 (Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
New settlements should not be viewed in isolation from existing infrastructure and communities – need to consider opportunities for creating new settlements around existing infrastructure and services.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Local Plan's sustainability and climate change objectives mean that spatial strategy must optimise sustainable locations adjacent to Cambridge, rather than dispersing growth and travel.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58409 (Marshal Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
New settlements should include public transport hubs to serve their surrounding rural areas.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56578 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for new settlements of a substantial size to cater for more than local needs.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60116 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56853 (Sport England)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57827 (W Wicksteed)

Summary of issues raised:
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?
Comments highlighting this issue:
57827 (W Wicksteed)

Summary of issues raised:
Must be sustainable with sufficient transport, water, electricity and other infrastructure.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58388 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58997 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts area)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59151 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59151 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:
New settlements are well placed 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57827 (W Wicksteed)

Summary of issues raised:
Sufficient employment land for mix of businesses, including for smaller manufacturing businesses that are being pushed out of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57827 (W Wicksteed)

Summary of issues raised:
Attractive and easily accessible public transport provision needed to workplaces and leisure uses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57827 (W Wicksteed), 58388 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Reducing allocation of greenfield sites is supported.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56578 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Strongly support new settlements, especially those on brownfield sites.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58388 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
No objection to the three existing new settlements that will continue to be developed during the plan period and beyond.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
Potential to integrate new allocations with planned new infrastructure to the west of Cambridge, such as A428 dualling.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58796 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58737 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised:
Dry Drayton is in the middle of three new settlements (Northstowe, Bourn and Cambourne) – would we see increased traffic through the village?
Comments highlighting this issue:
59817 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57349 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
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
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:
Scotland Farm (East & West), Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 56252) – should be allocated as a new settlement

Comments highlighting this issue:
58302 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Grange Farm, east of A11 & north of A1307 (HELAA site 59401) – should be allocated as a new settlement

Comments highlighting this issue:
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

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.

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

Summary of issues raised:
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
• 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
Comments highlighting this issue:
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)
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners: 58603 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree that Cambourne presents opportunities to achieve sustainable growth.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58684* (Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised:
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
• 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
Comments highlighting this issue:
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:
Support expansion to north in relation to proposed EW Rail Station. Develop as a public transport hub whether or not a rail station materialises.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56579 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Agrees with the proposals and that Cambourne should not expand any further and should keep within its existing curtilage.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58348 (Caxton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59286 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60048 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Neutral)

Summary of issues raised:

No comments

Comments highlighting this issue:

58390 (Linton PC)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Objections)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern that EWR is driving the development of Cambourne.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56682 (S Houlihane)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern over development sprawl into neighbouring villages. Cambourne and Papworth Everard should remain distinct developments and not merge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56682 (S Houlihane)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
• 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57160* (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:

Cambourne is already very large – does it really need expanding?

Comments highlighting this issue:

58044* (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Oppose further housing at Cambourne. Consider redistribution of housing to provide a better balance across plan area.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57161 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57224 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
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).
Comments highlighting this issue:
59001 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59170 (Cambourne TC), 59178 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to any allocation until a final decision has been made on East West Rail and funding committed to the project.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59178 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59178 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59558 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60249 (Bourn PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57210* (D Lott)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Delivery)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57351 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58431 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington - LLP), 58750 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington – LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59027 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59097 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59178 (Cambourne TC)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised:
Green Belt, City Conservation areas and Historic Approach roads like Madingley Road and Barton Road must be protected from transport strategies, using principles of visually enhancing and protecting 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57132 (North Newnham Residents Association)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised:
Council working to expand secondary school capacity. Additional capacity will be needed but not sufficient for a new school. Consider how it will function with Bourn and nearby villages and relationship with Cambridge to enhance its sustainability.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56937 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57037 (W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy makes reference to East West Rail, but not Cambourne–Cambridge busway.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58519 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised:
New homes at Cambourne will create serious transport implications. Cannot make assumptions based on transport plans not yet developed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57661* (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambourne's wastewater is planned to be served from Uttons Drove Water Recycling Centre.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60450 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

S/CB: Cambourne – (other)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57334 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Seek to maximise opportunities for intensifying development within existing boundary of Cambourne West, consistent with NW Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59868 (East West Rail)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Promoters' Sites)

Summary of issues raised:
Promoting site for development – Land north of Cambourne, Knapwell (HELAA site 40114)
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

Comments highlighting this issue:
57890 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
58304 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
58576 (MacTaggart & Mickel)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58592 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58664 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Promoting site for development – Land north and south of Cambridge Road, Eltisley (HELAA site 51668)
Strongly recommend Councils review and re-assess the Site in light of the information prepared to support this representation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58692 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59065 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59097 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
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

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.

Table of representations: S/NS – Existing new settlements

Summary of issues raised:
Support / Broadly support / Agree / Sensible approach / No objection
Comments highlighting this issue:
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)

Summary of issues raised:
New settlements are better than dispersed development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56714 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Need to have good public transport, schools, doctors etc.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56714 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support provision of better public transport at existing new settlements – they need to act as a local transport hub.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56580 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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 & 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58437 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
Contingency sites should be included to ensure the Local Plan is deliverable throughout the plan period, as required by the NPPF.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Need to improve the carbon footprint of houses already in the pipeline at Northstowe and other existing planned developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56874 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58550 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59007 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised:
Understand that existing new settlements will be carried forwards as allocations, but concerned by poor building control, 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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59559 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Increased densities in areas with access to transport hubs could creep into Dry Drayton.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59819 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
No comments.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58393 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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
Comments highlighting this issue:
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:
Support.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59472* (Shepreth PC)

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

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Can the necessary infrastructure for this site also be delivered at the faster pace?
Comments highlighting this issue:
58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
If faster delivery rates, essential that supporting infrastructure and services are also delivered at an accelerated rate.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58121 (P Bearpark)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58437 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
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?
Comments highlighting this issue:
58977 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Unclear what technical work has been undertaken to demonstrate that an additional

750 dwellings within the plan period is achievable.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised:

Northstowe Area Action Plan is now 14 years old – is the Local Plan an opportunity to replace any out of date policies?

Comments highlighting this issue:

58550 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:

Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59644 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59721 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised:

Being served by the Uttons Drove WRC.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:

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 groundwater features will ever recover. No further building until issue is resolved. Need tighter enforcement of environmental standards on new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60744 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

SS/6: Land north of Waterbeach

Summary of issues raised:
Offers excellent opportunities for linked trips to the existing settlement.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
Further growth should be located here to ensure the long-term vitality of the settlement.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
If faster delivery rates, essential that supporting infrastructure and services are also delivered at an accelerated rate.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58121 (P Bearpark), 59843 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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 wastewater infrastructure and relocation of Waste Water Treatment Works.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Unclear what technical work has been undertaken to demonstrate that an additional 750 dwellings within the plan period is achievable.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58437 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
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?

Comments highlighting this issue:
58977 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised:
Issues relating to public transport and active travel options must be given proper consideration, and trip budgets will need to be revised.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58121 (P Bearpark)

Summary of issues raised:
New homes at Waterbeach will create serious transport implications. Cannot make assumptions based on transport plans not yet developed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57661* (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Any changes to the policy for Waterbeach New Town must properly consider the Neighbourhood Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58121 (P Bearpark), 59843 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59644 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Would like to know whether Policy SS/6 will be carried forward into the new Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59843 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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

Comments highlighting this issue:
59843 (Waterbeach PC)

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

SS/7: Bourn Airfield

Summary of issues raised:
Support the development of Bourn Airfield.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59471* (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58267 (DB Group (Holdings) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58267 (DB Group (Holdings) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
This is the only existing new settlement not to have amended annual delivery rates. Consider there is potential for higher 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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
Proposed policy maps should include the strategic site boundary and major development site boundary.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
The transport links / hub for Bourn Airfield should be considered in line with Cambourne and West Cambourne.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59180 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised:
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59644 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Within the Bourn wastewater catchment, although given the constrained capacity it is planned to be served by a connection to Cambourne main and then to Uttons Drove WRC.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

The rural southern cluster

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - The rural southern cluster > 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 within the rural southern cluster, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton and S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Support for clustering of new development in this area due to its good public transport links, co-location of housing and employment, and opportunities to expand existing business clusters. Parish Councils and individuals highlight the need to ensure that villages are not subject to a disproportionate amount of development, concern for loss of farmland and countryside, fear of urbanisation of the rural area, traffic congestion, lack of water resources, and poor infrastructure. Ickleton PC particularly highlights need to consider landscape impacts and impacts on river/chalk streams taking account of committed and planned developments. Some site promoters suggest that further allocations should be identified in this area, while other site promoters question separating the southern cluster from the rest of the rural area, especially as there are similar opportunities in other rural areas like the area surrounding Melbourn. TWI object to Granta Park and Welding Institute not being referred to given their importance. Support for the rejection of specific sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Table of representations: The rural southern cluster

Summary of issues raised:
Support the clustering of new development in this area, as:
• public transport links are good
• it improves sustainability by co-locating housing and employment
• provides more business space to support existing clusters
Comments highlighting this issue:
56581 (Gamlingay PC), 56870 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58440 (Deal Land LLP), 57355 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst wishing to support growth at the Biomedical Campus, care should be taken to protect the villages from disproportionate development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59473 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Babraham village is at risk from too much development as already two allocations in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Partnership park & ride and automated bus route. Further development would be above the housing need for the village and will have a significant adverse impact on the village character, the surrounding environment and landscape, local wildlife habitats, and historic assets. Risk creating ribbon development and amalgamation of villages. Will increase water abstraction from River Granta and put excessive pressure on existing amenities.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59262 (Multiple individuals)

Summary of issues raised:
Scale of the proposals and ambition is inadequate. Mismatch between economic potential of the existing sites and the scale of the new homes and employment sites being planned locally to support them.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58198 (SmithsonHill)

Summary of issues raised:
Welcomed that exceptional circumstances have been identified for Green Belt release, however consider that have not gone far enough. Additional land in the rural area should be identified for moderate levels of Green Belt release to ensure that viability of rural areas are protected and enhanced.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57164 (Southern & Regional Developments), 57229 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
The Local Plan states that the need to support the life sciences cluster is so great and the benefits are so significant to justify the release of land from the Green Belt, however the failure to make adequate provision for new housing in this area will have serious implications for travel patterns, carbon emissions, affordability and access to skilled labour. Additional land should be allocated for housing development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58917 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree there is a case for exceptional circumstances to release some limited areas from the Green Belt in this location if it results in the generation of less carbon emissions from car use.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57355 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the release of Green Belt land in this area, to enable housing growth next to established sustainable villages, and so that new residents are close to employment areas, services and facilities.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58440 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
Opportunities for development on brownfield sites, for rural diversification and small business related developments should not be excluded.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
Small residential developments should be included, taking account of Neighbourhood Plans.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
Range of housing, jobs and facilities are needed as part of new allocations to allow villages to thrive and remain vibrant.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60565 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Sites in villages on rail routes, at public transport nodes, and within public transport corridors should be prioritised.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
Significant growth in appropriate locations that maximises public transport should be considered as additions to the sites proposed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

Summary of issues raised:
Question the approach that separates the southern cluster from the rest of the rural area – there are other public transport and employment clusters, such as the area surrounding Melbourn. South western area should be explored in the same way as an area with strong existing public transport connections and employment

opportunities.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57333 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Regret any loss of good farmland and countryside.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58394 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Fear urbanisation from Stapleford to Saffron Walden. Major planning applications have been considered individually, with no consideration of cumulative effects and impacts on landscape and existing settlements.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57907 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Moratorium is required on large developments in the upper Cam valley, until water usage, landscape impacts, and impacts on river/chalk streams have been assessed taking account of existing permitted developments and those already planned for. Cross-border liaison under Duty to Co-Operate is required.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57907 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Planning has already been granted to develop some of these areas, but roads and other infrastructure still need to be upgraded. Infrastructure should be a priority and delivered ahead of other buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58046 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Concerns over traffic congestion, poor infrastructure, lack of water resources, and significant building on floodplains.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58394 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Important that there is both sufficient and suitable business space to meet the needs of those who wish to locate in the area.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58198 (SmithsonHill)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the recognition that the life sciences cluster needs to be maintained and

developed. The success of the cluster is closely linked to the continued success of Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58803 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised:

Object to Granta Park and the Welding Institute (TWI) not being referred to, as this is not reflective of the importance of Granta Park.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58726 (TWI)

Summary of issues raised:

Major transport consideration needed before any proposed expansion. Rural areas should not be segregated from Cambridge, particularly where there are jobs and services nearby.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57700 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Concerns regarding effects of expansion of Haverhill – need workplaces for those living in these homes, and also genuinely affordable housing for lower paid workers.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58394 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59155 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59155 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:

Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:

• additional land in the rural area should be identified for moderate levels of Green Belt release to ensure that viability of rural areas are protected and enhanced

• south-western area should be explored in the same way as an area with strong existing public transport connections and employment opportunities
• to expand Avtech commercial business cluster
• mismatch between economic potential of the existing sites and the scale of the new homes and employment sites being planned locally to support them
• to support the clustering of new development in this area
• responds directly to the priorities of the Local Plan
• to ensure a range of housing, jobs and facilities are provided within villages to allow them to thrive and remain vibrant

Comments highlighting this issue:
57164 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57229 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57333 (HD Planning Ltd), 58006 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58198 (SmithsonHill), 58440 (Deal Land LLP), 58715 (Grange Farm Partnership), 58803 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58917 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 59118 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 60565 (Countryside Properties)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:
Avtech1, Avtech 2 and the expansions of Duxford village (HELAA Site 40095) – should be allocated for employment uses, housing and community facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:
58006 (Imperial War Museum / Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the east of the A1301, south of the A505 near Hinxton and west of the A1301, north of the A505 near Whittlesford (HELAA site 40441) – should be allocated for employment uses

Comments highlighting this issue:
58198 (SmithsonHill)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Grange Farm, east of A11 & north of A1307 (HELAA site 59401) – should be allocated as a new settlement

Comments highlighting this issue:
58715 (Grange Farm Partnership)

Summary of issues raised:
Six Mile Bottom (HELAA site 40078) – should be allocated as a new settlement

Comments highlighting this issue:
59118 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to Babraham (HELAA site 40297)
• Support for rejection as will have a significant adverse impact on Babraham village character, its surrounding environment, local wildlife habitat and historic interest.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59262 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston (HELAA site 40509)
• Support for rejection as will have a significant adverse impact on Babraham village character, its surrounding environment, local wildlife habitat and historic interest.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59262 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)

S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

10 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the rural southern cluster heading as the comments were specific to the Genome 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

Executive Summary

Ickleton PC identified issues regarding implementation of the planned development, including addressing governance issues. Histon & Impington and Linton PCs highlighted the need for suitably priced housing to support a range of job types. Campaign for Protection of Rural England object to the development in principle. Historic England consider that the policy should mention the importance of considering historic environment impacts. North Herts DC highlight the need to consider traffic implications. One individual highlights that jobs should be where homes are planned, such as Cambourne.

Table of representations: S/GC – Genome Campus, Hinxton

Summary of issues raised:
Strongly object to Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton as:
• Too large compared to existing campus.
• Majority of it is on productive farm land.
• There is room for expansion on the existing campus.
• It is not required and is sprawl into the countryside, hidden within the badge of a Wellcome expansion.
• Hinxton is a rural community with a long history in a countryside location and this should be respected.
• It is similar to a previous proposal near Hinxton which the Council rejected and which was upheld by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59563 (Campaign for Protection of Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Removing further land from the Green Belt is inconsistent with the re-iteration of the purpose of the Green Belt in the statement on Great Places in the Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60402 (Campaign for Protection of Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Within the Green Belt and therefore needs protection from excessive development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56724 (Croydon PC), 56723* (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support research work at the Genome Campus. But concerns over the availability of suitably priced housing. For example, affordable housing for those in lower paid roles that support the research such as cleaners, childcare, should be supported.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57701 (Histon & Impington PC), 58395 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
It is of utmost importance that the “tie” conditions for the development restricting homes to Campus workers are rigorously applied. Failure to limit growth will lead to unacceptable impacts on neighbouring communities.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57918 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Consideration should be given at an early date to civic governance issues including whether a separate parish council is required. There is the potential that the voices of Hinxton residents will be lost, with residents dependent on the Campus for homes and jobs in the majority.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57918 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan applies as the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for chalk and part of it lies within a MSA for sand and gravel.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56938 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but to the west it is close to a Conservation Area which includes several grade II* and numerous grade II listed buildings and to the south lies an important cluster of scheduled monuments. The policy should mention the importance of considering historic environment impacts as part of any future proposals and it would be helpful if it mentioned key heritage assets and potential mitigation needed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59646 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree with the proposed policy for additional industry and warehousing uses associated specifically with the use requirements of the Genome Campus.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57356 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
The Wellcome Genome Campus is currently only accessible by car from North Hertfordshire. The proposed development will have an impact on the district,

positively in terms of increased employment opportunities or negatively in terms of additional traffic using the A505. The recommendations from the current A505 corridor studies could have a bearing on this.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58666 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:

Locate the Genome Campus where you are planning new homes e.g. Cambourne. The location of employment growth south of the city and new homes north of the city contradicts the desire for sustainable growth.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56496* (D Clay)

S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section

21 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the rural southern cluster heading as the comments were specific to the Babraham Research 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

Executive Summary

Babraham PC oppose the removal of the campus from the green belt and expansion outside of their land. Cambridge Past, Present & Future highlight green belt policy requirements for compensatory improvements to the remaining green belt. They also highlight landscape sensitivities that would need to be addressed. Campaign for Protection of Rural England consider the policy proposals too vague to provide assurance they will not lead to sprawl. Concerns were expressed by a number of people about the continued expansion of the campus, and its impact on the green belt, the environment and the character of Babraham village. Some representors,

including Linton PC and Histon & Impington PC, were concerned about the availability of affordable housing to support the employment. Babraham Research Campus support the allocation of development and release from the green belt, due to the importance of the site to the life sciences cluster. They also support opportunities to include co-located housing, in particular to redevelop from 40 homes to 60 homes and 100 student apartments. They seek amendments to the site boundary, including to exclude the church. They include evidence to support the proposals. Historic England highlight the need for consideration of impact on historic assets when exploring development proposals.

Table of representations: S/BRC – Babraham Research Campus

Summary of issues raised:
Within the Green Belt and therefore needs protection from excessive development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56725 (Croydon PC), 56723* (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The Research Campus has already doubled in size in last five years. The removal of the site from the Green Belt will add further pressure on the need for housing in Babraham and will destroy the open, rural landscape character of Babraham Hall's open parkland setting.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59216, 59262* (Multiple individuals)

Summary of issues raised:
Successive developments over the last 5 years have resulted in extensive use of parish Green Belt for housing, reducing green space between Sawston and Babraham; adoption of CSET automated bus route and P&R; and doubling in size of the BRC. The process of steady drip-fed development is unacceptable to Babraham villagers.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59216 (Multiple individuals)

Summary of issues raised:
The BRC submission needs to be placed in context of other sites brought forward in the area. All sites together surround Babraham village. The process does not adequately explain the risk to Babraham village as demonstrated by earlier accepted developments in our Parish including the GCP Babraham P&R and automated bus route; the soon to be completed Hawthorns; and S/RSC/H1(c).
Comments highlighting this issue:
59216 (Multiple individuals)

Summary of issues raised:
These individual sites taken both individually and together will have a significant adverse impact on Babraham village character, its surrounding environment, local wildlife habitat and historic interest. Specifically, these submissions, if accepted, will:
• Amalgamate the villages of Sawston and Babraham to create a ribbon of housing stretching from Trumpington village, through the Shelfords and Stapleford.
• Increase the current housing stock of Babraham by 2650% from 130 houses to 3710 houses.
• Far exceed the advice from the Housing Needs Assessment (Nov 2021) which advises Babraham should accommodate 10 additional houses over 10 years.
• Ignore the historic importance of Babraham village and its farming heritage.
• Build on land once farmed by Jonas Webb, a pioneer in animal husbandry.
• Build on ancient water meadows and open landscape windows.
• Destroy river systems, floodplain grasslands, and habitats.
• Adversely affect the setting of 13 listed buildings in the village and parish.
• Surround Babraham Hall's historic parkland with housing and laboratories.
• Overlook archaeological findings including Anglo Saxon settlements.
• Place development on floodplains along the River Granta.
• Increase water abstraction and damage chalk stream ecosystems.
• Overwhelm village amenities and infrastructure designed for 130 homes.
• Add to recent large-scale development in Babraham Parish.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59216 (Multiple individuals), 58232 (A Ogilvy-Stuart)

Summary of issues raised:
Removing this site from the Green Belt will remove very important constraints on planning and should not be allowed. The Close is adjacent to the village – a conservation area – and must remain under strict planning constraints to ensure sensitive development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58156 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
There has been enormous development in the Babraham Research Campus already, despite its Green Belt location, so removing this could be extremely detrimental to the village character, housing density and infrastructure. Removing the Campus from the Green Belt will invite over-development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58156 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree with the proposed policy if the release of Green Belt does not impact on

important landscape features, biodiversity and heritage.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57358 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:

Co-locate the research campus where the majority of new homes are e.g. in Cambourne. It makes no sense to develop the majority of the new housing north of the city and then create new employment clusters south of the city.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56495 (D Clay)

Summary of issues raised:

Support Babraham research work, but concerns over availability of suitably priced housing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58396 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Agree that development should be restricted to R&D and appropriate supporting ancillary uses and infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57358 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:

Supporting research is important but that also includes affordable homes for those supporting the research generally, e.g., lower-level staff whose services are still required.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57702 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:

The listed buildings here are an important part of the heritage.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57702 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Include publicly accessible footpaths through the campus open to members of the public like Hinxton.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57837 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised:

Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan applies as the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for chalk and nearly all within a MSA for sand and gravel.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56939 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not agree with the withdrawal of Babraham Institute from the Green Belt. Strongly oppose any expansion of Babraham Institute outside of their land and into the surrounding Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59507 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The following provisos should be incorporated into the Local Plan:
• Apply the principle: “National Planning policy requires that the impact of removing land from the Green Belt be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land.”
• Recognise that the site is within the Cambridge Nature Network and adjacent to two strategic green infrastructure areas (Gog Magog Hills and River Cam Corridor). Emphasise biodiversity enhancement and public access.
• Address potential conflict with landscape character policies. New buildings should be below tree height when viewed from the Gog Magog Hills and blend into the landscape.
• One newer building has negatively impacted the landscape. Require retrospective action to screen or better blend it into the landscape before further development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58569 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59507 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Object most strongly to Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus. The proposed policy area would approximately double the size of the existing site. It is unacceptable to withdraw this area from the Green Belt. Withdrawal is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. The site is within the Cambridge Nature Network and adjacent to strategic green infrastructure areas.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59565 and 60401 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Vague terms used by the Shared Planning Service such as:
• “Protect and enhance the landscaped setting of the site”
• “Preserve the appearance of the conservation areas, and the setting of the Grade II Listed Babraham Hall and the Grade I Listed St Peters Church”
• “Protect and enhance the corridor of the River Granta”
• “Include sustainable travel opportunities”
• “Retain The Close as key worker and affordable housing”

These provide no comfort that this policy will not lead to further sprawl into the countryside.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59565 and 60401 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
The proposed Policy Area extension is on higher ground than the existing campus buildings and the location is sensitive in landscape character, being visible from the higher ground of the Gog Magog Hills, including from the Roman Road Scheduled Ancient Monument. The landscape has already been damaged by one of the recently constructed buildings on the campus. CPRE is very concerned by the further development of this site towards Cambridge and will request the Secretary of State to consider very carefully any further attrition of the Green Belt at this location.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59565 and 60401 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the identification of Land at Babraham Research Campus as a proposed Policy Area for employment development and the release of land from the Green Belt, as:
• The life science cluster in Greater Cambridge continues to grow and needs additional flexible R&D/laboratory workspace.
• Life science companies benefit from clustering near research institutes and clinical medicine.
• The Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study supports employment designation.
• The Campus has grown rapidly and attracted significant interest for expansion.
• It plays a unique role in supporting start-ups within the life science ecosystem.
• Demand for space is outstripping supply, creating a barrier to growth.
• The proposal aligns with national and local planning policy to support economic growth and high-tech industries.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
There is a need for additional dedicated housing at the Campus:
• To retain Cambridge University doctoral graduate students from outside the UK.
• For key support staff operating Campus facilities.
• Local Plan housing delivery will take time to affect prices and availability.
• Co-locating housing with employment reduces transport impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
Exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the release of land from the Green Belt.
• The Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) concludes the parcel has ‘low harm’ if released.
• A Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Green Belt Study by Bidwells LLP supports this conclusion.
• Adverse effects are limited to a local scale and restricted group of receptors.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
The boundary of the proposed Policy Area is broadly supported but should exclude the Church and Church Lane, which fall outside the Campus estate.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
Clarification is needed on how the councils calculated 17.1 hectares. BRC Ltd estimates the additional employment land equates to 9.4 hectares and approximately 28,870 sqm of floorspace.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the proposal to identify the whole site release from the Green Belt as a Policy Area, with development restricted to R&D (use class E(g)(ii)) and appropriate supporting ancillary uses and infrastructure.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
Recommended design principles for future Campus expansion:
• Dense planting to the west and north-west to mitigate visual effects.
• Larger trees to the north to filter views from Roman Road footpath.
• Retain open grassland to the west to preserve river landscape character.
• Internal green gaps to maintain openness.
• Landscape maintenance plans to ensure successful planting.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
An initial Built Heritage Appraisal has been prepared. It concludes that, with appropriate masterplanning, impacts on built heritage assets can be mitigated or

removed, and are likely to result in “less than substantial” harm under NPPF policies.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:

BRC Ltd are committed to protecting and enhancing the corridor of the River Granta. A priority for BRC’s approach to nature is retaining the existing ecological value such as the flood plain which provides flood alleviation and locks up carbon. Campus expansion will enhance ecological value by delivering at least a 20% biodiversity net gain (BNG) in line with Natural Cambridgeshire’s Vision of doubling the nature conservation value of the area by 2050. This will include wider enhancements to the campus, including improvements to the river systems.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:

A Transport Strategic Overview and Access and Movement Strategy has been prepared to support the Campus expansion. It integrates with existing and committed walking, cycling and public transport networks, including the CSET scheme. Key elements include:

• Reducing car travel and promoting healthy lifestyles through on-site housing and active travel infrastructure
• Planning for new mobility options
• Prioritising walking and cycling for local trips
• Maximising public transport use via CSET and other connections
• A balanced private car strategy that discourages habitual car use

The strategy concludes there are no transport or highways reasons preventing allocation of the Campus for development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:

Support for retaining The Close as affordable housing for key workers. Proposed redevelopment from 40 homes to 60 homes and 100 student apartments will retain a low-density character appropriate to its village edge location.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal concludes the site has lower value to wildlife at

the county scale. Effective mitigation for development impacts is likely and will benefit biodiversity.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
A Sustainability Statement has been prepared to inform the Campus expansion masterplan. It outlines commitments across five areas:
• **Physical** – Net zero carbon, energy efficiency, EV charging, digital connectivity
• **Social** – Inclusive placemaking, community engagement
• **Economic** – Circular economy, stewardship, life sciences
• **Human** – Healthy buildings, wellbeing
• **Natural** – Environmental net gain and natural capital

Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
Babraham Research Campus is mostly in Flood Zone 1 (low flood risk), with land near the River Granta in Flood Zone 2. Mitigation measures include:
• Additional flood plains and scrapes
• Restoring watercourses and ponds
• Re-wetting grazing marsh
• SuDS, green roofs, green walls, and street trees to enhance water management

Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
An Archaeological Assessment found all remains to be undesignated heritage assets under the NPPF. Based on extensive investigations, further significant finds are unlikely. Development impacts are expected to be manageable and not constrain future allocation.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
The identification of Babraham Research Campus as a Policy Area in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, including for its expansion, would provide significant economic, social and environmental benefits:
• No insurmountable technical constraints to development, subject to Green Belt release
• Supports Government objectives to grow UK Life Science capabilities
• Provision of ~28,870 sqm of R&D floorspace, supporting ~1,400 jobs and £50.7m GVA

• Further employment through expanded facilities, construction, and business rates
• Provision of 120 Campus-linked houses
• New nursery, retail, community meeting point, and play area
• Retention of ~3.5 ha of amenity land and creation of a community orchard and 'Common' area
• Location within A1307 Strategic Transport Corridor supports transport improvements like CSET
• New opportunities for informal recreation and wellbeing
• Embedded Net Zero Carbon strategy
• At least 20% Biodiversity Net Gain through green space and habitat creation
• New publicly accessible green open spaces
• Flood risk mitigation via new flood plains and scrapes
• Compensatory improvements to remaining Green Belt and robust new boundaries

Comments highlighting this issue:
58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised:
The Babraham Institute is currently only accessible by car from North Hertfordshire. Proposed development may increase employment opportunities but also traffic on the A505. Recommendations from the A505 corridor studies may influence this.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58669 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
The site includes the Grade I listed Church of St Peters, Grade II listed Babraham Hall, and part of Babraham Conservation Area. Nearby listed buildings and scheduled monuments could be affected. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) should be prepared and used to inform policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59647 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Welcome reference to the church, Hall, and Conservation Area in the policy. Suggest also referencing wider offsite heritage assets.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59647 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy wording should be amended to:
"Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets, including the Grade I listed St Peters Church, Grade II Babraham Hall and Babraham Conservation Area as well as nearby heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset)."

Comments highlighting this issue:
59647 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the release of land from the Green Belt to support nationally important R&D and life science jobs located near public transport routes and active travel networks.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60117 (C Blakeley)

S/RSC: Other site allocations in the rural southern cluster

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/RSC: Other site allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

121

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Individuals have commented that use of Green Belt land is contrary to previous consultations, and that Green Belt should be protected from urban sprawl as provides recreational space. Objections to release of Green Belt in Great Shelford and Babraham, and to development at Linton. Comments highlight need to retain character of existing villages. Parish Councils support small scale developments where there is suitable infrastructure and public transport, and highlight that Neighbourhood Plans need to be considered when identifying sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters, on the basis that there is a need for affordable housing, there is suitable land for additional residential development, and growth is needed to support existing village services and facilities. A comment from an individual that more smaller developments are needed to deliver homes quickly.

S/RSC/HW: Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford – Cambridge Past, Present & Future, local parish councils, district councillors, and a number of individuals have commented that the site: fails to meet the exceptional criteria for Green Belt release, will destroy high grade land, will contribute to the merging of Great Shelford and Stapleford into one settlement, has poor quality

access and will create congestion, and does not materially contribute towards the overall housing need. Cambridge Past, Present & Future and district councillors suggest the policy should include requirements for public open space / Green Belt mitigation / Local Green Space for both the northern and eastern boundaries. Concerns that proximity to the station will result in the new homes being bought by London commuters rather than locals, and that the allocation is based on the promise of transport initiatives that have not yet been approved. Also comments from individuals that there is no reference to the retirement village allowed on appeal for a nearby site, that the assessment fails to consider the proposed busway, that Cambridge South Station will not benefit new residents as its more convenient to travel by car to Addenbrooke's, and that the existing infrastructure is already overstretched such that new development will put pressure on water supply, drainage, services and facilities, biodiversity, and food production. Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration. Support for its allocation from the landowner, with a commitment to prepare additional assessments.

S/RSC/MF: Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford – IWM has highlighted that the site falls within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zone and Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration.

S/RSC/CC: Comfort Café, Fourwentways – Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration.

S/RSC/H/1(c): land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (Part of the site is in Babraham Parish) – individuals do not support this allocation as: the neighbouring site north of Babraham Road has used inappropriate building materials that are not in accordance with the Design Guide SPD, the housing density is inappropriate, the green space to be provided is negligible, transport improvements are needed, character of the village needs to be conserved, loss of woodland and farmland, and impacts on landscape and water courses need to be considered. A comment that once full planning permission is approved the allocation will no longer be necessary. Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration.

Table of representations: S/RSC – Village allocations in the rural southern cluster

Summary of issues raised:
Object to any Green Belt changes, including the release of Green Belt land in:
• Great Shelford

• Babraham

Comments highlighting this issue:

56485 (N Hilliard), 58436 (J Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:

The use of Green Belt land is contrary to previous consultations.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56485 (N Hilliard), 56684 (P Dootson)

Summary of issues raised:

Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:

• Suitable for additional residential development (including affordable, market, key worker, older persons, care home, custom/self-build, specialist housing)
• Within a village with sustainable transport and employment opportunities
• Identified need for affordable housing not met by other means
• Suitable for open space and/or recreational/leisure uses
• Need to support existing village services and facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

57087 (Shelford Investments), 57128 (The Grange Field Consortium), 57509 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 58439 (NW Bio and Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58442 (NW Bio and Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58522 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58540 (Deal Land LLP), 58906 (St John's College Cambridge), 58927 (Wedd Joinery), 58940 (Carter Jonas), 59021 (Deal Land LLP), 59033 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 60566 (Countryside Properties), 60689 (Gladman Developments), 60691 (Gladman Developments), 60695 (Trustees of Great Wilbraham Estate), 60713 (D Wright), 60714 (Pembroke College), 60715 (C Sawyer Nutt), 60732 (F.C Butler Trust), 60753 (S Gardner), 60754 (S Gardner), 60771 (Mr and Mrs Bishop), 60773 (Abington Farms Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:

Green Belt should be protected from urban sprawl and provides much needed recreational space.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56679 (R Rigge)

Summary of issues raised:

Comments on sites in Ickleton, Duxford and near Hinxton that have been rejected to date.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56533 (P Fletcher)

Summary of issues raised:

Support small scale development in the rural area where there is suitable

infrastructure and reliable public transport (train/bus/cycle).

Comments highlighting this issue:

56582 (Gamlingay PC), 56726 (Croydon PC), 57919 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Development in villages near employment clusters is understandable, but should remain limited to preserve village character.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56809 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised:

Neighbourhood Plans should be fully considered when allocating housing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57299 (Foxton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Unclear whether allocations are existing commitments or proposed. Discrepancy in wording, mapping, and inclusion in development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57332 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:

No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57359 (Huntingdon DC)

Summary of issues raised:

Strongly disapprove of any further expansion around Linton.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58397 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Use good multidisciplinary design to avoid exploitative development as seen in past planning history.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58436 (J Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:

Instead of land in Great Shelford, development could be delivered in other locations such as:

- Bassingbourn
- Over
- Girton
- Whittlesford

Comments highlighting this issue:
58667 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern about the definition and implications of the “Rural Southern Cluster” – requires more detailed explanation and justification.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59855 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy has a different name on the map page.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60118 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
The First Proposals plan relies heavily on large strategic developments which take 5–8 years to deliver first homes. A pipeline of smaller developments is needed to maintain housing delivery and address affordability.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60712 (C King)

Summary of issues raised:
S/SCP/WHD Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge:
Includes scheduled monument and Grade II* listed Chapel of the Hospital of St John and Grade II listed Red Lion. Development could affect these heritage assets. Recommend preparing a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to inform policy wording. Height is a concern in this sensitive location.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59652 (Historic England)

New allocations – housing

S/RSC/HW: Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford

Summary of issues raised:
The site fails to meet exceptional criteria for Green Belt release and will destroy high-grade land. There is no new relevant information to justify reassessment of this site since its rejection in the 2018 Local Plan. What are the ‘exceptional circumstances’ that justify removing the land from the Green Belt?
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals: 56485 (N Hilliard), 56681 (N Campbell), 56684 (P Dootson), 56686 (A Kennedy), 56694 (D Kennedy), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56833 (M Dewey), 56835 (L Plumb), 56836 (L Carrothers), 56839 (A Collier), 56840 (M Farrington), 56842 (L Sikkema), 56844 (N Punshon), 56845 (B Ragbourn), 56849 (J White), 57317 (A Czernuszewicz), 57631

(P Antill), 57764 (J Sennitt), 57843 (A Gannon), 57982 (K Lockhart), 57985 (A Lockhart), 58083 (C Bendelack), 58101 (S Ingram), 58104 (K Ackerman), 58124 (C Hilliard), 58143 (N Hamid), 58150 (M Vigouroux), 59256 (P Sparks), 59283 (M Berkson), 59761 (Anonymous), 60544 (P Mirrlees), 60254 (Cllr B Shelton), 60496 (Cllr N Sample)
Public Bodies: 56972 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57561 (Stapleford PC), 59084 (Great Shelford PC)
Third Sector Organisations: 58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Developers: 58667 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for development at allocated land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford due to exceptional circumstances including proximity to services, employment, sustainable transport, and housing need including affordable housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57303 (A J Johnson)

Summary of issues raised:
A number of technical reports will need to be prepared including:
• Landscape assessment
• Heritage assessment
• Ecological appraisal
• Transport assessment
Comments highlighting this issue:
57303 (A J Johnson)

Summary of issues raised:
There is no mention of the proposed retirement village in the Local Plan report.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56694 (D Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge South Station will not benefit residents of the proposed 100 homes as commuting to Addenbrooke's is more convenient by car.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56485 (N Hilliard), 57985 (A Lockhart)

Summary of issues raised:
The assessment failed to consider the proposed Bus Way, expected to run north of the site. The route does not provide reasonable access from Great Shelford. Its construction increases the importance of maintaining the intervening Green Belt land.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56485 (N Hilliard), 56694 (D Kennedy), 59283 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
The site sits on the boundary between Great Shelford and Stapleford, contributing to the merging of these communities into one continuous suburban settlement, damaging village character and impacting social wellbeing and mental health.
Comments highlighting this issue:
Multiple individuals (see full list above)

Summary of issues raised:
Poor quality access to the site via a narrow 20 mph road. Increased traffic and pollution will harm the conservation area of Stapleford. Existing traffic issues at the railway crossing will be worsened. Inadequate public transport will lead to more car use, creating danger for cyclists.
Comments highlighting this issue:
Multiple individuals (see full list above)
Public Bodies: 59084 (Great Shelford PC), 57561 (Stapleford PC)
Third Sector Organisations: 58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
S/RSC/HW provides less than 1.5% of total housing allocations and does not materially contribute to housing stock. Homes would not be truly affordable. Why is such a large area (10 hectares) proposed?
Comments highlighting this issue:
Multiple individuals (see full list above)
Public Bodies: 59084 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
There appears to be a longer-term intention for further Green Belt release in this location. If the development is to be contained, mitigation should be provided for both northern and eastern boundaries.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
The Planning Authority is relying on transport initiatives such as CSET that are not yet approved or submitted for planning.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59084 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Proximity to Great Shelford station may attract London commuters, risking that new housing does not support local job creation and exacerbates housing shortages.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59084 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Other non-Green Belt sites should be prioritised. Housing on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus would be more appropriate and less impactful.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56836 (L Carrothers)

Summary of issues raised:
Local infrastructure is already overstretched and further development will increase pressure on:
• Water supply and drainage
• Schools
• GP practices
• Other local services and amenities
• Biodiversity, flora and fauna
• Congestion and pollution from cars
• Local character including the Magog Hills and Wandlebury
• Long views from Mingle Lane to the rolling chalk hills to the north
• Food production needs and loss of arable land
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals: 56485 (N Hilliard), 56681 (N Campbell), 56684 (P Dootson), 56686 (A Kennedy), 56694 (D Kennedy), 56707 (M Zmija), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56830 (H Sikkema Lucena), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56833 (M Dewey), 56835 (L Plumb), 56836 (L Carrothers), 56839 (A Collier), 56840 (M Farrington), 56842 (L Sikkema), 56844 (N Punshon), 56845 (B Ragbourn), 56849 (J White), 57317 (A Czernuszewicz), 57631 (P Antill), 57764 (J Sennitt), 57843 (A Gannon), 57900 (Schofield), 57982 (K Lockhart), 57985 (A Lockhart), 58083 (C Bendelack), 58101 (S Ingram), 58104 (K Ackerman), 58124 (C Hilliard), 58143 (N Hamid), 58150 (M Vigouroux), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation), 60496 (Cllr N Sample), 60544 (P Mirrlees)
Public Bodies: 56972 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57561 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Uncertainty and changeability on the part of the council are contributing to significant stress for local residents.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56684 (P Dootson), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56839 (A Collier), 56842 (L Sikkema), 57631 (P Antill), 58101 (S Ingram), 58143 (N Hamid)

Summary of issues raised:
Where is the environmental impact study for the two new areas that make up this proposed site? The areas differ in land quality—meadow with high biodiversity value

and agricultural land with low nature value. Using the meadow over the agricultural land contradicts biodiversity goals.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56686 (A Kennedy), 56694 (D Kennedy), 57561 (Stapleford PC), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation)

Summary of issues raised:
Waverley Park, an existing built-up area opposite, will become available soon.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56790 (R Rigge)

Summary of issues raised:
Call for Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service to either:

1. Reduce the area of land proposed for development, or
2. Designate a Local Green Space for the 10-hectare plot beyond what is needed for 100 houses, offering potential parkland and play facilities for families in Great Shelford and Stapleford.
   Comments highlighting this issue:
   60496 (Cllr N Sample), 60397 (Cllr P Fane)

Summary of issues raised:
All land within Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) for chalk and sand & gravel. MWLP Policy 5 applies. Site is adjacent to residential properties; amenity buffer likely to sterilise most of the mineral.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56940 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
In Fig. 33, land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford (Policy S/RSC site HW) is incorrectly marked as an existing site (orange) when it should be a proposed new site allocation (purple).

Comments highlighting this issue:
59283 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Stapleford Conservation Area, which includes listed buildings such as Grade II* St Andrew's Church. Development could affect these assets through changes to their settings. Recommend a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to determine site suitability and inform policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59648 (Historic England)

S/RSC/MF: Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford

Summary of issues raised:
All within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for chalk. MWLP Policy 5 applies. Site is adjacent to residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56940 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
The 60 dwelling site at Maarnford Farm is within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zone. Consultation is necessary to ensure that any development in this location does not affect airfield operations and that residents of the new development are aware of the established impact of the location's proximity to the airfield.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58007 (Imperial War Museum / Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
There are no designated heritage assets on this site. While the Duxford Conservation Area lies to the southeast of the site, it is separated by existing development and a playing field. Recommend the preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to determine/confirm whether this site is suitable and to inform the policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59649 (Historic England)

New allocations – employment

S/RSC/CC: Comfort Café, Fourwentways

Summary of issues raised:
All within Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) for chalk and sand & gravel. MWLP Policy 5 applies. Site is too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56940 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on site, there is a Grade II listed building—the Temple café and restaurant—to the south of the site. Development has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through changes to its setting. Recommend preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to

determine/confirm site suitability and inform policy wording. However, due to intervening vegetation and distance, the impact is likely to be minimal.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59650 (Historic England)

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/RSC/H/1(c): land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (Part of the site is in Babraham Parish)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support development. The site currently under construction (Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston (H1/b)) used inappropriate building materials for construction that do not align with the design guidelines of Sawston.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58159 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
Housing density is inappropriate and allocated green spaces is negligible.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58159 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
S/RSC/H/1 should only be allowed to go ahead if development aligns with Sawston design guidelines, and is at a density MUCH lower than H1/b.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58159 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
Transport infrastructure must be brought in to avoid the additional pressure that has been placed on Babraham village by H1/b.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58159 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
Should preserve Babraham and the unique rural wooded farmland character. Allow full conservation of historic character.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58436 (J Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
Protect fertile soils, woodland, farmland and parkland character as a primary resource against climate change

Comments highlighting this issue:
58436 (J Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
Should survey chalk, landscape, hydrology and protect watercourses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58436 (J Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
A full application for this site is currently pending consideration so it will no longer be appropriate to allocate it.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58540 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. However, Sawston Hall a grade II Registered Park and Garden lies to the south west of the site. Development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through development within its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59651 (Historic England)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston (HELAA site 40509) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57019 (KWA Architects), 57032 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to Babraham (HELAA site 40297) – should be allocated for residential development, employment uses, community facilities, schools, public open space and areas for biodiversity enhancement.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57566, 57568, 57569, 57571, 57572 and 58482 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the rear of 24 Brookhampton Street, Ickleton (HELAA: 40536) should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60712 (C King)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Cabbage Moor, Great Shelford (HELAA: 40529) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
57087 (Shelford Investments)

Summary of issues raised:
Grange Field, Church Street, Great Shelford (HELAA: 40128) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57128 (The Grange Field Consortium)

Summary of issues raised:
Robinson Farm, Sawston (HELAA: 40146) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57509 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised:
Mill Lane Site, Sawston (HELAA: 40341) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58439 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58442 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of Linton (HELAA: 51047) – should be allocated for residential development, a doctors surgery, an early years facility and open space.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58522 (Bloor Homes Eastern)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Cambridge Road, Sawston (HELAA site 40547) – should be allocated for a residential-led mixed use development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58540 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of Hinton Way, Great Shelford (HELAA: 40485) should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58906 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Wedd Joinery, Granta Terrace, Stapleford (HELAA: 40477) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58927 (Wedd Joinery)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Hinton Way Stapleford (HELAA: 40369) – should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58940 (Carter Jonas)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Haverhill Road, Stapleford (HELAA: 40546) – should be allocated for mixed use development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59021 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the west of Duxford Road, Whittlesford (HELAA site 59397) – should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59033 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the north-west of Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA: 40411) – should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60566 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA Site 40336) – should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60689 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Back Road, Linton (HELAA Site 40343) – should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60691 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the East of the A11, Mill Road, Great Wilbraham (HELAA site 40130) – should be allocated for employment uses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60695 (Trustees of Great Wilbraham Estate)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the South of Shelford Road and Cambridge Road, Fulbourn, (HELAA: 48064) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60713 (D Wright)

Summary of issues raised:
Land South of Horseheath Road Linton (HELAA: 40554) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60714 (Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington (HELAA: 40539) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60715 (C Sawyer Nutt)

Summary of issues raised:
West of 40 Station Rd West, Whittlesford (new site: 59391) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60732 (F.C Butler Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of West End 27 West End Whittlesford (new site: 59382) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60753 (S Gardner)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adj to Whittlesford Highways Depot 57 Station Road East Whittlesford (new site 59383) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60754 (S Gardner)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adj to M11 (nr. 24 Newton Rd) Whittlesford (new site 59384) – should be allocated for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60754 (S Gardner)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Hinxton Court Hinxton (HELAA: 40080) – should be allocated for either employment uses or residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60771 (Mr and Mrs Bishop)

Summary of issues raised:
Land between Great Abington and north of Great Chesterford (HELAA: 40352 and 45645) – should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60773 (Abington Farms Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of M11, west of Duxford, AND Land at Duxford (HELAA: 40095) – should be allocated for residential development and community facilities.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58013 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Cambridge Road, Linton (HELAA site 51721) – should be allocated for residential development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60513 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Coploe Road, Grange Road, Ickleton (HELAA site 40502):
• Support for rejection as unsuitable for development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O'Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57919 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Ickleton Road, Great Chesterford (HELAA site 47934):
• Support for rejection as unsuitable for development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O'Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57256 (A Gale), 57919 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the east of the A1301, south of the A505 near Hinxton; west of the A1301, north of the A505 near Whittlesford, CB10 1RG (HELAA sites 52057, 52058, & 52059), Options 1, 2 & 3:
• Support for rejection as unsuitable for development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O'Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57919 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of M11, west of Duxford, AND Land at Duxford (HELAA site 40095):

• Support for rejection as unsuitable for development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O'Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57256 (A Gale), 57919 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land to the rear of 24 Brookhampton Street, CB10 1SP (HELAA site 40536):

• Support for rejection as unsuitable for development due to out of character with the village, access is restricted, next to a flood plain, is within a conservation area, and unnecessary in light of much more significant housing developments going ahead nearby.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56532 (P Fletcher), 56560 (S Lober), 56563 (J Williams), 56565 (G Nel), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O'Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 56794 (C Waters), 56795 (M Waters), 57256 (A Gale), 57541 (J Varley), 57579 (A Izzarf), 57581 (M Mortaz), 57919 (Ickleton PC), 58024 (M Smith), 58779 (D Keating)

S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

21

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the Policy areas in the rural southern cluster (S/SCP) with some particular points raised. Those who supported included Gamlingay PC who supported the need for improved cycling networks. Croydon PC indicated Papworth needed development after the loss of its hospital, as does Fen Drayton. They noted the current congestion in Duxford and questioned the need for additional development. Histon & Impington PC emphasised the need for the correct transport policy because some areas have very limited public transport.

One member of the public supported the existing site allocations to be carried forward along with the expansion of Babraham research campus using Green Belt

land. Another member of the public suggested the inclusion of Granta Park to provide a locally agreed framework for future development. Peterhouse requested that Greenhedge Farm, Stapleford should be released from the Green Belt given its limited contribution to the Cambridge Green Belt.

The approach proposed for **Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge (S/SCP/WHD)** was supported by Imperial War Museum (IWM)/Gonville and Caius College who are keen to work with Greater Cambridge Partnership to explore delivery of Whittlesford Parkway Masterplan. IWM asks that they are considered a key stakeholder in sustainable transport plans. Cambridgeshire County Council, as landowner also supports the promotion of an enhanced rural travel hub at Whittlesford Station and continue to promote their site at Whittlesford Depot for mixed use development. Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority, noted that the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel, and part is within a MSA for chalk. The railway, A505 and existing residential and other sensitive properties would be a constraint to working the site for minerals.

BCM LLP on behalf of Land North of Station Road East, Whittlesford request, given the site's proximity to the site, that the land submitted should be considered in the wider context of this site. The site was outlined for mixed use and residential development in initial consultation documents. SmithsonHill noted its site at Hinxton is strategically placed in the centre of this area - outside of green belt, immediately north of the Genome Campus policy area, and adjacent to Whittlesford Parkway Station. H.J. Molton Settlement, while supporting this policy they indicated the policy is limited to "redevelopment" of the existing built-up area and suggest the policy area should be expanded eastwards to include the land to the east of Whittlesford Highways Depot.

The approach proposed to the area **South of A1307, Linton (S/SCP/H/6)** was broadly supported by both Linton PC and several members of the public. Many re-iterated the same point about the settlements of Linton and Little Linton having historically distinct identities. New development in the area would disrupt the historic open landscape, destroying the separation and damaging the individual character of each settlement. Furthermore, land in this area is a valuable environmental resource, which should be protected. They supported the retention of the land between Little Linton and Linton within the designated countryside.

Historic England also support this policy approach, noting this policy area includes part of Linton Conservation area and many listed buildings; development in this area has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets and their settings; and the proposed policy restricts residential development in this area to improvements to existing properties.

Table of representations: S/SCP - Policy areas in the rural southern cluster

Summary of issues raised:
Support the requirement for improved cycling networks to enable access from rural areas surrounding the sites.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56583 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Papworth needs development after the loss of its hospital, as is Fen Drayton. Duxford is already very congested, so not sure why additional development is required here.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56727 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Need to get transport policy right – some areas have very limited public transport.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57703 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57360 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support existing site allocations to be carried forward including the expansion of Babraham research campus using Green Belt land.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60119 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
The First Proposals consultation includes policy areas for the Babraham Research Campus and for the Genome Campus. Given further likely developments at Granta Park, having a Policy Area covering it would provide a locally agreed framework for future development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60253 (T Orgee)

Summary of issues raised:
Greenhedge Farm, Stapleford: Overall, the Local Plan evidence clearly demonstrates that the site makes at best a relatively limited or limited contribution to the Cambridge Green Belt and in terms of purposes two and three it makes no contribution at all. In addition, its release would have negligible harm on the adjacent Green Belt and a low harm overall. The Council's own evidence, alongside that prepared by Peterhouse, clearly points in favour of releasing the site from the Green Belt.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59435 (Peterhouse)

S/SCP/WHD: Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge

Summary of issues raised:
Minerals and Waste – All within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand & gravel; part within a MSA for chalk. Most of the site is within the settlement boundary. Railway, A505 and existing residential and other sensitive properties would be a constraint to working the minerals.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56941 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
HELAA site: 40165 – Cambridgeshire County Council as landowner supports the promotion of an enhanced rural travel hub at Whittlesford Station and would like to continue to promote their site at Whittlesford Depot (reference 40165) for mixed use development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57510 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised:
IWM and Caius are supportive of S/SCP/WHD. IWM is keen to work with Greater Cambridge Partnership to explore delivery of Whittlesford Parkway Masterplan. Also, keen to work together to shift to sustainable transport routes for visitors, staff and volunteers. Given the scale of IWM's economic impact in the region (£43m GVA), and ambitions for growth and the volume of potential road journeys this equates to, IWM asks that IWM is considered a key stakeholder in sustainable transport plans. IWM is encouraged by GCP Making Connections consultation emphasis on accelerating the development of greenways and regular bus routes to connect Royston to Whittlesford and Cambridge via Duxford.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58008 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
HELAA Site: 40097 – As agent, on behalf of the landowner, land was submitted as

part of the HELAA 'Call for Sites' (JDI - 40097 Site Name - Land North of Station Road East, Whittlesford) adjacent to the proposed mixed use site at Whittlesford Station (S/SCP/WHD Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge). We would request that given the close proximity to the site, together with part of the client's land specifically the access track included, that the land submitted should be considered in the wider context of this site. The site was outlined for mixed use and residential development in initial consultation documents.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58178 (BCM LLP)

Summary of issues raised:

Land at Hinxton – By reference to Figure 40 of the first proposals plan, SmithsonHill notes that its site at Hinxton is strategically placed in the centre of this area – outside of green belt, immediately north of the Genome Campus policy area, and adjacent to Whittlesford Parkway Station. It is considered that there is substantial potential for future proposals on the SmithsonHill land to contribute positively to the rural southern cluster. SmithsonHill will be further exploring this potential, with the option to adapt and amend its AgriTech proposal to involve a broader mix of employment uses.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58204 (SmithsonHill)

Summary of issues raised:

Land East of Whittlesford Highway Depot (HELAA site 59406) and Station Rd West Whittlesford (HELAA site 59385) – Support the new policy area S/SCP/WHD Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge however due to the sustainable location we believe this policy area should be expanded eastwards to include the land to the east of Whittlesford Highways Depot. This site immediately adjoins the policy area S/SCP/WHD and inclusion of this site would act as a very logical extension. Furthermore, the policy is limited to "redevelopment" of the existing built up area and the inclusion of the adjoining, well contained site to the east would facilitate much needed further growth. The greenfield site would support the strategy and follow the redevelopment of the brownfield and as it is an unconstrained site can be delivered in a timely manner.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60368 (H.J. Molton Settlement)

S/SCP/H/6 South of A1307, Linton

Summary of issues raised:

Support for the proposals which exclude development in Little Linton.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay), 58393 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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. The direction of future development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate and will ensure that Little Linton and Linton retain their identity.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay), 58393 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land in this area is a valuable environmental resource, which should be protected.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay)

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the retention of the land between Little Linton and Linton within the designated countryside.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay)

Summary of issues raised:
This policy area includes part of Linton Conservation Area and just over a dozen grade II listed buildings. Development in this area has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets and their settings. We note that the policy restricts residential development in this area to improvements to existing properties. We broadly support this policy approach.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59653 (Historic England)

Rest of the rural area

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section

38 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development within the rest of the rural area, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Parish Councils support the strategy for the rest of the rural area, whereas site promoters object to the small amount of growth proposed for the rest of the rural area. Site promoters highlight that the proposed strategy: ignores the long term viability of rural settlements; is counter to the national planning policy objective of supporting and promoting mixed and balanced communities; ignores the need for local affordable housing, and needs more small and medium sized sites that can be delivered more quickly. Site promoters suggest that there are opportunities for a cluster of development around Melbourn due to its public transport links and services and facilities, whereas the Melbourn PC state that the village has no further capacity for development based on its existing infrastructure. Site promoters also suggest that investment should be put into improving public transport in rural areas, so that rural areas are not penalised, and that additional growth in villages would support existing public transport services. Parish Councils highlight that: Neighbourhood Plans should have greater influence on the proposed strategy; preservation of rural character and identity of villages is important; development should be limited to that required based on local needs; and should prevent loss of good farmland and countryside. Comment that garden centres should be recognised within the strategy for the rural area as they provide employment, retail and leisure opportunities, but they are not referred to in the First Proposals plan. Support for the rejection of specific sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Table of representations: Rest of the rural area

Summary of issues raised:
Acceptable / support the strategy
Comments highlighting this issue:
56728 (Croydon PC), 59474 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to small amount of growth identified in rural area:
• insufficient consideration being given to the long term viability of rural settlements

• limiting allocations in rural area is counter to national planning policy objective of supporting and promoting mixed and balanced communities
• to deliver a robust development strategy that meets needs, an adequate amount of development needs to be provided in the rural area, especially for settlements that are highly sustainable locations
• expansion of villages will boost the local economy, create a critical mass for improved services and facilities, rejuvenate villages / create a sense of place, and will promote sustainable lifestyles by reducing the need to travel
• needed to meet local needs and provide affordable housing
• national policy advocates a more nuanced approach than that proposed in the Local Plan
• needed to ensure a balanced and resilient strategy – small / medium sized sites can be delivered more quickly

Comments highlighting this issue:
57165 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57234 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 58445 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58572 (Croudace Homes), 58623 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58745 (LVA), 58817 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58983 (Endurance Estates), 60257 (Jesus College), 60549 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60613 (CALA Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Amount of development allocated in this area seems disproportionate and extremely low given the sustainable transport nodes in some of the villages. Railway corridor between Melbourn and Cambridge needs additional consideration as its own cluster. Development in this area can be achieved without the same landscape impacts as the proposed Green Belt releases in rural southern cluster.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57331 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Growth should be focussed in villages such as Melbourn which benefit from a range of services and are located outside of the Green Belt. Local Plan should take account of new public transport links.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60613 (CALA Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Understand the rejection of large scale sites in the Green Belt, but this should be mitigated by providing sites for affordable housing to sustain villages as viable communities. This should include Rural Exception Sites delivered by local Community Land Trusts.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59799 (Histon & Impington Community Land Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not consider it appropriate to differentiate between ‘rest of rural area’ and ‘rural southern cluster’ as insufficient rationale provided for this.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58670 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Evidence base should clearly acknowledge the different roles that parts of the district can play in delivering growth. Rural area across Greater Cambridge varies significantly in terms of its role and ability to deliver growth.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58653 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Should only accommodate new development that is local needs derived and that has the support of the local community / Parish Council.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56585 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Local residents must be listened to.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57228 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised:
Melbourn does not have any more capacity – already at capacity for doctors and health care workers, and children are being taken to other schools due to lack of spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60490 (Melbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Neighbourhood Plans are only mentioned 6 times – should the Local Plan take greater account of Neighbourhood Plans?

Comments highlighting this issue:
60364 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Development should be minimised in this location as over development of villages ruins their character and should therefore be avoided.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56810 (M Colville), 58846 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised:
Preservation of rural character and identity of villages is important.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59474 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Larger villages should not be expanded any further – villages should remain as they are so as not to lose their identity. E.g. Melbourn is now more akin to a small town, but the infrastructure has not been upgraded to match.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58047 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support proposals to limit housing development west of M11 as this supports implementation of Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zone – which allows Imperial War Museum to operate.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58010 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
Should only allow individual new homes, but these developments should not destroy the beauty of the rural area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57228 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised:
Support prioritisation of development in Cambridge and at new settlements, rather than in the rural area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56871 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Village development has the highest carbon footprint and should be avoided.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59474 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Any new development should have access to a sustainable alternative to the private car – hourly public transport to nearby market town or local transport hub or train station.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56585 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Investment should be put into improving public transport links in the rural area rather

than penalising those areas where there are not sufficient existing links.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57165 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57234 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:

Transport is an important factor for sustainability but is not the sole consideration. Additional growth in villages would support existing bus services.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58572 (Croudace Homes)

Summary of issues raised:

Major transport consideration needed before any proposed expansion. Rural areas should not be segregated from Cambridge, particularly where there are jobs and services nearby.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57802 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Support not locating development where car travel is easiest or only method of transport.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57586 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised:

Detailed location of new development should be considered in relation to likely traffic flow e.g. locate new development on the edge of the village that is located closest to Cambridge to avoid increased traffic flow through the village.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57586 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised:

Need more consideration for horse riders and inclusion of bridleways. Active travel should refer to more than just cycling.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59253 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Population projections used for schools planning should be reviewed for the rural area – especially where a second choice school would be more than a walk away therefore increasing car use.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57802 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59162 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:
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.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59162 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Support expansion of businesses in the rural area if the proposals are in keeping with character of the area and of benefit to local residents.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56585 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Garden Centres should be recognised within Local Plan policy – although they are widespread and provide employment, retail and leisure opportunities there is no mention of them in the Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59052 (Avison Young)

Summary of issues raised:
Villages are in danger of becoming isolated due to major infrastructure projects dissecting South Cambridgeshire.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56728 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Regret any loss of good farmland and countryside.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58399 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge and new settlements have at least as good and generally better transport links, so it's misguided to allow development in villages that have good transport links.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56810 (M Colville), 58846 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised:
The map in Figure 42 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58130 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57361 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:
• performs equally well or better than allocated sites
• necessary to enable long term viability of rural settlements and to deliver a robust development strategy that meets needs
• expansion of villages will boost the local economy, create a critical mass for improved services and facilities, rejuvenate villages / create a sense of place, and will promote sustainable lifestyles by reducing the need to travel
• limiting the amount of development in the rural area is too restrictive
• without allocating more sites there will be a reduction in services and facilities in rural areas, reducing rural sustainability
Comments highlighting this issue:
57039 (KWA Architects), 57165 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57234 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57331 (HD Planning Ltd), 58445 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58572 (Croudace Homes), 58623 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58653 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58745 (LVA), 58817 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58983 (Endurance Estates), 60257 (Jesus College), 60549 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 58670 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 59073 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c (HELAA site 40509) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57039 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised:
Station Fields, Foxton (HELAA site 40084) – should be allocated for residential, employment and community uses
Comments highlighting this issue:
59073 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised:
Sites in Fen Ditton parish:
• supportive of exclusion of all sites other than Marleigh and Cambridge Airport
Comments highlighting this issue:
59908 (Fen Ditton PC)

S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/RRA: Site allocations in rest of the rural area > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

223 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the rest of the rural area heading as the comments were specific to the proposed site allocations. 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 PM = Parish Meeting

Executive Summary

Many developers argue that growth in the more sustainable villages must be part of the development strategy. Although there is support from some for the overall approach there is also criticism that this is not followed through with sufficient allocations (for both housing and employment). Paragraph 79 of the NPPF is highlighted with its support for sustainable development in rural areas. Paragraph 69 of the NPPF was also flagged due to its focus on delivering more small and medium size sites and the benefits this can have in helping to maintain a five year housing land supply and making the Local Plan more resilient. There are calls for villages to

be assessed on their own merits rather than through a settlement hierarchy and many specific villages are promoted as being suitable for more development. There are also many sites, which have not been proposed for allocation, supported with promoters putting forward a broad range of economic, social and environmental benefits to support their specific sites. The corollary is that many parish councils and individuals have flagged their opposition to many sites that have not been proposed for allocation.

All of the proposed allocations received some feedback.

S/RRA/ML: The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn – the promotor states that the site remains available, deliverable and viable and fits with local policies, including being located within a Minor Rural Centre. However, there are concerns raised about traffic, ecology and heritage.

S/RRA/H: Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote – the promotor suggests some amendments to the policy to clarify capacity in the light of extant permissions and completions. East West Rail (EWR) also request the policy is updated to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR. Objections focus on the cumulative impacts when considered alongside Bourn, historical reasons for adjoining permissions (lack of a five year housing land supply) no longer being relevant, lack of public transport, landscape impacts and flooding.

S/RRA/MF: Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington – the promotor is seeking to increase the capacity of the site. However, Historic England want a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording and capacity. The parish council and several individuals object to the proposed allocation on multiple grounds including the cumulative impacts of Northstowe, coalescence, flooding, biodiversity and landscape impacts.

S/RRA/CR: Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn – the promotors and supporters of the site highlight the benefits of the site to both Melbourn and the wider economic area. The parish council consider that the residential element is unsustainable whilst Campaign to Protect Rural England is concerned that the employment area will further industrialise the village. Individuals argue that the infrastructure cannot cope with further growth.

S/RRA/SAS: Land to the south of the A14 Services – the promotors stress their willingness to be flexible in refining details, introducing appropriate mitigation measures and even providing more land. However, nearby parish councils oppose the proposed allocation citing flooding, transport and landscape impacts alongside the cumulative impacts when considered alongside other nearby proposals. Cambridge Past, Present & Future question the appropriateness of the site for 'last mile delivery' into Cambridge.

S/RRA/BBP: Land at Buckingway Business Park, Swavesey – the promotor stresses the range of B use classes that could be suitable on the site whilst the parish council opposes the proposed allocation on numerous grounds including scale, traffic and landscape impacts and would want significant mitigation measures if allocated. Campaign to Protect Rural England raise similar objections.

S/RRA/SNR: Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton – the promotor wants the site allocation expanded. However, East West Rail (EWR) request the policy allocation drafting is updated to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR whilst Historic England want a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording and capacity. The parish council requests a landscape strategy as mitigation.

S/RRA/OHD Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Lane, Cottenham – there is support for this allocation from the parish council subject to consideration of the impact on the neighbouring Grade 1 listed church. This stance is supported by Historic England, who also require a Heritage Impact Assessment, and Cambridge Past, Present & Future. Campaign to Protect Rural England suggest B8 uses should be excluded to avoid increasing HGV traffic through the village.

S/RRA/H/1(d): Land north of Impington Lane, Histon & Impington – there are few comments and no objections to this proposed allocation.

S/RRA/E/5(1): Norman Way, Over – the only comment on this proposed allocation was from Historic England who requested a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording.

S/RRA/H/2: Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton – the only comments received on this proposed allocation focused on the boundary. Historic England did also request a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording.

S/RRA/H/3: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals – The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust question the logic of retaining the allocation whereas a site promotor wants the site area expanded to include Capital Park. Historic England request a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording.

Table of representations: S/RRA – Allocations in the rest of the rural area

Summary of issues raised:
Growth of more sustainable villages must be part of development strategy, particularly those villages that contain a good range of services and facilities, accessible by a range of modes of transport, and where there is an identified need for affordable housing
• Support for proposed general approach but this not followed through with sufficient allocations
• The Rest of Rural Area should accommodate more housing/ allocations for housing
• Paragraph 79 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas and acknowledges that housing can enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and support local services
• Paragraph 104 of the NPPF expects transport issues to be considered at the earliest stages of plan-making. Those issues include opportunities created by existing or proposed transport infrastructure in terms of the scale, location and density of development, and opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use
• Paragraph 62 of the NPPF expects the size, type and tenure of housing needs of the community to be assessed and reflected in planning policies, including for example those with an affordable housing need, students, renters and self-builders
Comments highlighting this issue:
57005 (Hastingwood Developments), 57054 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57065 (C Meadows), 57075 (Elbourn Family), 57099 (RO Group Ltd), 57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 56720 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57354 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57520 (R2 Developments Ltd), 57655 (Endurance Estates), 57692 (Endurance Estates), 58098 (Jesus College), 58149 (J Manning), 58154 (Hill Residential), 40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58194 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd), 58236 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd), 58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58264 (Bletsoes), 58268 (Bletsoes), 58276 (Bletsoes), 58340 (Janus

Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58477 (D Moore), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning), 58552 (Croudace Homes), 58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58598 (Hill Residential Limited), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58662 (Artisan (UK) Projects Ltd), 58674 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58689 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58713 (R Grain), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58869 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58925 (St John's College Cambridge), 58976 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59123 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd), 59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59226 (Scott Properties), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60299 (Miller Homes), 60306 (Miller Homes), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60649 (K.B. Tebbit Ltd), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60706 (Countryside Properties), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60710 (Endurance Estates), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited)

Summary of issues raised:

More small and medium sized sites should be allocated in accordance with paragraph 69 of the NPPF. These sites can make a significant contribution towards the short term housing land supply and the five year housing land supply position in Greater Cambridgeshire

Comments highlighting this issue:

56483 (V Chapman), 56492 (D&B Searle), 56501 (W Grain), 56519 (R&J Millard), 57054 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57065 (C Meadows), 57075 (Elbourn Family), 57099 (RO Group Ltd), 57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57330 (HD Planning Ltd), 57354 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57655 (Endurance Estates), 57692 (Endurance Estates), 58098 (Jesus College), 58149 (J Manning), 58154 (Hill Residential), 40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58264 (Bletsoes), 58268 (Bletsoes), 58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58598 (Hill Residential Limited), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd),

58689 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58713 (R Grain), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58925 (St John's College Cambridge), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59457 (M Carroll), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited)

Summary of issues raised:

More employment land should be allocated to support spatial strategy

• Projections of need for storage and distribution space are an under-estimate

• Need for large scale facilities

• Employment allocations in larger villages support sustainability

Comments highlighting this issue:

58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 59092 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59317 (Avison Young), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60717 (Cheffins), 60756 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised:

Given that many living within the surrounding villages turn to the City for work, retail, leisure and entertainment it is clear that a planning framework that acknowledges this relationship needs to be developed

• Similar logic applies to smaller towns such as Cambourne

Comments highlighting this issue:

58545 (Bruntwood SciTech), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58792 (LVA), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised:

In order to provide greater certainty for the plan period it will be necessary to increase the amount of housing and employment space in Group Villages

• Provide greater flexibility and resilience in the Councils' housing/development strategy

• Need more allocations as should not rely on windfall sites as village frameworks are tight

Comments highlighting this issue:

57520 (R2 Developments Ltd), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58582 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58662 (Artisan - UK - Projects Ltd), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:

Do not object to any of the specific allocations proposed within the First Proposals

Comments highlighting this issue:

56811 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised:

More housing and employment could be delivered if villages are assessed on their individual merits

• Providing that a rural settlement has strong sustainability credentials in terms of public transport links, employment opportunities, social infrastructure, shops and services it is abundantly possible to bring forward proportionate levels of new sustainable development

• Many individual villages cited

• A more tailored assessment of settlements can deliver carbon reductions

• A more flexible approach to village frameworks

Comments highlighting this issue:

56899 (RWS Ltd), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning), 58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58578 (Endurance Estates), 58582 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58598 (Hill Residential Limited), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58662 (Artisan – UK - Projects Ltd), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59123 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd), 59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59226 (Scott Properties), 59310 (Countryside Properties), 59457 (M Carroll), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60299 (Miller Homes), 60306 (Miller Homes), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire

County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60725 (M Asplin), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited), 60756 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised:
Smaller villages are becoming more sustainable as more people work from home
Comments highlighting this issue:
57099 (RO Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
More sites should be allocated in rural areas for custom and self build
• Relying on plots within larger developments does not work
• There are economic benefits to the local economy from these small schemes
Comments highlighting this issue:
58477 (D Moore), 58713 (R Grain), 58863 (S Grain), 60725 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Housing needs (for the affordable or elderly persons markets for example) can best be met in the places where those communities' needs already exist
Comments highlighting this issue:
58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 60710 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
The Plan should recognise the possibilities for increasing the C2C corridor to St Neots and maximising the modal shift options that the section of the de-trunked A428 can offer post 2025/26 between Croxton and Cambourne
Comments highlighting this issue:
58660 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Allocated sites must have reliable/frequent public transport system (hourly) to a local transport hub/nearby market town/or train station
Comments highlighting this issue:
56587 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Transport plans are needed for Caldecote, Cottenham and Fulbourn. The expectation of a new station cannot be used as a reason for not making other transport improvements

Comments highlighting this issue:
57803 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
More consideration of sustainable transport in the rest of the rural area
Comments highlighting this issue:
59879 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Opposed to any allocations in the Green Belt.
• Good public transport and carbon reductions through reduced transport use are not 'exceptional circumstances' to justify release
Comments highlighting this issue:
56811 (M Colville), 58862 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised:
Planning assumption of 40 dwellings per hectare is too high for villages and will change the character of local areas
Comments highlighting this issue:
58139 (M Claridge)

Summary of issues raised:
There is a risk that developers will seek speculative permission in the open countryside greenfield sites contrary to the development strategy using the windfalls allocation
Comments highlighting this issue:
60120 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
Want some form of development protection given to the former private, outdoor, laboratory of the late Dr Norman Moore at Boxworth End, Swavesey. The site itself has some local value as habitat and a landscape amenity. However, its overwhelming significance is as a site of scientific study, in particular of ecology and wildlife conservation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59570 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
At this stage in the plan making process, the Council does not wish to make any detailed comments about the proposed development strategy set out in the consultation document, given that the significant proposals are situated to the north of Cambridge and there will be a more limited impact for North Hertfordshire
Comments highlighting this issue:
58711 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the Local Plan proposals insofar as they affect Whaddon
Comments highlighting this issue:
60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:
• Economic benefits to rural communities through construction jobs and increased demand for local goods and services
• Enhance the setting of a village
• Enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities
• Logical extension to proposed allocation
• Logical development when recent/pipeline schemes taken into account
• Accommodate tree planting thereby creating biodiversity net gain
• Site serves no Green Belt purpose
• Minimal impact on Green Belt
• Exceptional reasons for release from Green Belt
• Sites are in sustainable locations
• Will deliver infrastructure and community facilities
• Redevelopment of previously used land in the Green Belt
• Redevelopment of previously used land
• The relocation of the existing use from the site would provide benefits to the neighbouring residents and to the village in terms of removing noise, odour, and traffic movements
• Site has been incorrectly omitted/assessed
• Identified issues can be mitigated
• More suitable than other sites allocated
• Collection of sites should be assessed separately rather than collectively
• New information is available to update the assessment
• Provision of open space and green infrastructure
• Would include housing and affordable housing to meet local needs of the village
• There are realistic alternatives to the car for travel to and from the site
• Site will be more sustainable when planned bus and other transport improvements are implemented
• Utilises strategic highways/minimal impact on local roads
• To support a travel hub
• Could provide land for local Community Land Trust
• Could deliver custom and self build housing
• Provides opportunity to improve local footpaths and lighting
• Innovative approach including shared open spaces

• Unique opportunity to create garden village
• Potential to deliver facilities (such as hotel and EV charging) has not been considered
• Meet need for more commercial and R&D space
• Need for more distribution and storage space
• Larger employment sites provide more flexibility in terms of unit sizes
• Could support economic cluster on A14
• Could accommodate businesses re-located from North East Cambridge
• Single ownership means site can be delivered relatively quickly
• Landowner wanting to work with community

Comments highlighting this issue:

56483 (V Chapman), 56492 (D&B Searle), 56501 (W Grain), 56519 (R&J Millard), 56561 (D Calder), 56720 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 56846 (Queens' College), 56899 (RWS Ltd), 56957 (RO Property Management Ltd), 57005 (Hastingwood Developments), 57042 (KWA Architects), 57065 (C Meadows), 57075 (Elbourn Family), 57099 (RO Group Ltd), 57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57118 (Bartlow Estate), 57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57193 (R Cowell), 57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57307 (S Barker), 57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57520 (R2 Developments Ltd), 57535 (H d'Abo), 57655 (Endurance Estates), 57692 (Endurance Estates), 58098 (Jesus College), 58149 (J Manning), 58154 (Hill Residential), 40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58264 (Bletsoes), 58268 (Bletsoes), 58276 (Bletsoes), 58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58477 (D Moore), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58530 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington – LLP), 58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning), 58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58578 (Endurance Estates), 58660 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58662 (Artisan – UK - Projects Ltd), 58689 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58713 (R Grain), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58855 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58869 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58925 (St John's College Cambridge), 58955 (Carter Jonas), 58976 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59092 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59317 (Avison Young), 59457 (M Carroll), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60299 (Miller Homes), 60306 (Miller Homes), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 40329 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 60647 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 60649 (K.B. Tebbit Ltd), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire

County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60658 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60662 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60665 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60675 (Bidwells), 60676 (Savills), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60690 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 60692 (Gladman Developments), 60693 (Gladman Developments), 60694 (Gladman Developments), 60696 (Gladman Developments), 60697 (Gladman Developments), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60706 (Countryside Properties), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60710 (Endurance Estates), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60720 (Lancashire Industrial & Commercial Services), 60721 (Bidwells), 60722 (Bidwells), 60723 (S&D Raven), 60724 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners - Currington, Todd, Douglas, Jarvis, Badcock & Hartwell), 60725 (M Asplin), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited), 60756 (Bidwells), 60760 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised:
New development on edge of Cambridge should be scaled back due to post-Covid reductions in commuting
Comments highlighting this issue:
58844 (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised:
The supporting maps that form part of the evidence base are incorrect. Figure 43 indicates that the Mingle Lane site in Great Shelford is an existing commitment to be carried forward in the GCLP.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58951 (Great Shelford - Ten Acres - Ltd)

New allocations – housing

S/RRA/ML: The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn

Summary of issues raised:
The site remains available, deliverable and viable when considered against both existing and emerging policy requirements
Comments highlighting this issue:
56788 (T Elbourn)

Summary of issues raised:
The site fits with Melbourn’s position as a Minor Rural Centre
Comments highlighting this issue:
56788 (T Elbourn)

Summary of issues raised:
The site should be fully integrated into the proposed Melbourn Greenway and A505 Walking and Cycling bridge, to facilitate an active travel link between these sites, Cambridge to the north and Royston to the south. The proposed bus network improvements suggested, to better facilitate cross border routes and trips, are also supported
Comments highlighting this issue:
59476 (Hertfordshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
The junction of the Moor and the High Street is very dangerous and already has more traffic than it should
Comments highlighting this issue:
60179 (J Stevens), 60492 (Melbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The ecology of the site is unique. It is home to rare plants, animals and insects. It offers habitat to birds
Comments highlighting this issue:
60179 (J Stevens), 60492 (Melbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised:
This is the last of the many horse fields that would have been in and around Melbourn and as such is part of our heritage
Comments highlighting this issue:
60179 (J Stevens), 60492 (Melbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised:
An inappropriate site for development due to traffic issues on Moor Lane and a lack of infrastructure more generally in the village. Moor Lane has had considerable development over the last 20 years
Comments highlighting this issue:
56559 (W Bains), 58093 (R Ennals)

Summary of issues raised:
All within a MSA for chalk. The site is adjacent to residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral
Comments highlighting this issue:
56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

S/RRA/H: Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote

Summary of issues raised:
This allocation is necessary in order to enable villages such as Caldecote, which have very good existing and/or planned public transport connections, to grow and

thrive
Suggested drafting amendments:
• Consistency between capacity and site area, i.e. does the policy include phases 1 and 2 or just phase 2
• Landscaping criteria should be more flexible

Comments highlighting this issue:
58571 (Vistry Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The location of this allocation is in close proximity to EWR route alignments 1 and 9. Therefore, 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

Comments highlighting this issue:
59869 (East West Rail)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support. On its own as a village development this would have made sense. However, given the proximity of the nearby major development at Bourn Airfield, CPRE considers this will eventually lead to coalescence and a continuous urban sprawl alongside the A428 from Caldecote to Cambourne

Comments highlighting this issue:
59566 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Object due to:
• Outline permission granted due to lack of 5 year housing supply which is no longer relevant
• Lack of nearby public transport
• Outside of village framework
• Intrusion into countryside
• Flood risk

Comments highlighting this issue:
58139 (M Claridge)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy and boundary should be amended to take into account factual errors and existing permissions:
• Boundary and site area should exclude current (phase 1) permission
• Additional flood and landscape mitigation should be built into policy wording

Comments highlighting this issue:
58275 (P Claridge)

S/RRA/MF: Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington

Summary of issues raised:
This is a sustainable location and the capacity could be increased to 35 dwellings
Comments highlighting this issue:
57544 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the Oakington Conservation Area lies adjacent to the site. Westwick Conservation Area lies to the east of the site. There are also a number of listed buildings nearby including the grade II* listed St Andrews Church and several grade II listed buildings. Westwick Hall to the east of the site very much overlooks this site, albeit separated by the guided busway. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59654 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Developing this site would have damaging environmental consequences and is inconsistent with the aims of the plan. Issues include:
• Flooding
• Loss of biodiversity
• Loss of effective carbon sink
• Congestion
• Negative consequences for active travel
• Impacting the appearance and setting of Longstanton
• Erosion of gap between Northstowe and Oakington
• Impacting green buffer and distinctiveness of Westwick
Comments highlighting this issue:
56556 (P Garsed), 56673 (L Lawrence), 56885 (J Prince), 56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 58107 (E Brett), 58608 (A Malyon), 58688 (J Prince), 59821 (Dry Drayton PC), 59896 (D Pereira), 60672 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation)

Summary of issues raised:
Release of this site from the Green Belt is unjustifiable
• Proximity to guided bus stop does not justify Green Belt release
Comments highlighting this issue:
56556 (P Garsed), 56673 (L Lawrence), 56885 (J Prince), 56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 57789 (J Pavey), 58107 (E Brett), 58608 (A Malyon), 59896 (D Pereira)

Summary of issues raised:
The proposed additional housing, including affordable, could be better accommodated at Northstowe
Comments highlighting this issue:
56556 (P Garsed), 56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 57789 (J Pavey), 58107 (E Brett), 58608 (A Malyon)

Summary of issues raised:
Any assessment of site impacts needs to take into account the cumulative impacts of neighbouring Northstowe
Comments highlighting this issue:
60504 (S Guy)

Summary of issues raised:
There is a limit on developments of 15 houses on villages like Oakington
Comments highlighting this issue:
56885 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised:
The scheme could set a precedent for further development in Oakington & Westwick
Comments highlighting this issue:
56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 58608 (A Malyon)

Summary of issues raised:
Significant archaeological work required
• Would make 20 houses uneconomical
Comments highlighting this issue:
56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 58608 (A Malyon), 58688 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised:
The site falls outside the Northstowe Development Area
Comments highlighting this issue:
56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC)

Summary of issues raised:
All within a MSA for sand & gravel. WWLP Site is adjacent to residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral
Comments highlighting this issue:
56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Given significant level of development at Northstowe, insensitive to propose further development in Oakington
Comments highlighting this issue:
56818* (C Hough)

Summary of issues raised:
Will potentially destroy village atmosphere and will add pressure on already stretched infrastructure
Comments highlighting this issue:
56818* (C Hough)

Summary of issues raised:
Area has repeatedly flooded, with significant amount of water sitting on the field in winter 2020
Comments highlighting this issue:
56818* (C Hough)

Summary of issues raised:
Will increase traffic on Water Lane, which has already seen increased traffic due to developments in Cottenham
Comments highlighting this issue:
56818* (C Hough)

New allocations – mixed use

S/RRA/CR: Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn

Summary of issues raised:
As a site that lies adjacent to Melbourn Science Park, there is a clear opportunity to enhance the village's existing employment sector through more jobs and investment and providing a logical extension to the Park whilst planning for the adjacent residential development in an appropriate manner
Comments highlighting this issue:
58545 (Bruntwood SciTech)

Summary of issues raised:
Makes an important contribution to the spatial strategy through providing an opportunity to deliver affordable and market housing, alongside employment opportunities in a sustainable location including:
• Delivery of affordable housing
• Co-locating employment and residential uses
• Improvements in walkability and active travel
• Recreational assets
• Support for local economy
Comments highlighting this issue:
58194 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd), 58236 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The allocation is supported on the basis that it reflects an acknowledgement of the

role that Melbourn plays as a Minor Rural Centre in the Plan and the important links that the Park has to the local community

Comments highlighting this issue:

58485 (TTP Campus Limited)

Summary of issues raised:

The site should be fully integrated into the proposed Melbourn Greenway and A505 Walking and Cycling bridge, to facilitate an active travel link between these sites, Cambridge to the north and Royston to the south. The proposed bus network improvements suggested, to better facilitate cross border routes and trips, are also supported

Comments highlighting this issue:

59476 (Hertfordshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:

140 houses is unsustainable in terms of primary education within the village and traffic movements via The Cross

Comments highlighting this issue:

60491 (Melbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised:

At first sight, there is logic to this proposal but it could further industrialise the centre of this historic village which has already been badly visually affected by the existing Science Park

Comments highlighting this issue:

59567 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:

Unfair that Melbourn is being targeted again, it is already over-developed with inadequate infrastructure

Comments highlighting this issue:

56506 (A Hartley)

Summary of issues raised:

Melbourn does not have the infrastructure or road capacity for further major developments

• The train station is not accessible from the site

Comments highlighting this issue:

58093 (R Ennals)

Summary of issues raised:

All within a MSA for chalk. Situated between Melbourn Science Park and residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral

Comments highlighting this issue:
56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

New allocations – employment

S/RRA/SAS: Land to the south of the A14 Services

Summary of issues raised:
No objection to the proposed allocation, and being owner of part of the site, will work positively with the Local Planning Authority and adjoining landowners/promoters to refine the details of the allocation and bring forward the site, if allocation is taken forward in the Plan

Comments highlighting this issue:
58490 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
There are no constraints which cannot be addressed by suitable mitigation or technical reports

Comments highlighting this issue:
60717 (Cheffins)

Summary of issues raised:
There is also the potential for further land to be made available if required

Comments highlighting this issue:
60717 (Cheffins)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there are a number of listed buildings at Boxworth including the grade II* Church of St Peter as well as at Lolworth including the grade II* All Saints Church. Given the scale and mass of typical employment development, there is potential for impact upon the wider historic environment. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. We welcome reference to the need for landscape buffers around the site which should help to minimise impact. There is also considerable existing tree coverage between the heritage assets and the site which should offer some degree of mitigation. If the site is allocated the policy should reference nearby heritage assets and any mitigation required

Comments highlighting this issue:
59655 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Support Policy requirement to ensure that strong landscaping is provided to help the site fit into the surrounding rural countryside character

Comments highlighting this issue:
58579 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
A good location for a regional distribution centre but it cannot meet the aspiration that “last mile delivery” in Cambridge can be carried out by sustainable modes of transport

Comments highlighting this issue:
58579 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Any development should be restricted to the area south of Cambridge Services previously used as a compound for the A14 roadworks

Comments highlighting this issue:
56708 (Lolworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
If additional land is required there is adjacent brownfield land which should be used instead of farm land

Comments highlighting this issue:
56708 (Lolworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support. There is no natural barrier to prevent further expansion into the wide-open landscape at this location which has already been damaged by the necessary but unfortunate location of the services. Such development will lead to further, unsightly, road freight driven sprawl

Comments highlighting this issue:
59568 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Opposed to loss of Green Belt land

Comments highlighting this issue:
56708 (Lolworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
Mitigation measures should include:
• Noise reduction
• New tree belt
• No use of Robins Lane by contractors

Comments highlighting this issue:
56708 (Lolworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to this allocation

Comments highlighting this issue:
56838 (Boxworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern this will create increased foul and surface water flows into the Swavesey system. Must also be considered in context of other nearby proposals
Comments highlighting this issue:
59715 (Swavesey PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Proposals will create increased traffic, particularly of HGVs in this area and around the already busy Swavesey A14 junction. Must also be considered in context of other nearby proposals
Comments highlighting this issue:
59715 (Swavesey PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Further information would be welcomed specifically in relation to the potential transport and economic impact of these sites and their relationship with the Huntingdonshire economy and the nearby Lakes Business Park
Comments highlighting this issue:
57362 (Huntingdonshire DC)

S/RRA/BBP: Land at Buckingway Business Park, Swavesey

Summary of issues raised:
The site is well located and all identified constraints can be overcome
Comments highlighting this issue:
60657 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
The site is well suited to a variety of B-use classes
Comments highlighting this issue:
60657 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there is a grade II listed barn to the north east of the site. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the listed building and its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. We would recommend that landscaping be provided along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site to minimise visual and heritage impact in this open landscape
Comments highlighting this issue:
59656 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support. There is no natural barrier to prevent further expansion into the wide-open landscape at this location which has already been damaged by the necessary but unfortunate location of the services. Such development will lead to further, unsightly, road freight driven sprawl. There will also be adverse additional traffic through the centres of Swavesey and Over
Comments highlighting this issue:
59569 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
The A14 construction compound and accommodation block was granted temporary permission on the grounds that it would revert back to agricultural use. It should therefore be treated as a green field site
Comments highlighting this issue:
56838 (Boxworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
There is no rationale for extending the boundary of the site beyond the confines of the construction compound
Comments highlighting this issue:
56838 (Boxworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
Unacceptable traffic impacts at Cambridge services roundabout
Comments highlighting this issue:
56838 (Boxworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
There will be negative impacts on the setting of Boxworth village
Comments highlighting this issue:
56838 (Boxworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
If the site is allocated the following mitigation measures should be considered:
• Use the ex-construction compound on the other side of Boxworth Rd to geographically constrain the commercial expansion closer to the junction and remove any creep up Boxworth Rd
• Reduce congestion by moving exit to the new lorry park so that it passes behind the hotel (as originally proposed)
• Visual and ecological mitigation to minimise the impact on the entrance to Boxworth
• Density of the development should reflect the density and pattern of non-residential development in the nearby village of Boxworth
• A cycleway between Boxworth and the new NMU bridge over the A14

Comments highlighting this issue:
56838 (Boxworth PM)

Summary of issues raised:
Within CA for Uttons Drove Water Recycling Area (WRA). MWLP Policy 16 applies
Comments highlighting this issue:
56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60452 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Further information would be welcomed specifically in relation to the potential transport and economic impact of these sites and their relationship with the Huntingdonshire economy and the nearby Lakes Business Park
Comments highlighting this issue:
57362 (Huntingdonshire DC)

S/RRA/SNR: Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton

Summary of issues raised:
Support for allocation but want boundary to be expanded to also include additional land which can provide for development and other associated use and mitigation
Comments highlighting this issue:
60259 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Do not support. This small land parcel forms a green buffer between St Neots Road and the A428 and development would create further coalescence along the A428
Comments highlighting this issue:
59571 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the grade II* Registered Park and Garden, Childerley Hall lies to the north of the site. There are a number of listed buildings within the designed landscape. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the Conservation Areas and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording
Comments highlighting this issue:
59657 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
The allocation is located to the north-east of Bourn Airfield and EWR alignments 1 and 9, and as such, does not appear to conflict with existing EWR alignment proposals. However, due to the proximity of the allocation with EWR, and prior to the announcement of the preferred route option, EWR Co requests that a requirement is

included within the proposed wording of the policy allocation, which recognises EWR and ensures that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR

Comments highlighting this issue:
59871 (East West Rail)

Summary of issues raised:
Would office rents be set at affordable levels?

Comments highlighting this issue:
60663 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Landscaping should emphasise the rural location of this site

Comments highlighting this issue:
60663 (Dry Drayton PC)

S/RRA/OHD: Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Lane, Cottenham

Summary of issues raised:
Support the allocation of the Old Highways Depot site for economic development, subject to protection of view of the church

Comments highlighting this issue:
59879 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the Cottenham Conservation Area is next to the south western corner of the site. The grade I listed Church of All Saints is very nearby as are two grade II listed buildings. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording

Comments highlighting this issue:
59658 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
Support policy requirement to ensure enhanced landscaping on its open boundaries and avoidance of any impact on the settings of the Grade I listed church and conservation area

Comments highlighting this issue:
60644 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the redevelopment providing it was limited to employment Class E(g)(i) and/or E(g)(ii). Oppose development of this site for Class B8, storage and

distribution use. Cottenham already endures significant disturbance from HGV traffic arising from the industrial site further north along Twenty Pence Road

Comments highlighting this issue:

59572 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/RRA/H/1(d): Land north of Impington Lane, Histon & Impington

Summary of issues raised:

Do not object to development of site S/RRA/H/1, as long as it is a small development, to provide additional housing whilst maintaining the character of Impington and keeping it as a separate entity from Cambridge city and Milton

Comments highlighting this issue:

58844 (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised:

No comments – this site is committed, and part built out??

Comments highlighting this issue:

59659 (Historic England)

Continuing existing allocations – employment

S/RRA/E/5(1): Norman Way, Over

Summary of issues raised:

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on the site, the scheduled monument and grade II listed Over Mill lies to the south west of the site. Whilst the principle of development of this site has already been established and there is a buffer of planting between the site and the assets, any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. However, we recommend that the policy refers to these heritage assets and the need for suitable landscaping mitigation between the asset and the site

Comments highlighting this issue:

59660 (Historic England)

S/RRA/H/2: Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton

Summary of issues raised:

The principle of development of this site has already been established. Agree the

boundary should be amended to show only the area for employment uses. Map on p349 still shows whole site. This part of the site lies very close to the cluster of grade II listed buildings at Hauxton Mill. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. The policy for this site should mention these listed buildings and state that 'Development should preserve the significance of the listed buildings (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).' Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59661 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
It is not clear whether the policy will make reference to the Former Waste Water Treatment Works to West of A10, Hauxton as it did in the 2018 Local Plan

Comments highlighting this issue:
58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc)

Continuing existing allocations – mixed use

S/RRA/H/3: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals

Summary of issues raised:
There is no logic in retaining Policy H3 in the new Local Plan as it relates to Fulbourn and Ida Darwin given the policy was drafted over 7 years ago and planning permission has now been granted for residential development on the Ida Darwin site

Comments highlighting this issue:
58239 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Site allocation should be expanded to include Capital Park (HELAA site 59394) for commercial uses

Comments highlighting this issue:
58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF)

Summary of issues raised:
This site lies within Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. The policy for this site should mention the conservation area and state that 'Development should preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting'. Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording

Comments highlighting this issue:
59662 (Historic England)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent A1198, Caxton (HELAA site 51606) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56483 (V Chapman)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at 20 Bourn Road, Caxton (HELAA Site 40453) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56492 (D&B Searle)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Bourn Road, Caxton (HELAA site 52991) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56492 (D&B Searle)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at St Peter's Street, Caxton (HELAA site 40462) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56501 (W Grain)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Brockholt Road, Caxton (HELAA Site 40254) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56519 (R&J Millard)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Thorpe, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40325) – should be allocated for residential development/care home
Comments highlighting this issue:
56561 (D Calder)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north east of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40383) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56720 (KB Tebbit Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south west of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40378) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60649 (KB Tebbit Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Noon Folly Farm, Land north of A14 Bar Hill (HELAA site 40121) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56846 (Queens' College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham (HELAA site 40295) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56899 (RWS Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Madingley Mulch, land at Madingley Mulch off A428 (HELAA site 40158) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
56957 (RO Property Management Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Bury End Farm in Meldreth (HELAA site 40284) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57005 (Hastingwood Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c (HELAA site 40509) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57042 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of Malton Road in Orwell (HELAA Site 40324) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57054 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land r/o 113 Cottenham Road, Histon (HELAA Site 40526) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
57065 (C Meadows)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Fenny Lane, Meldreth (HELAA Site 40036) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57075 (Elbourn Family)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Hall Lane, Great Chishill (HELAA Site 47879) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57099 (RO Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Two Mill Field, Cottenham (HELAA Site 40419) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Oakington Road, Cottenham (HELAA Site 40417) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at 3 Hills Farm, Ashdon Road, Bartlow (HELAA Site 40375) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57118 (Bartlow Estate)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Home End, Fulbourn (HELAA Site 40523) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Court Meadow House off Balsham Road, Fulbourn (HELAA Site 40522) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Bannold Road, Waterbeach (HELAA site 40466) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57166 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Kingfisher Way, Cottenham (HELAA site 40472) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60702 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the north of Cottenham (HELAA site 59386) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60703 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Boxworth End, Swavesey (HELAA site 40506) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60704 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Priest Lane, Willingham (HELAA site 40468) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60705 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Hazelwood Farm, Lolworth (HELAA site 52680) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57193 (R Cowell)

Summary of issues raised:
Grain Store Site, Lodge Road, Thriplow (HELAA site 47379) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Dry Drayton Road, Oakington (HELAA site 51617) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
57236 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Fen End, Willingham (HELAA site 40469) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57236 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to Bridleway 2 between Highfields Road and Hardwick Wood, Highfields Caldecote (HELAA site 59378) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57307 (S Barker)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to No. 53 Station Road, Meldreth (HELAA Site 40461) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57330 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Ridgeway and Old Pinewood Way, Papworth Everard (HELAA Site 40439) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57354 (Bloor Homes Eastern)

Summary of issues raised:
Glebe Farm, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham Glebe Fen Farm (HELAA site 40176) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of Cottenham Road, Histon (Buxhall Farm) (HELAA site 40193) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to Histon School, Glebe Way, Histon (HELAA site 40192) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the north of Cardyke Road, Waterbeach (HELAA site 40183) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Belsar Farm, Willingham (HELAA site 40179) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Tostock Farm, Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 40199) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Herod's Farm, High Street, Foxton (HELAA site 40148) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40412) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57520 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south-east of Cambridge Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40408) – should be allocated for mixed-use development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57520 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
West Wratting Estate (HELAA site 56213) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57535 (H d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised:
Hall Farm, West Wratting Estate (new site 59388) – should be allocated for mixed-use development

Comments highlighting this issue:
57535 (H d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Old House Road, Balsham (HELAA Site 40438) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57655 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Poplar Farm Close, Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40230) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57692 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off The Causeway, Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40228) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57692 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40227) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
57692 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Station Road, Harston (HELAA site 40303) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58098 (Jesus College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Station Road, Willingham (HELAA Site 40527) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58149 (J Manning)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Balsham Road in Fulbourn (HELAA Site 40271) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58154 (Hill Residential)

Summary of issues raised:
Meadow Drift, Elsworth (HELAA Site 40514) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Capital Park, Fulbourn (HELAA site 40087) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off High Street, Little Eversden (HELAA Site 40211) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58264 (Bletsoes)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA Site 40212) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58268 (Bletsoes)

Summary of issues raised:
Land West of Comberton (HELAA Site 40152) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58276 (Bletsoes)

Summary of issues raised:
Capital Park, Fulbourn (HELAA site 59394) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF)

Summary of issues raised:
Former Waste Water Treatment Facility, Cambridge Road, Hauxton (HELAA site 59400) – should be allocated for mixed-use development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc)

Summary of issues raised:
South of the High Street, Graveley (HELAA site 40231) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
58477 (D Moore)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Manor Farm Site, Graveley (HELAA site 40229) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58477 (D Moore)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent Ponds Farm Cottage, Graveley (HELAA site 40234) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58477 (D Moore)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (HELAA site 40061) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58524 (Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Cambridge Road, Hardwick (HELAA Site 40414) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58530 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington – LLP)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of Station Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 40088) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Station Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 40089) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Long Lane, Fowlmere (HELAA site 59408) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58552 (Croudace Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Ambrose Way, Impington (HELAA site 40392) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to A10 and Royston Road, Melbourn (HELAA Site 40262) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58578 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Station Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40159) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58598 (Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north and south of A428, Croxton (HELAA site 40288) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58660 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Whitecroft Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 59398) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58662 (Artisan – UK - Projects Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Leaden Hill, Orwell (HELAA Site 47890) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58689 (Hawkswren Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at St Peters Road, Caxton (HELAA Site 40543) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58713 (R Grain)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Ermine Street, Caxton (HELAA site 59433) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
58792 (LVA)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Bush Close, Comberton (HELAA site 40501) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58834 (Hopkins Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
South of High Street, Hauxton (HELAA Site 40283) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at and to the rear of 30 and 32 New Road, Over (HELAA site 40552) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58855 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land North Of 26–46 Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40328) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60647 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of Oakington Road, Girton (HELAA site 40329) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
40329 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at 92 Old North Road, Longstowe (HELAA site 40422) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58863 (S Grain)

Summary of issues raised:
Land West of London Road, Fowlmere (HELAA site 40116) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58869 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land West of London Road, Fowlmere, northern parcel only (HELAA site 40252) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58869 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjoining 107 Boxworth End, Swavesey (HELAA site 40042) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised:
Land East of Papworth Everard (HELAA Site 40429) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the west of Papworth Everard (Parcels A and B) (HELAA Site 40428) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation)

Summary of issues raised:
Cockerton Road, Girton (HELAA site 40555) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58925 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Cambridge Road, Great Shelford (SHLAA Site 40413) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58951 (Great Shelford - Ten Acres - Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Butt Lane in Milton (HELAA Site 40365) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
58955 (Carter Jonas)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the East side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 47757) – should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
58976 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south of Hattons Road, Longstanton (HELAA site 40518) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Frog End, Shepreth (HELAA Site 40085) – should be allocated for mixed-use development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59083 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Slate Hall Farm, Bar Hill (J25 Bar Hill site) (HELAA site 40248) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59092 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Land South of Newington, Willingham (HELAA site 59349) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south of the Causeway, Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40216) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59176 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the west of South Street, Comberton (HELAA Site 40310) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59226 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of Station Road, Fulbourn (HELAA site 40293) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59310 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth (HELAA site 47353) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59317 (Avison Young)

Summary of issues raised:
Heydon End, 87 Chishill Road, Heydon (HELAA site 47352) – should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
59457 (M Carroll)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Rectory Farm, Milton (HELAA site 54906) – should be allocated for mixed-use development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60265 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Shelford Road Fulbourn (HELAA site 51610) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60299 (Miller Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Cambridge Road Melbourn (HELAA Site 47903) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60306 (Miller Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Craft Way, Steeple Morden (HELAA sites 40440, 40442 - new site boundary submitted 59416) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
South of Chestnut Lane, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40073 - new site boundary submitted 59416) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Silverdale Close, Coton (HELAA site 40079) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60581 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Water Lane, Melbourn (HELAA site 40274) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60615 (CALA Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land Rear of Fisher's Lane, Orwell (HELAA site 40496) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60619 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Land East of Redgate Road, Girton (HELAA site 40241) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north-east of Villa Road, Impington, (HELAA site 40236) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60699 (NIAB Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Land West of South Road, Impington (HELAA site 40232) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60635 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Thorpes Farm, Swavesey (HELAA site 40191) – should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60658 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Station Fields Foxton (HELAA site 40084) - should be allocated for a new sustainable community
Comments highlighting this issue:
60662 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Long Road, Comberton (HELAA site 40497) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Scotland Farm for the Scotland Farm Travel Hub (Related to HELAA sites 56252, 51608 & 56252) - should be allocated for a travel hub
Comments highlighting this issue:
60665 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Site on Whaddon Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 55082) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60669 (Mill Stream Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
The Drift, Harston (HELAA site 40535) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60675 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised:
Land Between New Road and Water Lane Melbourn (HELAA site 40500) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60676 (Savills)

Summary of issues raised:
Kings Gate site, Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40041) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Kingsgate Land off Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40239) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land South of St.Neots Road Hardwick (HELAA site 40273) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60690 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Brook Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40342) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60692 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Whitecroft Road, Meldreth (HELAA Site 40338) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60693 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at New Road, Melbourn (HELAA Site 40337) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60694 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Station Road, Over (HELAA Site 40551) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60696 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Willingham Road, Willingham (HELAA Site 40340) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60697 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:
East Goods Yard Oakington (HELAA site 59328) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60700 (S Collis)

Summary of issues raised:
East of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 47647) & West of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 40516) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60706 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
Land between 12 and 14 Station Road, Steeple Morden (HELAA Site 40054) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60707 (Steeplefield)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote (HELAA site 51599) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Branch Road and Long Road, Comberton (HELAA site 40261) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60710 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the southwest of St Michael's, Longstanton (HELAA Site 40521) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60711 (S&J Graves)

Summary of issues raised:
Land East of A10, south of Church Road Hauxton (HELAA site 45674) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60716 (W Garfit)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the West of Elizabeth Way, Gamlingay (HELAA site 40030) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Ely Road, Milton (HELAA site 40345) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60720 (Lancashire Industrial & Commercial Services)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to St Georges Way and Woodcock Close, Impington (HELAA site 40282) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60721 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised:
Bedlam Farm, Milton Rd, Impington (HELAA site 40389) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60722 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised:
R/O 89 Rampton Road, Cottenham (HELAA site 59330) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60723 (S&D Raven)

Summary of issues raised:
Land West of Beach Rd, Cottenham (HELAA site 59409) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60724 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners - Currington, Todd, Douglas, Jarvis, Badcock & Hartwell)

Summary of issues raised:
The Boundary, High St, Horningsea (HELAA site 59410) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60725 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:
Shepreth Rd/A10 at Foxton/Shepreth (HELAA site 59399) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60727 (Clarion Housing Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Land South Bramley Ave, Melbourn (HELAA site 59396) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60728 (Carter Jonas)

Summary of issues raised:
Land West of Fox Rd, Bourn (HELAA site 59395) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60729 (P, J & M Crow)

Summary of issues raised:
Land South of Long Lane, Fowlmere (HELAA site 59393) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60730 (Orchestra Land)

Summary of issues raised:
Telephone Exchange, Fowlmere (HELAA site 59392) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60731 (Orchestra Land)

Summary of issues raised:
Land South of Bartlow Road, Castle Camps (HELAA site 59337) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60733 (The Critchley Family)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to 61 Waresley Rd, Gamlingay (HELAA site 59336) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60734 (J Swannell)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Rampton Rd, Cottenham (HELAA site 59407) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60735 (R Agnew)

Summary of issues raised:
Bar Hill Golf Course (HELAA site 59381) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
N Wilbraham Rd, Six Mile Bottom (HELAA site 59380) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60737 (Lanpro Services)

Summary of issues raised:
The Stables, Primes Paddock, Chiswick End, Meldreth (HELAA site 59434) - should be allocated for residential development

Comments highlighting this issue:
60755 (M Prime)

Summary of issues raised:
High Street, Longstowe (HELAA site 40387) - should be allocated for mixed use development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60756 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised:
Land South Of Milton, North of A14 (HELAA site 47943) - should be allocated for employment development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60760 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Haden Way, Willingham (HELAA site 59431) - should be allocated for residential development
Comments highlighting this issue:
60825 (Carter Jonas)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised:
Kings Gate site, Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40041)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; and site access
Comments highlighting this issue:
56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of South Road, Impington (HELAA site 40232)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; site access; scale; and conflict with Neighbourhood Plan
Comments highlighting this issue:
56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north-east of Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40236)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; and site access
Comments highlighting this issue:
56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised:
Kingsgate Land off Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40239)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; site access; scale; and conflict with Neighbourhood Plan
Comments highlighting this issue:
56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised:
Site adjacent to Walnut Tree Close, east side of North End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40020)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to north and south of Ashwell Street, Bassingbourn-Cum-Kneesworth (HELAA site 40106)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Beauval Farm, Old North Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40202)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of The Causeway, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40203)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land at Clear Farm, South End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40204)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions

Comments highlighting this issue:

56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land off Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40227)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions

Comments highlighting this issue:

56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land off The Causeway, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40228)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions

Comments highlighting this issue:

56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land off Poplar Farm Close, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40230)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions

Comments highlighting this issue:

56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land at Wireless Station Park, Chestnut Lane, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40311)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions

Comments highlighting this issue:

56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land north of Elbourn Way and The Limes, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40328)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions

Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land east of Ermine Street, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40330)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off Brook Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40342)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off North End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40398)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to Bassingbourn Nr Royston Hertfordshire (HELAA site 40560)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land North and South of Chestnut Lane and Kneesworth Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40105)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the east of Old North Road, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40299)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Chestnut Lane, Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth (HELAA site 40073)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; and adverse impact on the road network
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land west of South End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40164)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; and adverse impact on the road network
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the south of The Causeway, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40126)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; loss of woodland; and adverse impact on the road network
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land north of Chestnut Road, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth (HELAA site 40463)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; and adverse impact on the road network
Comments highlighting this issue:
56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land south of Wimpole Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40027)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology

impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options

Comments highlighting this issue:

58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land off Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40212)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options

Comments highlighting this issue:

58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land at Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40404)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options

Comments highlighting this issue:

58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land west of Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40443)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options

Comments highlighting this issue:

58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land behind Low Close, 52 Harlton Road, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40004)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options

Comments highlighting this issue:

58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Land east of Leetes Lane, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40026)

• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options

Comments highlighting this issue:

58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land adjacent to 9 Lowfields, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40035)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options
Comments highlighting this issue:
58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off High Street, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40211)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options
Comments highlighting this issue:
58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land off High Street, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40405)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options
Comments highlighting this issue:
58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Land to the north, east and south of Six Mile Bottom (HELAA site 40078)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: impact on local landscape; wider impact of proposal beyond more limited proposal assessed through HELAA
Comments highlighting this issue:
60443 (Westley Waterless PC)

Summary of issues raised:
DB Group (Holdings) Ltd, Wellington Way, Bourn (HELAA site 47529)
• Support for rejection on grounds of: it is necessary to check that all surface water drains to the west, away from Highfields. If it were to be allowed to drain to the east, it would run into the Highfields Road drainage system, and there would be a high risk that it would cause flooding in Highfields
Comments highlighting this issue:
60560 (M Claridge)

S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

23

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

General support for the policy areas in the rural area from parish councils. A number of individuals supported the lack any proposals to develop in the area of Little Linton which protects its identity and Fen Ditton PC support exclusion of any sites within their parish. In contrast a developer claims there is a contradiction between wanting rural villages to thrive and only proposing to allocate a limited number of sites and are promoting land for development.

There is general support for the provision of new open space and community facilities at **East of bypass, Longstanton (S/RRP/L).** However, there were mixed views on the type of housing proposed, questioning the need for affordable housing and suitability of sheltered and older persons housing given the distance from local facilities, whilst suggesting there is a shortage for assisted living.

No objection to carrying forwards **Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate (S/RRP/H/5)**, being mindful of potential impact on heritage assets.

Support for a flexible approach to allow for mix-use development at **Papworth Hospital (S/RRP/E/6)** should healthcare and employment not be successful. Concern for mitigating potential impacts on ancient woodland and heritage assets adjacent to the site.

Site promoter seeking amendments to the **Imperial War Museum, Duxford (S/RRP/E/7)** proposal whilst Historic England are concerned for mitigating potential impacts on heritage assets on the site.

One representor strongly supports **Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area (S/RRP/E/8)**, which is endorsed by the Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England have concern for mitigating potential impacts on heritage assets near the site.

Historic England are concerned for mitigating potential impacts on heritage assets on and near the **Papworth Everard West Central (S/RRP/H/4)** site.

Table of representations: S/RRP - Policy areas in the rest of the rural area

Summary of issues raised:
Support for the policy areas
Comments highlighting this issue:
56588 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree areas designated in 2018 Local Plan should be carried forwards
Comments highlighting this issue:
56876 (Bassingbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised:
A number of Rural areas already have Neighbourhood plans. This should be respected.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57804 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support proposals which exclude any development in the area of Little Linton. Settlements of Linton and Little Linton have historically had distinct identities. The direction of future development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate and will ensure that Little Linton and Linton retain their identity.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57845 (S Nickalls), 57871 (A Nickalls), 57910 (S Foulds), 57924 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57955 (C Mackay)

Summary of issues raised:
HIGHLY SUPPORTIVE of exclusion of any sites for development in green belt, village envelope and conservation areas in Fen Ditton parish. Plan accords with Parish policies on development especially in Green Belt – specifically extant green lungs/corridors including Ditton Meadows, in backland areas and in adopted Conservation Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59909 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Proposing land for development - Flint Cross, A505, south of Melbourn (HELAA site 59402)
Comments highlighting this issue:
58516 (Dencora)

Summary of issues raised:
GCSPS wants rural villages to thrive and sustain their local services. Not reflected within policy S/RRA or S/RRP, which propose very limited number of allocations. Strategy needs to include appropriate distribution of growth in villages. Promoting land for development - Land Rear of Fisher's Lane, Orwell (HELAA site 40496)
Comments highlighting this issue:
60620 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site)

S/RRP/L: East of bypass, Longstanton

Summary of issues raised:
Only very small part at east of site within a MSA for sand & gravel.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56943 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Revised proposal no longer for employment is very good but question the need for housing – too far from local facilities for sheltered or older persons' housing. Could be used for recreation and open space.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57003 (P Coldrick)

Summary of issues raised:
Support to provide new open space, community facilities and affordable housing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57363 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support use for assisted living, which there is a shortage of in the village, but not for general affordable housing.
Would like to see suitable infrastructure improvements as part of the plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57466 (Longstanton PC)

S/RRP/H/5: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate

Summary of issues raised:
No objection to carrying forwards policy which promotes legacy of network of smallholdings and sustainable living
Comments highlighting this issue:
57363 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Fen Drayton Conservation area and listed buildings lie to the east. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59666 (Historic England)

S/RRP/E/6: Papworth Hospital

Summary of issues raised:
Support. Need flexibility, given its size and nature, to allow for mix-use development should healthcare and general employment not be successful. Allows for greater certainty of redevelopment to perpetuate the sustainability of the village.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57363 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised:
Adjacent to an area of ancient woodland known as Papworth Wood at TL29116299 (8.5 Ha). We would like to see a suitable buffering strip to protect this woodland if development takes place on the site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58985 (Woodland Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Site includes part of Papworth Everard Conservation Area and adjacent to and in setting of grade II* listed Papworth Hall, scheduled monument moated site and close to grade II listed Lodge. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain/enhance them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.
Keen to work with Council in preparing a Design Guide SPD for this site to ensure that full consideration is given to conservation and enhancement of historic environment. HIA would help to refine the content of the design code.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59665 (Historic England)

S/RRP/E/7: Imperial War Museum, Duxford

Summary of issues raised:
IWM and Caius responded to the 2019 and 2020 “call for sites” (Site reference 40095) which included IWM Duxford. Submission expands on previous submission.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58015 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised:
Multiple designated assets on site including Duxford Airfield Conservation Area, five grade II* listed buildings and over 20 grade II listed buildings. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording, draw on Conservation Management Plan and emerging masterplan. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain/enhance them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59663 (Historic England)

S/RRP/E/8: Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area

Summary of issues raised:
Strongly support. Also endorsed by the Neighbourhood Plan which was strongly endorsed in the referendum
Comments highlighting this issue:
57792 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised:
No designated heritage assets within site but Histon and Impington Conservation Area and associated listed buildings lie to north. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59667 (Historic England)

S/RRP/H/4: Papworth Everard West Central

Summary of issues raised:
Site includes Papworth Everard Conservation Area, pair of listed cottages and 2, Church Lane. Nearby designated heritage assets include grade II* St Peters Church and Papworth Hall, and several other grade II listed buildings. Development has

potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text. Note a large permission has been substantially built out - appropriate to adjust the boundary of the policy area accordingly?

Comments highlighting this issue:

59664 (Historic England)

Climate Change theme

General comments on Climate Change theme

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Climate change > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think'> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this policy: 74

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There was strong support for the general direction of the climate change policies in representations submitted from individuals, parish councils and developers. Some representations asked the councils to ensure that new housing will use up-to-date heating technology and the representations emphasised the need to constantly review the policy in the context of new technologies and government targets. Some respondents felt that the First Proposals omitted important things, such as a retrofitting policy and the provision of gardens or allotments which could store carbon. Several representations also objected to policies on the grounds that the level of development in the Local Plan would exacerbate pre-existing water issues, thereby negating the climate change policies. Other representations, including one by the Cambridge Doughnut Economic Action Group also objected, arguing that growth and sustainability are incompatible. Some developers and landowners supported the policies and often explained how their site could fulfil these policies. Other developers, such as Southern and Regional Developments Ltd, objected to the policies because they thought that the proposed standards were too high which would make the policies undeliverable.

Table for comments on ‘Climate Change’ theme

Summary of issues raised:
Support for policy aims and prioritisation of action to address climate change
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals
56911 (D Sargeant), 57670 (J Conroy), 57794 (J Pavey), 58205
Public Bodies
56877 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council), 56944 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57364 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58405 (Linton PC), 59187 (Cambourne TC), 59089 (Great Shelford PC), 59266 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority), 59477 (Shepreth PC), 59695 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 59861 (East Cambs DC), 59972 (Natural England), 59166 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group CCG)
Third Sector Organisations
57769 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58016 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58493 (University of Cambridge), 58936 (St John’s College Cambridge), 59014 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
57203 (Abrdn), (Universities Superannuation Scheme Retail), 58310 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58423 (Marshall Group Properties), 58696 (The Church of England Commissioners for England), 58747 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company – a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme), 58811 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 59064 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 60221 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60282 (Commercial Estates Group), 60550 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The climate crisis means we need to move away from GDP-led models of growth, which locally have meant disproportionate influence of the university and business lobbies in development and planning. Instead, the process should be led by democratically accountable public bodies and communities. This would enable the promotion of other forms of land ownership such as community land trusts and community-led housing, etc.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56528 (C Preston)

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge can grow economically without a huge housebuilding programme, with its attendant water and embodied carbon issues. Nowhere in the plan is the basic methodology of household formation questioned. 80% of jobs created by new homebuilding are service jobs, largely servicing the new residents. Thus, of the

58,000 projected new jobs, only 11,600 will be in the Value Added category of hi-tech/bio med. And many of these will not require a 5 day a week presence. With improved rail connections, many of these hi-tech workers could be housed in existing communities up to two hours away, which would spread the envisioned prosperity.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56555 (M Brinkley)

Summary of issues raised:
Front-fund infrastructure investment particularly in water resilience—this is key to all future development decision making. Emphasis should be made on protecting all existing flood plains and water courses.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56614 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Recommend changing the wording of the policy:
“Achievement of these budgets…” to say “Staying within this budget…” or “Staying within these budgets…”.
I think you’re really talking about the GC budget here, so I wouldn’t use the plural.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56687 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised:
Land used for growing food also contributes to carbon storage. A study (attached in the Rep) states that “Covering only 0.0006% of Great Britain, allotments contribute a disproportionate 0.05–0.14% of nationwide total organic carbon stocks.” I would like to see the additional carbon storage in newly-planned allotments, community gardens and market gardens in Greater Cambridge quantified and added to our carbon budget.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56688 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised:
All new housing must be required to use the most up to date solar/alternative heating and insulation and consideration of new zero carbon technologies and government targets needs to be kept under review.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56738 (Croydon PC), 56877 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council), 58587 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60192 (J Preston), 60745 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), 58717 (Wates Development Ltd), 58722 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Page 6, para 1 – some data on things like rising sea level and impact on our area

(maybe a map) might add valuable context for the reader.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56877 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised:

In most cases, under “What alternatives did we consider?” there is no mention made of tougher climate change policies. These policies are a good start but given the magnitude of the crisis, even more stringent, urgent measures should be evaluated.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56886 (J Price)

Summary of issues raised:

Concerned by the poor construction quality in the new developments and that this may be undermining their 'green' credentials. A significant percentage of the promised green benefit may be being undermined by poor construction and lack of developer commitment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56973 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:

I don’t agree with the scale of development. But if it is to happen then very tough requirements on CO2 emissions for construction and operation are right. Anna Mackenzie’s webinar presentation says we will spend the Greater Cambridge CO2 budget in 6.1 years if we continue at the 2019 rate.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57038 (Dr W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised:

Your support for EWR is contrary to your climate goals – it’s (still unpublished) business case must depend on unnecessary infrastructure and housing around EWR stations – why do you support it? The local connectivity problem should be solved by the GCP.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57038 (Dr W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised:

Concern is raised in respect of the approach to dealing with villages in the emerging Local Plan where only low levels of new homes are proposed. It is considered that the Council should consider improving public transport links to the rural areas to ensure that the rural population have a real alternative to the private car.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57167 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57237 (European Property Ventures Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
The Council's policy on Climate Change is not considered to be achievable or deliverable and it is considered that it runs counter to advice in NPPF paragraph 16 (b) that states that Plans should be prepared positively in a way that is aspirational but deliverable.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57167 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57237 (European Property Ventures Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
We encourage a broader strategic vision on the role of electric vehicles in delivering on the objectives to tackle climate change. We have included comments under policy "I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles". With the sale of new petrol and diesel cars ceasing in 2030, EV ownership and addressing the infrastructure requirements for the management and powering of EVs will play a central role in tackling climate change during the plan period.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57194 (R Cowell)

Summary of issues raised:
The first priority for new development should be to redevelop brownfield land in existing town centres. This is the most effective way of ensuring new development limits carbon emissions as it reduces the need to travel long distances for commuting, education, and leisure. Increasing density on brownfield sites and adding residential uses to town centres can be a significant driver of limiting carbon emissions across Greater Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57203 (Abrdn), 57270 (Universities Superannuation Scheme), 58205 (Universities Superannuation Scheme Retail)

Summary of issues raised:
The unique and protected Chalk Hills and river systems are a serious concern with regards to protection and management and any large scale development will exacerbate these difficult issues. Stapleford has suffered flooding and the river run dry. A length of cycle/footpath alongside the A1301 was replaced when the river broke its banks causing flooding on the A1301, putting cyclists in danger. Water management is a key local concern.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57521 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The village has declared a Climate Emergency and we are embracing climate change policies in all our decisions. Building on the Green Belt does not meet our

policy statements.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57521 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised:
We would like to see measures adopted to make it easier for homeowners to upgrade the energy efficiency of existing homes. For example, by eliminating the need to get planning permission to install rendered external wall insulation or PV panels (unless this was essential to preserve important heritage aspects)

Comments highlighting this issue:
57769 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Reducing Carbon is not just about making personal car use difficult. We have major concerns that making personal car ownership hard for an easy win is not a good decision. A wider view is needed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57805 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Our water courses are already in a real mess from over abstraction and too much poorly treated sewerage. Serious money needs to be allocated to a strategy and action plan that will undo past damage and not just cope with further development. There will be a need for working closely with adjoining areas for rivers and streams whose catchments stretch beyond the Greater Cambridge Plan boundaries.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58929 (W Wicksteed)

Summary of issues raised:
The preparation of the Local Plan should focus on those issues that have the most impact on the decision-making for the Local Plan, including:
• setting policies to reduce operational carbon emissions from new development;
• assessing whole life carbon emissions to account for a balanced approach to embodied and operational emissions for new buildings;
• promoting patterns of development that reduce the need to travel; and
• locating development where a choice of travel options exist other than the private car.

LPAs should therefore be:
• encouraging transport choices that have less impact on the climate, such as walking, cycling and public transport;
• promoting self-containment and sustainable settlements, where public transport can easily be supported and a wide range of facilities and services are within walking and cycling distance;

• allocating development where public transport infrastructure already exists, is planned, or can be provided, to encourage sustainable travel.

Further recommendations for the Plan include:
• Care needs to be used in prioritising each of these themes. A balanced approach should be used.
• Each policy of the new Local Plan, and each potential site for employment or housing (or both), will have different impacts that are nuanced depending on proposals and site locations.
• The Sustainability Appraisal is the key to understanding relative impacts on the four big themes. However, the location and design of development will play a key part in achieving key principles of sustainability, including minimising operational carbon emissions and the effects of movements, which relate to climate change, wellbeing, social inclusion and place making.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57895 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised:
To achieve net zero and still grow the economy we would need to decouple emission quantities completely from growth, not just reduce or mitigate them. Several economic projections including one by the UN Environment Programme indicate that such “absolute decoupling” cannot occur and “green growth” is simply not possible in practice.
This Plan calls for an average growth of the machinery of the economy of around 1.2% per year. The UK economy is currently growing at around 3% per year per capita long-term average, so the plan will grow the local economy by over 4% per year. If we are to believe the plan will “help”, then it needs to demonstrate how it will reduce the emissions in Cambridge by more than 4% per capita per year. Otherwise (as it seems) the plan will simply “make it marginally less hard than it might otherwise be for Greater Cambridge to reach net zero”.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57983 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised:
This could go further in terms of sustainability

Comments highlighting this issue:
58027 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The 40% expansion of houses over 21 years is incompatible with the requirements of climate change. Just building these houses will create around 5 million tons of CO2. Even with your limits on water supply that number of homes will require over 10 million litres of water per day. Growth is always exponential and in 100 years your

growth rate for Cambridge will have increased housing by around 500% which is totally unsustainable.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58038 (J Carroll)

Summary of issues raised:
Yes, we can all become greener and produce less carbon, but in this part of the UK the issue is going to be water shortage. It's madness to bring in more people when the amount of water available is finite and is decreasing with global warming.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58056 (Bruce Marshall)

Summary of issues raised:
Flooding is already a serious problem in the fields immediately to the south of the city. During January 2021 a lot of the fields were under water. Further development would make this worse. Climate change threatens an increase of 35% in winter rainfall above the current levels, so permitting development of this land now seems very irresponsible.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58172 (S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised:
DB Group's strategy is focused on improving sustainability within the construction sector, and the company seeks to reduce their environmental impact in everything they do. Local production and use of Cemfree ultra-low embodied carbon concretes can play a part in the Councils plans for more sustainable development across Greater Cambridge. The Council should be proactively working with DB Group, and companies like them, to ensure that the Council enables them to achieve their full potential in terms of contributing towards this goal.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58272 (DB Group Holdings LTD)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree that development should be located so that low carbon transport links can be accessed. However, such locations should not be chosen based on proposed busways – the delivery of these is uncertain and their construction generates carbon emissions through the embodied carbon in the building materials, tree felling etc. is contrary to the Council's net zero carbon agenda. Most of the busways are also in the green belt.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58587 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60192 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the Councils' aim to transition to net zero carbon by 2050 and recommend

that this provides further justification as to why the Plan period should be extended to 2050 as detailed in the response to Policy S/JH.
The Commissioners wish to reiterate the comments made in response to Policy S/DS and Policy S/CB where reference is made to the Councils' identification of development at Cambourne being the most sustainable outside of Cambridge. This is in part due to the proposed infrastructure works in the area which would help reduce carbon emissions.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58696 (The Church of England Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised:
Well-designed residential development can contribute to carbon offsetting through tree planting, and delivery of sustainable technologies such as water reduction, etc., whilst encouraging existing and new communities to adopt more sustainable methods of travel, including provision of attractive open spaces and green linkages to encourage walking and cycling.
Provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) within new development can also alleviate existing fluvial and pluvial flood issues.
Climate change policy should not be overly prescriptive such that it provides a barrier to sustainable development.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58717 (Wates Development Ltd), 58722 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The current development strategy fails to maximise the opportunities for sustainable development in the southern areas where the areas in close proximity to public transport links are not allocated for growth.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58912 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised:
The current focus on larger-scale development does not necessarily result in the benefits of new housing being distributed among existing communities, and the fact that new development also addresses issues and brings with it other benefits, including environmental enhancements, and the contribution that new development makes towards sustaining and enhancing local services. It is therefore considered that there is a need to balance the growth strategy to ensure that the needs of existing settlements are met, alongside the larger strategic elements in Cambridge and in the main growth areas.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58912 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy direction should apply to the delivery of new floorspace only. The policy should also allow for viability considerations, as not all developments will be able to meet other requirements and obligations required by the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58971 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised:
Focusing development on the edge of Cambridge in immediate proximity to employment and to planned public transport improvements is demonstrably the best strategy to enable growth to take place consistent with climate change objectives.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58988 (Jesus College – working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings – a private landowner and St John's College), 59536 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60282 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Nature-based solutions, where habitat creation and retention help mitigate carbon emissions, are also an important element to include which highlights the overlap between the climate change and biodiversity policies in the plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59014 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised:
We support regenerative and agro-ecological farming and we prioritise local, seasonal food that is good for the planet. Our local plan should reflect this need through:
• space for small scale vegetable and fruit growing, either as a tenanted farmer, community supported agriculture or on the model of CoFarm
• provision of allotments, a community garden and orchard
• a marketplace and encouragement for local growers to have an outlet for their produce in order to support access to local fresh produce
Comments highlighting this issue:
59062 (Cambridge Sustainable Food CIC)

Summary of issues raised:
We request that the NHS is supported in seeking to deliver more sustainable facilities and services to meet the needs of the population.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59166 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group CCG)

Summary of issues raised:
Concerned that growth remains a priority in the plan when to counter climate change

we actually just need to consume less and build less. Zero emissions should be the target rather than carbon neutrality which allows for pollution as long as there is a counterbalance.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59221 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Concerned at Council's promotion of house building at levels that exceed already-inflated government targets and that will have destructive effects on the river system. The chalk streams are increasingly polluted by industrial waste, and runoff from agricultural and non-agricultural pesticide-use, and are also drying up. The proposed development, with its excessive targets to build homes, will exacerbate these problems.

The Environment Agency has requested that water companies and farmers reduce abstraction and it encourages more efficient use of water. Moreover, it maintains that any further growth will harm the environment. It says there is insufficient water to supply the existing population, let alone an expanded one. The Integrated Water Management Study, the Stantec Report, found that low, medium and high regional growth scenarios all have a deleterious impact on the river system. To fill 'the water gap' it is proposed that water be transferred, by building new infrastructure from areas which are already losing jobs and people to the Cambridge area. This would draw another resource from areas from which jobs and people are migrating. Surely it is better to encourage jobs in and movement of people to the places where the water and houses already exist?

The local plan makes no reference to the provision of sustainable water supplies, reduced flood risk and effective waste water treatment; these should be established as baseline conditions for any new development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59461 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised:

The targets presented within the GCLP will introduce some of the highest sustainability standards in the UK at a time when the housebuilding industry is already responding to the introduction of the Government's Future Homes Standard. Given the volume of new homes required within Greater Cambridge there is a risk that the introduction of these standards will restrict the delivery of new housing, particularly given that the supply chain is currently not able to deliver these standards at volume. These challenges will also be particularly acute for smaller housebuilders which may further restrict delivery and diversity within the market.

It is important that the sustainability policies do not restrict the delivery of much needed new private and affordable housing across the county. To meet the requirements of the NPPF, these policies must be supported by a robust evidence

base and viability assessment that demonstrates these policies and targets are deliverable.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59536 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
Historic England considers looking after and learning from the historic environment contributes positively to overall global sustainability and can help us adapt to and mitigate for climate change. Further details of Historic England's position on Climate Change and Sustainability can be found via the following link: https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/statements/statement-onclimate-change-and-sustainability
Heritage assets themselves can be affected by climate change, particularly in the case of buried water-logged assets. Heritage assets can also be a valuable aid to achieving sustainable development, in both climate change mitigation and adaptation, rather than a constraint.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59668 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised:
The combination of unproven employment markets and unsustainable travel patterns associated with the new towns raises questions around the proposed strategy towards employment growth in these areas, and it is considered that this is contrary to the aims of the central climate change theme. Putting more development in new settlement areas could lead to more unsustainable travel patterns.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60282 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Keen to have future conversations to share experiences and to understand how net zero carbon can be achieved in terms of viability, and to explore how this can be monitored to ensure the approach is successful.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59695 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised:
The settlement of WNT and Waterbeach village on the Environment Agency flood maps show them to be vulnerable and prone to flooding from fluvial, surface water and sea level rise. How will residents and important farmland be protected due to the proposed accelerated growth of WNT in the draft GC plan?

Comments highlighting this issue:
59847 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised:
How will GC planning ensure net gain offsetting targets in the draft local plan are met due to the accelerated growth of WNT? How will it be monitored and managed to obtain “net gain”?
Comments highlighting this issue:
59847 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised:
WPC seek to know if the proposed accelerated growth will affect GC zero carbon targets and how will it affect the GC aspirations in the draft local plan?
Comments highlighting this issue:
59847 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Minor OBJECT that the Policies as written are aspirational rather than achievable. Need refinement such as:
• avoidance of new build. This is a higher priority since this avoids embodied carbon. The economic and housing growth targets proposed in the Plan are excessive. The proposed relocation of the WWTW is a second prime example of avoidable new build.
• reuse of existing buildings should be emphasised
• a ‘brownfield first’ policy for new building
• halting the use of scarce farmland for solar energy generation
• recognising that not all electricity has the same cost and carbon content. Peak power is much worse the shorter the time period over which it occurs also depending on the time of day and year when it occurs.
• Solar installations might be mandated on all industrial buildings, new and existing. The cost, cost sharing and carbon footprint of district heating/cooling needs to be investigated and a comparison made of air source and ground source HPs. It is insufficient, even if convenient, to treat each building in isolation.
• The role of the grid to supply part of the demand must be described since this has access to low cost and carbon sources as well as providing resilience.
• Does the Plan envisage “smart” demands that avoid short duration peaks in the system?
• The role of hot water storage should be described since this avoids use of power in short duration peak periods.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59911 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Recommends that the vision should advocate a more holistic approach to securing multi-functional benefits through the protection and enhancement of the natural

environment.
In accordance with paragraphs 17 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Plan should encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that land can deliver a wide range of ecosystem services required for sustainable development including climate change mitigation, flood management, amongst other benefits.
The Plan should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services, considering a natural capital evidence approach and making strong links to the Nature Recovery Network and the Cambridge Nature Network.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59972 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised:
On construction and climate, please allow for the urgency of the climate crisis – whole life calculations may be looking past the tipping point.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60818 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:
The rate of change in and around Cambridge over the past 30 years has been significantly greater than for just local needs, mainly to develop nationally important economic development. This Plan continues this approach despite the issue of climate change and water supply and large amounts of new development still to be implemented from current Local Plans. The time has now come to step back from this direction of travel and begin to reduce the scale of growth around Cambridge using the Low option as a first step.
Given the aims of the Plan and the input of the Net Zero Carbon study, I hoped for a more radical Plan which addressed climate change and zero carbon targets through aiming to reduce the total amount of new development to meet local needs and move to a position which is in line with Government targets in the next planning round.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60121 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
Transition to net zero carbon by 2050 necessary but inadequate. Critiques of policy include:
• ‘Net zero’ refers to a situation where ongoing emissions of carbon are balanced by carbon sinks. However, the level at which atmospheric carbon eventually stabilises will be determined by the total accumulated emissions up to that point, not by the balance between sources and sinks in that moment. Therefore, it is critical to a)

radically reduce emissions as early as possible in this time period and b) protect stocks of carbon, such as those in soils and vegetation, to prevent their release to the atmosphere. The Local Plan risks driving large emissions in the short term (from materials and emissions used during building works) in the name of achieving net zero balance in the long term. This will not avert climate disaster.
• Note that a total carbon budget for Greater Cambridge of 11 million tonnes for the period 2020–2100 has been calculated (page 143, First Proposals). This must be given equal weighting and emphasis with the net zero target.
• Success of the policies on new buildings will depend on how well they are implemented by developers. Look forward to seeing more detail on how the Planning Authority will assure quality control as the Local Plan begins to be implemented.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60745 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Supports the Council's prioritisation of managing water resources as a fundamental part of climate change response. Anglian Water provides two clarifications:
• Amendment needed for Climate Change topic paper (page 23), to show that Anglian Water currently supplies residential properties in parts of Northstowe.
• There is a tension between the OWCS conclusion that integrated water management can be applied on smaller sites (page 41 of the Climate Change topic Paper) and the prior observation that the Environmental Agency have concerns about deliverability of water efficiency through the planning system. Given the priority attached to climate adaptation and resilience by respondents (page 125) that tension will need to be resolved in the final Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60486 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Criticisms of the policy include:
• The definition of a Net Zero Carbon building set out in the Evidence Base does not include its embodied carbon, this is a very serious omission.
• Build for future re-use, including requiring use of lime mortar not cement to enable re-use of fired and quarried materials.
• Already out of date in terms of Government targets (e.g. the Heat and Buildings Strategy, not mentioned in the draft Plan), and rapidly developing guidance and best practice.
• There are serious quality control challenges in relation to whether aspirational aims are actually delivered.
• Projects proposed to help achieve net zero need to be both delivered and safeguarded, throughout the Plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60192 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern that the First Proposals deal only with new development and ignore the existing built environment. Retrofit should be within the direct scope of the Plan whenever it involves works which could potentially require planning permission or listed building consent.
Would like to know what proportion of the projected demand for new homes and jobs could be met through a programme of retrofitting. It seems an important piece of evidence when assessing the Local Plan.
Retrofit is also within the scope of the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, which needs to be updated to include embodied carbon, over the whole life cycle of construction.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60192 (J Preston), 60745 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), 57038 (Dr W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised:
No mention whatsoever of the need for a different approach to buildings of traditional solid wall construction. These may form at least a quarter of the existing stock; this proportion should have been considered and assessed as part of the Evidence Base.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60192 (J Preston), 60745 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Specific challenges of traditional buildings, and the risks of unforeseen consequences are highlighted in PAS2035. However, the PAS is published by the British Standards Institute, costs £190, and so is inaccessible to homeowners. The Climate Change section of the Plan should quote key principles and guidance from PAS 2035 and its non-domestic counterpart PAS 2038 to ensure that people dealing with traditional buildings have access to the appropriate advice and skills to ensure that their buildings are put in good repair, and then suitable retrofit measures are applied as appropriate.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60192 (J Preston), 60745 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
ECDC is interested in continuing to work closely on the aspects in your Plan relating to climate change and the natural environment, recognising that these matters are clearly ones that will require cooperation and shared learning across all organisations and administrative areas. We would be happy to assist with your

evidence base on these matters should you find that helpful.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59861 (East Cambs DC)

Table of site-specific comments posted under 'General Comments on Climate Change'

Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised:
Bourn Airfield already benefits from a recommendation for outline planning permission and is supported by a strong sustainability strategy that deploys extensive renewable energy technologies across the development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59536 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
Focusing development on the edge of Cambridge in immediate proximity to employment and to planned public transport improvements is demonstrably the best strategy to enable growth to take place consistent with climate change objectives. At Cambridge South, comprehensively planned development would have the additional benefit of integrating social, recreation, retail and support facilities to reduce the need to travel. The opportunity exists to plan an exemplary urban extension.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58988 (Jesus College – working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings – a private landowner and St John's College)

Summary of issues raised:
Note S/NEC Policy is contrary to ambition/values:
Carbon expenditure, emissions, and embedded carbon to decommission 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 expenditure associated with fulfilment of S/NEC Policy
Comments highlighting this issue:
57670 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised:
Horningsea Parish Council believes the proposal to relocate the Cambridge Waste

Water Treatment Plant – a fully functioning waste water treatment plant – to Green Belt is a waste of taxpayers' money, a waste of Green Belt and an unnecessary contribution to the effects of climate change.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58066 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Cambridge East is being planned to achieve an exemplar development which can act as a flagship for the Councils' objectives. By pioneering new technologies and considering the long-term welfare of our planet and its people, we believe Cambridge East can create a transformative green infrastructure connecting the City with the countryside that sets the new global standard for sustainability. There is potential for the sustainability benefits of Cambridge East to be even greater if development also includes land east of Airport Way. The ambitions of Cambridge East include:

• net zero embodied carbon and net zero operational carbon through careful design of infrastructure, carbon offsetting through local (if possible) sequestration via the creation of new or enhancement of existing areas of woodland and other habitats, sustainable water management for the wider area (not simply for the benefit of Cambridge East), and creating a 'green link' which will encompass many climate initiatives such as using green infrastructure to reduce the impacts of climate change (e.g. providing shade and reducing overheating).

• These commitments are set out in the Sustainability Vision that Marshall submitted in February 2020. These commitments will be developed further through Marshall's joint working with the GCSP.

• In line with the climate approach of the Local Plan, the ambitions of Cambridge East seek to provide a net zero operational development and reduce embodied carbon to net zero through construction.

• Offsetting would ensure consideration at an on-site and local scale where feasible. To provide a holistic approach to carbon offsetting, it is recommended that consideration is given by GCSP to a holistic carbon offsetting strategy, and the demarcation of potential sites where the offsetting of the carbon impacts from allocated Local Plan development could bring additional local benefits. This will ensure that this intrinsically important, yet often difficult to apply, policy is targeted, local, and achievable.

• Marshall is happy to work in collaboration with GCSP to develop, agree and achieve a strategy which works for all. Through collaboration a truly balanced plan will be created, in which the 4 pillars of the Local Plan objectives are achieved by embracing growth rather than resisting it.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58423 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
The strategy informed by carbon assessment that highlights impact transport emissions can have, promotes patterns of development that enable low carbon transport modes, shifting away from reliance on private car. Many rural settlements are sustainably located on public transport networks, having good access to local services, facilities, and employment opportunities. Land West of London Road, Fowlmere benefits from local employment, primary school, village hall, recreation ground and places of worship, serviced by two bus services, to Cambridge and other settlements with train stations.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58717 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Land West of London Road, Fowlmere is proposed to contribute to carbon offsetting through the provision of a landscape strategy, including additional tree planting, provision of sustainable drainage systems that are multi-functional, and delivering an attractive open space in the form of a village park. The proposed development would also deliver low carbon housing, electric vehicle charging at every dwelling and promote low water consumption, therefore proactively mitigating the effects of climate change through reducing overall carbon emissions.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58717 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Proposals at Whittlesford would provide 300 Net Zero homes and a NBG, making a positive contribution to reducing CO2 emissions and nature recovery.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59064 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised:
The site ‘Land East of Cambridge’ has the potential to significantly contribute to mitigating against the impacts of climate change. It could:
• provide a range of new housing and employment opportunities in an established location where sustainable transport is the key method of travel, helping reduce carbon emissions and pollution brought about through road congestion which is a key issue in Greater Cambridge.
• These are benefits which simply cannot be replicated on other sites, especially those in locations further afield, because they cannot necessarily rely upon development coming forward close to existing and well-established employment sites, such as those at PTP, the Biomedical Campus and Addenbrooke’s Hospital.
• The delivery of new homes to zero carbon standards will also help improve the standard of housing stock in Cambridge and reduce ongoing emissions from

housing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60282 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised:

Land East side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn offers an opportunity to deliver much needed growth to the settlement, to support local housing need and enhance social cohesion. The site is in a sustainable location, in proximity to services and facilities and is available for development. It is considered that development within this location will encourage future occupiers to adopt sustainable modes of transport, supporting healthy lifestyles and seeking to mitigate the impacts of climate change.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58722 (Wates Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:

The CBC 2050 Vision for growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus aligns with GCSP's goals and it is our intention to ensure that development mitigates and can adapt to the impacts of climate change through measures such as management of water supply, mode shift, local living, green infrastructure and net zero buildings. We envisage close joint working with GCSP, stakeholders and local communities to co-design steps towards these outcomes.

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment – Integrated Water Management Study, November 2020, identifies how growth is most preferable concentrated in new settlements or urban extensions to maximise opportunities for high standards of design for efficient water usage and re-use, and multi-functional blue-green infrastructure. Specific ways in which future development must meet these objectives are anticipated to be agreed with GCSP through the development of the general and site specific local plan policies.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58811 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised:

Both parties are committed to finding sustainable access solutions for future proposals with an accent on walking, cycling and public transport to an expanded Whittlesford Parkway. In addition, the partners emphasise that the "raison d'être" of the Avtech proposal is to research and manufacture low carbon forms of air mobility. IWM decarbonisation plan to bring IWM Duxford to net zero by 2035, and infrastructure investment to ensure the historic site is resilient to the impacts of climate change is already underway. The Avtech proposal would align to these approaches and support the GCLP climate change policies. In combining the land resource of IWM Duxford and Caius the Avtech development is of sufficient scale to be commercially viable and accommodate designing for climate change and any

environmental mitigations.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58016 (Imperial War Museum / Gonville and Caius College)

CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think'> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of representations for this policy : 81

Executive Summary

The general thrust of the policy attracted a significant level of support from parish councils, organisations such as Carbon Neutral Cambridge CPPF and the Wildlife Trusts, members of the public and some of the area's developers and landowners including the University of Cambridge and Marshall Group. Some of those supporting the policy made suggestions as to how the policy could be refined and improved, with a number of consultees noting that while the policy contains specific targets related to energy use in buildings, more defined targets are needed to take account of embodied carbon associated with demolition and remediation of sites. For some, for example the University of Cambridge, while the general approach to the policy was supported, flexibility ws requested in the application of some of the targets to take account of different building types where a more nuanced approach may be needed.

Those objecting to the policy, primarily developers and the Home Builders Federation, were concerned that the delivery of net zero carbon policy is not a matter for planning but should be left to Building Regulations and the emerging Future Homes Standard. They raised concerns around the technical feasibility of the policy, impact on viability and implementation of the policy. The issue of policy implementation was also raised by some Parish Councils. It was also considered that policy should only consider regulated energy and not unregulated energy (energy used by plugged-in appliances) as these are outside of the control of developers. Many considered that the delivery of net zero carbon was best left for national standards and that the role of the decarbonisation of the grid also needed to be recognised. There were also objections to the reference in policy to there being no new gas connections. Members of the public and some parish councils also raised concerns that the policy did not contain targets for existing buildings and did not recognise the importance of reusing rather than demolishing existing buildings.

Table of representations for CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings

Summary of issues raised:
Support for policy and targets therein
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals
56503 (D Clay), 57588 (R Pargeter), 57671 (J Conroy), 57823 (D Lister), 58305 (I Butnar), 58714 (H Brown), 60122 (C Blakeley), 60433
Public Bodies
56615 (Gamlingay PC), 56739 (Croydon PC), 56878 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58407 (Linton PC), 59188 (Cambourne TC), 59824 (Dry Drayton PC), 59912 (Fen Ditton PC), (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Third Sector Organisations
56857 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57016 (The Wildlife Trust), 57365 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57768 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58474 (ARU), 58498 (University of Cambridge), 58610 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58913 (National Trust), 59016 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
58434 (Marshall Group Properties), 58557 (Croudace Homes), 58594 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site), 58749 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company – a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme), 58886 (bpha)

Summary of issues raised:
Would suggest the policy should state that all new dwellings should have a space heating demand of less than 20 kWh per meter squared per year rather than the current proposal of 15–20 kWh.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57768 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Support clear and evidence-based requirements but request that policy provide some flexibility to include for site-specific circumstances and changing standards, legislation and technology. Policy should also recognise the importance of a fabric-first approach.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58199 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised:
All homes must be Passivhaus standard. Additional costs of meeting this should not be considered standalone (e.g. incremental costs required to increase electricity generation should be considered). In winter it's unlikely electricity requirements can be met on-site, so off-shore wind, nuclear and other means will be required. The cost

of this additional generation and distribution infrastructure must be factored in when considering the cost-benefit of a building's insulation requirements.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58122 (P Bearpark)

Summary of issues raised:
Mandate solar panels and EV charge points for all new housing and commercial developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57823 (D Lister), 58305 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised:
Should specify space to accommodate energy storage

Comments highlighting this issue:
58305 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised:
Is there scope for district heating/cooling instead of individual homes or buildings?

Comments highlighting this issue:
58305 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised:
Plan does not pay sufficient attention to embedded (embodied) carbon emissions. Requirement to 'demonstrate actions to reduce lifecycle carbon emissions' is not strong enough. Need to stipulate how much emissions should be reduced by and over what timescale/clearer targets.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56675 (C Preston), 56887 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised:
Inadequate attention given to restoring old buildings rather than building new.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56675 (C Preston), 56878 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58174 (H Brown)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy should also include carbon emissions associated with the decontamination and demolition of existing buildings on the site such as the current CWWTP. Should also include eventual demolition of the new building. Should include the carbon expenditure of HCVs used to transport demolition waste and transfer tunnels. All needs to be factored into carbon cost of fulfilling S/NEC policy.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56857 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57522 (C Martin), 57613 (J Pratt), 57671 (J Conroy), 58067 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Could the last resort offsetting option be somehow more onerous financially?
Comments highlighting this issue:
56878 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Operational emissions are too lax – may be exploited to evade the net zero requirement. Future-proofing is not enough – emissions must be reduced over the next few years to have the necessary impact.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56887 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised:
All new public buildings must already be 'nearly zero energy buildings' which has led to an increase in costs. County Council's preferred approach is a combination of different mechanisms to achieve at least 6 BREEAM Ene01 credits and an EPC rating of A or better and/or installing on-site renewable energy to meet a significant proportion (>80%) of buildings' expected energy use. Policy CC/NZ is less flexible and will incur additional costs. We request that it is made clear that there will be an expectation on developers to meet such costs through S106 agreements.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56945 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Support should be expressed for developments below 150 dwellings that voluntarily provide information on whole life carbon emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
57091 (C King), 57295 (C S Nutt)

Summary of issues raised:
Re: reference point 9, this should be in effect for all new housing developments to avoid unwanted preference for housing developments of between 100–150 houses. Policy should be stricter.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58158 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:
Note reference to 'methodology to accurately predict a building's actual energy performance' and a 'nationally recognised Whole Life Carbon Assessment'. Hope that these will be sufficiently developed by the initiation of the plan and that there will be defined ways of ensuring that developers comply with the requirements.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57588 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised:
Current wording related to operational emissions is considered too technical and not clear and will be difficult to work in practice. Contrary to para 16(d) of the NPPF
Comments highlighting this issue:
57168 (Southern and Regional Developments Ltd), 57239 (European Property Ventures Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:
Incorporation of extra features into new developments could boost acceptance amongst developers and improve market demand, boosting viability for application across Huntingdonshire.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57365 (HDC)

Summary of issues raised:
Object to policy – should be left for Building Regulations and the Future Homes Standard, a standardised approach which will be more effective in achieving net zero by 2050. Even if local plans can set policy requirements for carbon reduction, this can only be up to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:
How will the policy be assessed via the planning application process and what consultee would be involved in assessing compliance?
Comments highlighting this issue:
57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:
With regards to Part C of the policy, site-specific deliverables need to be accounted for – this may not be achievable. There is also no acknowledgement of decarbonisation of the grid. It should be ensured that Part D of the policy is achievable to obtain the requirements of Part C on all sites prior to offsetting.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:
Further clarification is needed on requirements of Whole Life Carbon Assessments. Any resulting recommendations should be included in viability.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:
Welcome ambitions to deliver net zero carbon buildings. We have published a new

Output Specification (OS21) for schools which is broadly aligned. Request flexibility on assessment methodologies to be used to demonstrate whole life carbon and energy performance gap and recommend flexibility on application (over-provision in some areas to offset under-provision in other areas but demonstrate overall compliance).

Comments highlighting this issue:
57481 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
Unclear whether policy will require whole-life net zero carbon or only consideration/calculation of embodied carbon.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57481 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
Seems unlikely that developments can generate enough renewable energy to meet their needs at the required standards. At a conservative average of 50m² per home, 49,000 homes using 35 kWh/year would need 85 gigawatt hours per year of new generation paid for within the homes price – far beyond developers' construction capabilities. If via PV this too seems unlikely – average 50m² home would need 1750 kWh/year requiring 17m² of panels which is all of the south-facing roof capacity for every single house. Is there confidence that developers can achieve this or is it expected that every development would need offsetting measures? What absolute standard would be applied for offsetting or what are the futureproofing approaches?

Comments highlighting this issue:
57986 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Some elements of the policy are supported, including:
• All heating being provided through low carbon fuels (not fossil fuels), and no new developments should be connected to the gas grid, are supported.
However, it is important to note that:
• the requirements are demonstrably deliverable in the context of new development in Greater Cambridge.
• An ambition for proposals to generate at least the same amount of renewable energy (preferably on-plot) as they demand over the course of a year is understood but also needs to be demonstrably deliverable in the context of new development in Greater Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58942 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Support should be expressed for developments below 150 dwellings that voluntarily

provide information on whole life carbon emissions

Comments highlighting this issue:

57091 (C King), 57295 (C S Nutt)

Summary of issues raised:

Re: reference point 9, this should be in effect for all new housing developments to avoid unwanted preference for housing developments of between 100–150 houses. Policy should be stricter.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58158 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised:

Note reference to 'methodology to accurately predict a building's actual energy performance' and a 'nationally recognised Whole Life Carbon Assessment'. Hope that these will be sufficiently developed by the initiation of the plan and that there will be defined ways of ensuring that developers comply with the requirements.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57588 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised:

Current wording related to operational emissions is considered too technical and not clear and will be difficult to work in practice. Contrary to para 16(d) of the NPPF

Comments highlighting this issue:

57168 (Southern and Regional Developments Ltd), 57239 (European Property Ventures Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised:

Incorporation of extra features into new developments could boost acceptance amongst developers and improve market demand, boosting viability for application across Huntingdonshire.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57365 (HDC)

Summary of issues raised:

Object to policy – should be left for Building Regulations and the Future Homes Standard, a standardised approach which will be more effective in achieving net zero by 2050. Even if local plans can set policy requirements for carbon reduction, this can only be up to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:

How will the policy be assessed via the planning application process and what consultee would be involved in assessing compliance?

Comments highlighting this issue:
57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:
With regards to Part C of the policy, site-specific deliverables need to be accounted for – this may not be achievable. There is also no acknowledgement of decarbonisation of the grid. It should be ensured that Part D of the policy is achievable to obtain the requirements of Part C on all sites prior to offsetting.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:
Further clarification is needed on requirements of Whole Life Carbon Assessments. Any resulting recommendations should be included in viability.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57381 (Persimmon)

Summary of issues raised:
Welcome ambitions to deliver net zero carbon buildings. We have published a new Output Specification (OS21) for schools which is broadly aligned. Request flexibility on assessment methodologies to be used to demonstrate whole life carbon and energy performance gap and recommend flexibility on application (over-provision in some areas to offset under-provision in other areas but demonstrate overall compliance).
Comments highlighting this issue:
57481 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
Unclear whether policy will require whole-life net zero carbon or only consideration/calculation of embodied carbon.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57481 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised:
Seems unlikely that developments can generate enough renewable energy to meet their needs at the required standards. At a conservative average of 50m² per home, 49,000 homes using 35 kWh/year would need 85 gigawatt hours per year of new generation paid for within the homes price – far beyond developers' construction capabilities. If via PV this too seems unlikely – average 50m² home would need 1750 kWh/year requiring 17m² of panels which is all of the south-facing roof capacity for every single house. Is there confidence that developers can achieve this or is it expected that every development would need offsetting measures? What absolute standard would be applied for offsetting or what are the futureproofing approaches?

Comments highlighting this issue:
57986 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Group)

Summary of issues raised:
Some elements of the policy are supported, including:
• All heating being provided through low carbon fuels (not fossil fuels), and no new developments should be connected to the gas grid, are supported.
However, it is important to note that:
• the requirements are demonstrably deliverable in the context of new development in Greater Cambridge.
• An ambition for proposals to generate at least the same amount of renewable energy (preferably on-plot) as they demand over the course of a year is understood but also needs to be demonstrably deliverable in the context of new development in Greater Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58942 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
Support policy, but it should also:
• Reference that the targets prioritise a fabric first approach which involves maximising the performance of the construction components and materials making up the building fabric before the use of mechanical and electrical building systems.
• We support a policy direction which recognises embodied carbon. However, it is noted that embodied carbon is not included in all of the findings of the evidence base (Net zero carbon study (2021)). This undermines the claims made about the sustainability of new development and raises questions about the claimed sustainability credentials of the preferred growth option.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58610 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Setting appropriate levels of energy use that will be allowed for in new development should be the remit of Building Regulations and not the Planning system.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58671 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
In accordance with paragraph 16 of the NPPF, Plans need to be aspirational but also deliverable. The emissions targets as set out within the policy are extremely ambitious, aiming for London Energy Transformation Initiative ("LETI") targets. The Council should ensure that the use of such targets outside of London is evidenced and achievable.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58700 (The Church Commissioners for England), 58942 (St John's College Cambridge), 59542 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59948 (Taylor Wimpey), 60601 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60603 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 59544 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
We note in Viability Assessment that a "net zero carbon cost has been explicitly included in the appraisals" and this is welcomed. It is noted that the cost for installation of heat pumps, mechanical ventilation and PV can vary amongst different dwellings. Unclear whether in all instances installation of a heat pump, mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (MVHR) and photovoltaics will be sufficient to demonstrate a net zero carbon cost as this will vary from development to development, and therefore whether sufficient cost.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58732 (Wates Development), 58734 (Wates Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Shepreth Parish Council (SPC) notes that transport carbon is more of a problem than building carbon.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59478 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The latest construction technologies should be enshrined in planning and building regulation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59478 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Viability Study includes cost figures greater than 7 years out of date. Recommend figures are updated (rather than being index linked) to ensure evidence is robust and meets tests of soundness. Concerned whether 2% uplift represents a sufficient increase in build costs.
Whilst clearly desirable to achieve highest possible water efficiency, Building Regulations is 125 litres/person/day. NPPG 56-014-20150327 states where a clear local need, policies can require a tighter optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day. Blanket 80 litres/person/day target not considered realistic. Instead, 110 litres/person/day should be encouraged. May be appropriate to set tighter standards for certain site allocations.
Overall, Assessment recommends growth be concentrated in new settlements or urban extensions that avoid high flood risk and have high standards for design of flood risk management, water usage and re-use, and blue-green infrastructure. Follows a Location Opportunities and Constraints Categorisation and Scoring which

assesses and scores each proposed growth strategy.
Disputed why development within the Minor Rural Centres and Group Villages have been disregarded as an appropriate growth strategy if they are able to meet ambitious water usage targets and implement water recycling systems.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58741 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Technology will move faster than the Local Plan process so any policy should avoid being too prescriptive in relation to specific technology types.
Regular reviews should be carried out to ensure policies are updated.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58886 (bpha), 60222 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60551 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60242 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised:
Clarity should be given on the requirements of Whole Carbon Assessments and what they should contain.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58886 (bpha)

Summary of issues raised:
Draft policy CC/NZ sets a high threshold of 150 homes for calculating whole life carbon emissions. Support should also be expressed for developments of <150 dwellings where this information is provided voluntarily.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59137 (Endurance Estates), 60286 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60337 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60348 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60363 (H.J. Molton Settlement), 60376 (Stephen & Jane Graves), 60386 (D Wright), 60474 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow)

Summary of issues raised:
What support will be available for developers in seeking to meet the high standards proposed? Will the potential impact on viability be taken into consideration? Regardless of the chosen approach, it would be useful to include further guidance/information in a supplementary planning document (SPD).

Comments highlighting this issue:
59137 (Endurance Estates), 60286 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60337 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60348 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60363 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60376 (Stephen & Jane Graves), 60386 (D Wright), 60474 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow), 57091 (C King), 57295 (C S Nutt)

Summary of issues raised:
Concerned that the policies as they stand are unsound as they propose to introduce some of the highest sustainability requirements in the country without a complete

evidence base. It may reduce the delivery of affordable and private housing within the Greater Cambridge (GC) area.
Criticisms include:
• The Topic Paper (page 17) states that the standards proposed are not as onerous as the passivhaus standard but do go beyond the proposed FHS. The passivhaus standard requires an EUI of less than 120 kWh/m² per annum compared to the policy target of 35 kWh/m² – thereby suggesting that the draft policy target is in fact considerably more onerous than passivhaus.
• The passivhaus standard requires a space heating demand of 15 kWh/m² per annum compared to a draft policy target of 15–20 kWh/m² thereby suggesting close alignment between the two on this specific issue.
• Draft Policy CC/NZ requires applicants to address both regulated and unregulated energy as opposed to the FHS which deals with regulated energy alone.
• To hit the EUI target of 35 kWh/m² the Evidence base document estimates that the following will be required although no exact details are available:
(a) Low U-values that exceed the requirements of the proposed FHS
(b) Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR)
(c) A high level of air-tightness
• All of these identified measures are characteristic of implementing the passivhaus standard
• The cost of implementing Policy CC/NZ has been estimated at between 10% and 13% above that required to build to current Building Regulations. No detailed analysis of the assumptions behind this calculation were available.
• Building to passivhaus requires a complete transformation of the on-site construction process and supply chain which would significantly delay housing delivery and increase costs of new dwellings particularly for small and medium sized house builders.
• The cost of constructing houses to passivhaus is likely to be significantly higher than that identified in the evidence base.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59542 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59948 (Taylor Wimpey), 60601 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60603 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 59544 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
Other reservations about the policy include:
• It is unreasonable to prohibit all new developments from connecting to the gas grid as it may still be the most suitable fuel for buildings such as care homes and health facilities.
• The requirement for new dwellings to generate at least the same amount of renewable energy as they demand over the course of the year is extremely

challenging.
• The offsetting policy lacks detail and cost certainty, which fails the test of soundness.
• The offsetting policy may increase house prices and reduce affordability.
• The requirement to calculate Whole Life Carbon (WLC) in construction places an unnecessary burden on developers already committed to reducing embodied carbon.
• Suggest allowing corporate commitments and progress as acceptable evidence of compliance.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59542 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59948 (Taylor Wimpey), 60601 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60603 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 59544 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
Recommend the following amendments:
• Utilise the FHS as the main metric for the construction of energy efficient housing. The use of this standard will also provide greater support to the small and medium (including self-build) housing sector which is critical to ensure greater supply and diversity of affordable housing.
• Publication of a complete and full evidence base for stakeholder comments before these draft policies are developed further.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59542 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59948 (Taylor Wimpey), 60601 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60603 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 59544 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
For draft Policy CC/NZ, a more detailed review of the full evidence is not possible as only the non-technical summary has been published and therefore Countryside reserve the right to amend their representations once this material has been reviewed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59544 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60601 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised:
To be effective, the policy needs to be taken in conjunction with three further policies which are not present in the draft Local Plan:
• a ‘brownfield first’ policy for new building
• a policy to minimise the number of new buildings and developments in the Greater Cambridge region
• a policy to halt the use of scarce farmland for solar energy generation and instead

ensure that solar installations are mandated on all industrial buildings, new and existing.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59573 (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 59912 (Fen Ditton)

Summary of issues raised:
Planners should encourage and preferably enforce carbon neutral/eco-friendly developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59824 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Reuse of existing buildings should be emphasised over new build.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59912 (Fen Ditton), 60193 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised:
Objections to policy include:
• The policies as written are aspirational rather than achievable.
• The cost, cost sharing and carbon footprint of district heating/cooling needs to be investigated and a comparison made of air source and ground source heat pumps.
• It is insufficient to treat each building in isolation.
• The role of the grid to supply part of the demand must be described since this has access to low cost and carbon sources as well as providing resilience.
• The role of hot water storage should be described since this avoids use of power in short duration peak periods.
• Does the Plan envisage “smart” demands that avoid short duration peaks in the system?

Comments highlighting this issue:
59912 (Fen Ditton)

Summary of issues raised:
According to the recent Cambridge and Peterborough Climate Commission report, at the present rate the Region will have used up all of its carbon budget, allocated to meet its legal obligation to reach zero carbon by 2050, in less than six years; due to the level of planned growth, emissions will accelerate further. The obvious conclusion is that all unsustainable growth has to be curbed. Imported emissions arising from construction (the UK imports most of its building materials, even the bricks are made in Belgium or Holland), must be reduced if the UK is to meet its now legal emission targets. The intensification of housing in Cambridge should use sustainable building techniques based around wood and recycled materials.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59946 (O Harwood)

Summary of issues raised:
Should not be specific about not connecting a gas pipe to new housing. This might prevent the future distribution of Hydrogen. Should keep this option open.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59999 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Concerns about how heat pump technology can be installed and used at reasonable cost in new development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60122 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised:
The definition of a Net Zero Carbon building set out in the Evidence Base does not include its embodied carbon: this is a very serious omission. Support recognition of embodied carbon, also whole life carbon (see CC/CE).
Comments highlighting this issue:
60193 (J Preston), 60242 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60746 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Require whole-life assessments whenever demolition of an existing building is proposed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60193 (J Preston), 60746 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to parts A and B, we recognise the need to move towards greater energy efficiency but this should be done via a nationally consistent set of standards and timetable e.g. Future Homes Standard which is universally understood and technically implementable.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60168 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised:
The Government have confirmed that local authorities are able to set policy requirements related to carbon reduction in their local plans. However, paragraph 6-012 of PPG states that for new housing this can only be up to the equivalent of level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. This is roughly the equivalent to a 20% improvement on the 2013 Building Regulations and will soon be superseded by the proposed changes to building regulations. A policy proposing its own standards is not consistent with national policy. Councils should comply with the Government’s intention of setting standards for energy efficiency through Building Regulations and not set its own standards as part of the local plan. The Councils’ proposed approach

to energy use and efficiency in policy CC/NZ will only cause confusion in its implementation and enforcement with seemingly little additional improvement in energy efficiency. By requiring additional standards, the Council will require additional assessments to be applied in parallel to building regulations creating confusion and adding costs.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60168 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to part C – in some cases it may not be possible to meet the required standard due to site-specific viability and deliverability issues, and this should be recognised in the policy. The policy also makes no allowance for the decarbonisation of the national grid. Such improvements will need to be considered within any assessment of energy use and the level of onsite renewable energy that is required to be generated.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60168 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised:
In relation to part D – development should deliver the energy efficiency improvement required by building regulations and where feasible and viable meet some of its energy demand through onsite renewable energy generation. Further offsetting should not be required.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60168 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised:
There are serious quality control challenges in relation to whether aspirational aims are actually delivered. Outline planning permissions must be subject to the aspirations articulated in the Draft Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60242 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised:
Gladman are supportive of attempts to reduce carbon, however new buildings and residential developments will be built in accordance with the Building Regulations at the time of their construction.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60313 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:

Residential developments of 150 homes or more and non-residential development of 1,000 m² or more should calculate whole life carbon emissions through a nationally

recognised Whole Life Carbon Assessment and demonstrate actions to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions. This should include reducing emissions associated with construction plant.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60313 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised:

In Greater Cambridgeshire 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. The local plan has identified the need for “smart” power networks with greater capacity for new developments. As part of these new developments, section 106 agreements must be negotiated to help rural residents also install renewables. There are many rooves in these areas that would benefit from solar PV with batteries plugged into this “smart” network.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60489 (Grantchester PC)

Summary of issues raised:

Policy direction needs to be strengthening. Recommendations include: • applying more rigorous standards, concerns over delivery.
• Welcome policy applying to minor developments and temporary buildings.
• Use of sustainable materials. Reuse and recycling of materials should be favoured. The use of timber from sustainably managed (ideally UK) woodland should be promoted. Lime mortar should be used instead of cement wherever possible. Finally, buildings should be designed for longevity.
• Offsetting: welcome the conditions set out under ‘Part D’ (page 146) that limit the use of offsetting. It is important that offsetting is genuinely a last resort and is not used by developers to avoid meeting net zero requirements on-site. The carbon accounting for any offsetting schemes applied must be rigorous and transparent.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60746 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Table of site-specific comments posted under ‘CC/NZ: Net Zero carbon new buildings’

Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Carbon expenditure, emissions, and embedded carbon to decommission a fully operational waste water treatment plant 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 Policy S/NEC

Comments highlighting this issue:

58067 (Horningsea Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We have committed to being a net zero company by 2030 and have released a Pathfinder report and action plan that would be applied to Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58199 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Marshall supports the net zero requirement of the Local Plan, which aligns with the ambitions at Cambridge East. The aspirations look to achieve net zero operational carbon and embodied carbon. Any remaining carbon will be offset at a site, local, and regional scale.

Marshall also welcome the prospect of developing a more detailed approach to the use of materials with low embodied carbon, and to the achievement of a circular economy. Whilst carbon reduction is an intrinsic aspect of Cambridge East, we welcome more specific emerging policies so that we can work with the authorities to test our vision.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58434 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Croudace Homes support such initiatives. They are already developing to the standard of New Homes and fully intended to deliver housing at Fowlmere, were it to come forward, to the highest building and sustainability standards.

These and the other environmental policies demonstrate that development should not be promoted based on transport links alone, but rather wider regard has to be had to the scope of the site for development of the highest sustainability standards in terms of energy consumption, access to renewable and sensitivity to, and ability to work with, the immediate environment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58557 (Croudace Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The promoted development Caxton Gibbet, will be net zero carbon in operation, taking a holistic approach that implements energy efficient buildings alongside a dedicated solar farm and solar PV on roofs. Given the fast pace of technological advancement and evolution, the development will assess the available options at the time of construction to be able to deliver a sustainable, viable, project.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58594 (Endurance Estates- Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The full carbon cost of the NEC site is not described. Claiming the NEC is the most sustainable brownfield site is disingenuous because it isn't a brownfield site - it has a recently upgraded, fully operational sewage plant on the site, and a range of industrial/commercial businesses. The area is being turned into a brownfield site by destroying the plant and moving the businesses. The carbon cost of destroying the plant, decontaminating, digging new tunnelling and constructing a new plant, less than a mile away is extremely carbon intensive and wasteful.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59202 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Utilising recycling systems, Assessment suggests large sites are able to successfully use recycling to reduce demand for potable water. Disagree. New development (regardless of scale) is able to adopt rainwater recycling systems. Land to East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn, can adopt rainwater recycling system if required. Assessment also identifies potential for introducing flood management and SuDS schemes to deliver multifunctional benefits including biodiversity enhancements. Land to East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn can deliver.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58741 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Consideration will need to be given to whether the CWWTPR would be subject to Policy CC/NZ which governs the energy intensity of new commercial buildings. The project will set out in the application the full carbon benefits of the relocation from freeing up a low carbon location for homes, through minimising embedded carbon in construction to being net zero (or better) in operation. This will then align with the emerging carbon and climate change policy in the current draft suite of Energy NPS which is likely to be mirrored in the update to the Wastewater NPS.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60459 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

To meet these policy objectives, North Cambourne MGH will use the energy hierarchy, reducing demand for heating through efficient design and adopting measures consistent with those in the Future Homes Standard consultation.
Site will not be connected to the gas grid, employing all-electric systems and considering opportunities to use waste heat and to share heat between domestic and non-domestic uses. We would look to maximise renewable energy generation through onsite means aiming to achieve net zero emissions without offsetting where possible. Carbon offsetting would only be used as a last resort. Whole life carbon assessment would also be undertaken in line with current RUCS best practice guidance.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57896 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The council should adopt FHS rather than the policy's high standards, because there would a consistent, deliverable standard for all new dwellings in Greater Cambridge thereby providing a level playing field for all housing developers. For Bourn Airfield this would provide opportunities for smaller housebuilders and self-build to deploy the same high standard even if this was for a limited number of plots.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59544 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We support clear and evidenced based requirements but request that policy provide some flexibility to include for site-specific circumstances and changing standards, legislation and technology. Policy should also recognise the importance of a fabric first approach. We have committed to being a net zero company by 2030 and have released a Pathfinder report and action plan that would be applied to Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58199 (Countryside Properties)

CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think'> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of representations for this policy: 68

Executive Summary

There was strong support for the policy direction from a range of public bodies and individuals. Many representations expressed concern about the level of water stress in the area and damage to chalk streams, and stated that there should be a limit on growth if there is insufficient water or until further water supply is available. The Environment Agency and Natural England identified that the Water Cycle Strategy will need to demonstrate how water to meet growth needs will be supplied sustainably. Other comments related to the collaborative working that will be needed and that there will be more detail about this future supply in the Water Resources Management Plans being produced by the water companies.

There was support for the proposal to require high water efficiency standards, noting the potential of rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling to achieve these. However, there were also representations from developers saying that 80 litres per person per day is unrealistic and would have an impact on the viability of developments, and that the Building Regulations level of 110 litres should be used. Some representations from developers and landowners highlighted some of the potential problems with rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling such as maintenance issues, where there is limited roof collection (such as flats) and that rainwater is limited in this part of the country. There were some suggestions on the policy wording. For example, whether the standard would apply to all sizes of developments, if BREEAM is the right tool to use for non-housing developments and is the term "unless demonstrated impracticable" too weak, giving developers a let-out. The Environment Agency stated that to ensure the policy is effective, further guidance would be needed regarding the evidence applicants would be expected to submit to demonstrate that this standard has been achieved and how this would be monitored.

Table of representations for Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Carbon expenditure, emissions, and embedded carbon to decommission a fully operational waste water treatment plant 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 Policy S/NEC

Comments highlighting this issue:

58067 (Horningsea Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We have committed to being a net zero company by 2030 and have released a Pathfinder report and action plan that would be applied to Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58199 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Marshall supports the net zero requirement of the Local Plan, which aligns with the ambitions at Cambridge East. The aspirations look to achieve net zero operational carbon and embodied carbon. Any remaining carbon will be offset at a site, local, and regional scale.

Marshall also welcome the prospect of developing a more detailed approach to the use of materials with low embodied carbon, and to the achievement of a circular economy. Whilst carbon reduction is an intrinsic aspect of Cambridge East, we welcome more specific emerging policies so that we can work with the authorities to test our vision.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58434 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Croudace Homes support such initiatives. They are already developing to the standard of New Homes and fully intended to deliver housing at Fowlmere, were it to come forward, to the highest building and sustainability standards.

These and the other environmental policies demonstrate that development should not be promoted based on transport links alone, but rather wider regard has to be had to the scope of the site for development of the highest sustainability standards in terms of energy consumption, access to renewable and sensitivity to, and ability to work with, the immediate environment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58557 (Croudace Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The promoted development Caxton Gibbet, will be net zero carbon in operation, taking a holistic approach that implements energy efficient buildings alongside a dedicated solar farm and solar PV on roofs. Given the fast pace of technological advancement and evolution, the development will assess the available options at the time of construction to be able to deliver a sustainable, viable, project.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58594 (Endurance Estates- Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
The full carbon cost of the NEC site is not described. Claiming the NEC is the most sustainable brownfield site is disingenuous because it isn't a brownfield site - it has a recently upgraded, fully operational sewage plant on the site, and a range of industrial/commercial businesses. The area is being turned into a brownfield site by destroying the plant and moving the businesses. The carbon cost of destroying the plant, decontaminating, digging new tunnelling and constructing a new plant, less than a mile away is extremely carbon intensive and wasteful.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59202 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Utilising recycling systems, Assessment suggests large sites are able to successfully use recycling to reduce demand for potable water. Disagree. New development (regardless of scale) is able to adopt rainwater recycling systems. Land to East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn, can adopt rainwater recycling system if required. Assessment also identifies potential for introducing flood management and SuDS schemes to deliver multifunctional benefits including biodiversity enhancements. Land to East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn can deliver.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58741 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
Consideration will need to be given to whether the CWWTPR would be subject to Policy CC/NZ which governs the energy intensity of new commercial buildings. The project will set out in the application the full carbon benefits of the relocation from freeing up a low carbon location for homes, through minimising embedded carbon in construction to being net zero (or better) in operation. This will then align with the emerging carbon and climate change policy in the current draft suite of Energy NPS which is likely to be mirrored in the update to the Wastewater NPS.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60459 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
To meet these policy objectives, North Cambourne MGH will use the energy hierarchy, reducing demand for heating through efficient design and adopting measures consistent with those in the Future Homes Standard consultation.
Site will not be connected to the gas grid, employing all-electric systems and considering opportunities to use waste heat and to share heat between domestic and non-domestic uses. We would look to maximise renewable energy generation

through onsite means aiming to achieve net zero emissions without offsetting where possible. Carbon offsetting would only be used as a last resort. Whole life carbon assessment would also be undertaken in line with current RUCS best practice guidance.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57896 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
The council should adopt FHS rather than the policy's high standards, because there would a consistent, deliverable standard for all new dwellings in Greater Cambridge thereby providing a level playing field for all housing developers. For Bourn Airfield this would provide opportunities for smaller housebuilders and self-build to deploy the same high standard even if this was for a limited number of plots.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59544 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised in comments:
We support clear and evidenced based requirements but request that policy provide some flexibility to include for site-specific circumstances and changing standards, legislation and technology. Policy should also recognise the importance of a fabric first approach. We have committed to being a net zero company by 2030 and have released a Pathfinder report and action plan that would be applied to Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58199 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

What support will be available for developers in seeking to meet the high proposed standards? Will potential impact on viability be taken into consideration? It would be useful to include further guidance in an SPD.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57093 (C King), 57296 (Charlotte Sawyer Nutt), 59144 (Endurance Estates), 60287 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60334 (S & J Graves), 60338 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60349 (F.C. Butler Trust 2nd comment), 60362 (H.J. Molton Settlement), 60387 (D Wright), 60472 (P, J & M Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Add into the policy:
• Any development larger than 3 houses must create ponds.
• Underground tanks should be a last resort
• Full and published mapping survey must be carried out and the neighbourhood must be consulted on full-length of watercourses and discharge points to the main

river points, e.g., the Cam.
• Analysis of the quality of water (to measure pollutants) as well as analysis of quantity flow must be measured for a period of a year before and evidence given before permits are given to discharge water into open or culverted ditches.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57133 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Local Plan posits a significant increase in housing, which assumes sufficient water will be available to meet the housing's needs. However, the GCLP strategy states there is an inadequate supply. No proposals have been put forward to address this, therefore the housing strategy has no basis in reality.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57146 (Oakington & Westwick PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The target is too onerous. The current Building Regulations standard of 110 litres/person/day is more realistic. The Council's policy on water efficiency should adopt a flexible approach and encourage the use rainwater harvesting in new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57169 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57241 (European Property Ventures)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Incorporation of water efficiency measures for new developments could boost the acceptance amongst developers of these approaches and improve market demand for them.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57366 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy requirements are significantly lower than current requirements. It would be appropriate to wait until the Water Resource Management Plan in 2022 to assess whether such extreme measures on water consumption reduction is necessary. A goal of 100–110 litres per day would be more appropriate and achievable.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57382 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We would like to see the policy strengthened, so that development can only proceed where there was adequate, proven availability of water, without depleting the aquifer

and without incurring the energy and carbon cost of long-distance water transfer.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57770 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The policy only sets a water standard per home. This will limit the overall increase in water demand, but the Cambridge area is already in severe water stress. The policy should include a limit based on the absolute water stress of the Cambridge area. The criterion should be included in this part of the document to ensure that developers address the actual problem.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57897 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

A limit on water consumption must also be applied to commercial and industrial premises.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58036 (D Blake)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Designing for 80 litres/person/day is a good policy, but there are better gains by designing for zero people consuming zero litres per day. With global warming there is not sufficient water supply in the Cambridge area to justify increasing the population.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58059 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Water supply is in our area is clearly limited and this can potentially limit the rate of house building in the area. I would support mandating new developments provide a solution to harvest rainwater and potentially allow grey water reuse.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57824 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It is unlikely that the 80 litres per person per day target will be achievable through low flow fittings alone. The potential to include rainwater harvesting should therefore be investigated in more detail, and rainwater harvesting systems employed at a building level or used in conjunction with the site-wide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) features to provide a centralised rainwater collection system.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57897 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Achieving all five BREEAM WAT01 water conservation credits is an extremely challenging standard that is likely to go beyond the limits of viability for smaller projects, projects with limited roof collection area, and projects with functions that do not fit the BREEAM standardised calculation methodology.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58501 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is a risk of 'white elephant' grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting systems that are too small to be sustainable in terms of operating cost. We ask that guidance on the appropriate threshold of viability be provided; ideally in the form of worked examples for different building types.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58501 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

What if 80L per person per day is impractical? More work is needed such as pushing for more grey water systems.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57807 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We acknowledge there are issues with over-abstraction of Chalk aquifer that has a detrimental impact on environmental conditions.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58744 (Wates Development Ltd), 58759 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We are concerned that the Aspinal Verdi Viability Study (2021) uses cost figures greater than 7 years out of date and recommend figures are updated to ensure evidence is sound. We remain concerned, therefore, whether a 2% uplift represents a sufficient increase in build costs to allow for the delivery of CC/WE.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58744 (Wates Development Ltd), 58759 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

80 litres/person/day target not considered realistic. Instead, 110 litres/person/day – the Building Regulations limit – should be encouraged. May be appropriate to set tighter standards for certain site allocations.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58744 (Wates Development Ltd), 58759 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58677 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We support the position that no proposed development can go ahead in the Local Plan until more water is found. We encourage all relevant authorities to go further and to ensure that water efficiency measures are introduced even for the existing developments to enable the aquifer to recover within a reasonable timescale.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59102 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment (November 2020) recommends growth be concentrated in new settlements or urban extensions that avoid high flood risk and have high standards for design of flood risk management, water usage and re-use, and blue-green infrastructure.
We dispute why development within the Minor Rural Centres and Group Villages have been disregarded as part of an appropriate growth strategy when these sites are able to meet ambitious water usage targets and implement water recycling systems.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58744 (Wates Development Ltd), 58759 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Coordination with every organisation involved in the water supply is essential

Comments highlighting this issue:

59309 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Notes the Stantec report and the requirement for strategic intervention on water supply, presumably a new reservoir or pipeline.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59479 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Both rainwater harvesting and/or greywater recycling systems introduce significant maintenance requirements (and therefore cost) for homeowners and introduce technology that has not been tested ‘en-masse’. Countryside’s and Taylor Wimpey’s experience of trialling grey water recycling is that it is unreliable and likely to cause maintenance issues for homeowners.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59546 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59949 (Taylor Wimpey), 60604 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Countryside and Taylor Wimpey believe that the GCLP should implement the Government's technical standard for water efficiency which is 110 lpppd. This would be viable, deliverable, and achievable for all new dwellings within GC. Should technology such as grey water recycling become viable during the lifetime of the plan then this could be considered as a means to improve water efficiency beyond the target of 110 lpppd.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59546 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59949 (Taylor Wimpey), 60604 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Countryside and Taylor Wimpey believe the only practical mechanism to achieve the 80lpppd would be using rainwater harvesting systems. This brings two problems

• They are more difficult for flats given that communal harvesting tanks (which are more expensive) would be necessary.

• Greater Cambridge is already one of the driest areas in the UK. Given that climate change will reduce rainfall in GC, it is unlikely that rainwater harvesting will capture sufficient rain to meet the policy target, making it ineffective.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59546 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59949 (Taylor Wimpey), 60604 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments, is not going to solve the potable water crisis affecting Cambridgeshire, a crisis which is only likely to deepen if the report written by Stantec for the Shared Planning Service is ignored.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59576 (Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE))

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Anglian Water's proposed solution to this problem, pumping water from North Lincolnshire, appears completely impracticable because the Environment Agency, in the same report, has also classified North Lincolnshire as an area of serious water stress.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59576 (Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE))

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Another solution being considered by Anglian Water, according to Water Resources East, is to build two reservoirs in the Fens. However, this idea seems to completely ignore the fact of sea level rise which will likely cause much, if not all, of the Fens to be flooded by sea water within decades.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59576 (Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE))

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Our members questioned whether low water use targets can be met through design and construction methods alone, given that there are no restrictions on how much water people can use.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58617 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

No objections

Comments highlighting this issue:

59706 (Caldecote PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Proposed requirements for developments to provide integrated water management, including sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) where possible and for SuDS and green /brown roofs to provide multiple benefits (including biodiversity and amenity) are welcomed.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59973 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

As noted with policy S/DS, the evidence base (IWMS Detailed WCS) will need to demonstrate how the water companies' plans can meet the needs of growth without causing unsustainable abstraction and associated deterioration. We offer our support to work on this collaboratively with the interested parties both ahead of the next consultation in 2022 and beyond.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59722 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Water neutrality should also be explored, noting the references made to water reuse and offsetting.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59722 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Currently the policy direction has a caveat of ‘unless demonstrated impracticable.’ This should be explored further in the WCS so the Council has clear guidance on the circumstances where achieving this standard would be impracticable. This will help ensure planning applications can be fairly and reasonably assessed. This will also help ensure the overall goal of the policy is not weakened or undermined.
Similarly this evidence needs to be drawn out for the non-residential standard. The WCS should also set out the backstop position should the standard of 80 litres/person/day be practicably unachievable.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59722 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We are concerned that the plan is currently unlikely to achieve the kinds of reductions in demand needed to keep the proposed levels of growth within sustainable levels. The WCS will need to demonstrate how water, to meet growth needs, will be supplied sustainably without adverse impact to the natural environment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59722 (Environment Agency), 59973 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We support stringent water efficiency in water stressed areas. We recommend reviewing the document ‘The State of the Environment: Water Resources’ (2018) prepared by the Environment Agency.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59722 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Page 150 references the Shared regional principles for protecting, restoring and enhancing the environment in the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. We recommend this is also considered and referenced elsewhere in the plan with regards to net zero, net gain, tree cover and strategic resource infrastructure provision.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59722 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

As GCSP notes, it will need to be satisfied that this standard can be legally and practically implemented in the context of current legislation, national policy and building regulations. This affects the practical implementation of this policy. It would need to be determined the evidence/metric applicants would be expected to submit

to demonstrate this standard has been achieved. It would also need to be evidenced how the policy standards would be implemented, and how this would be monitored to ensure the policy is effective.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59722 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Asks for clarity about which measurement will be used in general, i.e., is it the 80 litres, 110 or 125?

Comments highlighting this issue:

59825 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Recognise that water is a major issue, but the Local Plan should address this issue comprehensively

Comments highlighting this issue:

59857 (Barrington PC), 60434 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Object because the policy needs further investigation. The cost and carbon content of reuse should not be excessive given that c.90% of all water used in buildings could otherwise be treated at a WWTW and then be available to meet minimum environmental minimum flows or other demands downstream.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59913 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The reliance on reduced demand must not act as a fig leaf cover for an increase in the use of drought orders and restricted supply at times of shortage.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59913 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire already have an unsustainable supply of potable water. In 2021 the Environment Agency published “Water stressed areas – final classification 2021”, included the fact that the supply areas of Cambridge Water and Anglian Water are areas of serious water stress. Appendix 3 states Cambridge Water needs to reduce abstraction by 22 megalitres per day from levels current at 1st July 2021, and Anglian Water needs to reduce abstraction by 189 megalitres per day from levels current at 1st July 2021.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59947 (O Harwood)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Council have noted that the position regarding future supply and the necessary infrastructure to meet demands is still uncertain and that more detail will be known on publication of the next Water Resource Management Plan in 2022. Should the necessary infrastructure be provided to address the demands in this area then the Council will need to review the necessity of the 80 litre per person per day requirement.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60167 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

To achieve any 'water neutrality' from the current position will require substantial reductions in demand commensurate with any and every development envisaged. The track record of our resource management is so bad that we have little confidence in any major development improving things without a huge cultural change and management change to the water industry operations. This is really urgent.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60173 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In our report 'Let it Flow!' we proposed that consumption might be regulated by the local authority. We do recognise that this would require Central Government legislation and action, but why not? Local authorities play a much stronger role in controlling water use in similarly water stressed regions. Our local water companies currently propose little more than 'targeted communication' to encourage voluntary reductions in water use during prolonged dry weather. Local authorities should join us in pressing for mandatory restrictions on consumptive uses every summer, with such restrictions being rapidly tightened and widened if 'dry weather' turns into 'drought'.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60173 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Welcome target for water efficiency, want further detail on how target will be enforced and monitored.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60747 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Although it is stated that water supply is not within the remit, the importance of "making full use of water re-use measures on site including rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling" is acknowledged. We would like to see details of how this will be achieved. Ideally we feel that rainwater harvesting and grey water use in new developments should be mandatory and designed in from the start.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60747 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We are not clear to what extent wastewater management falls within the remit of the Local Plan. However, sewage management is a critical element of sustainability for new developments and we would like to see more information on this, or signposting to where such information exists.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60747 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Anglian Water asks that further evidence is developed with the two water companies to maximise water efficiency in all new development going beyond the adopted policy of 110 litres/person/day. The reduction in water use coupled with measures such as grey water re-use is the first step in reducing the need for additional water and wastewater capacity arising from new development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60453 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There should be a legal break stopping construction if new water provision for the region cannot be ensured.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58308 (I Butnar)

Table of site-specific comments posted under 'CC/WE: Water efficiency in new develpoments'

Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In relation to Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment (November 2020), it states that by utilising recycling systems, large sites are able to successfully use recycling to reduce demand for potable water. We disagree and assert that new development (regardless of scale) is able to adopt rainwater

recycling systems. Land West of London Road, Fowlmere and Land to the East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn can adopt rainwater recycling system if required.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58744 (Wates Development Ltd), 58759 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Assessment (November 2020) also identifies potential for introducing flood management and SuDS schemes to deliver multifunctional benefits including biodiversity enhancements. Land West of London Road, Fowlmere and Land to the East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn represents an opportunity for delivering a scheme which includes SuDS that provide multifunctional benefits including an opportunity to benefit and enhance designated wildlife sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58744 (Wates Development Ltd), 58759 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (Policy S/RRA/CR) can incorporate a range of measures to ensure the delivery of a water efficient development, with homes and buildings using water efficient fixtures and fittings. Water re-use measures will be explored for the site.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58203 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

North Cambourne (Policy S/CB) will aim to reduce potable water consumption to the levels set out above by utilising low flow fixtures and fittings throughout the development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57897 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Recognise the complexities of water scarcity and the Local Plan’s measurements to improve water efficiency. Water efficiency, rainwater harvesting, and greywater harvesting will be intrinsic to the emerging water management strategy at Cambridge East from the outset. However, Marshall recognises that additional strategic water strategies will be required to facilitate the wider Local Plan. Cambridge East (S/CE) is keen to liaise with WRE and stakeholders in order to formulate a solution.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58446 (Marshall Group Properties)

CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of representations for this policy: 39

Executive Summary

Support for the policy was expressed within representations from a variety of respondents; several proposed additional elements to include in the policy such as site-wide adaptive measures, green walls and sustainable drainage systems. Other respondents, such as Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, questioned the applicability of some of the policy’s technical stipulations which could require rephrasing elements of the policy’s wording. Respondents also disagreed about the scope of the policy. Some, such as the Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group, thought it should go further and provide targets for developers to meet. Contrastingly, some respondents, including the Home Builders Federation, felt that the councils had not adequately considered how the policy would affect the viability of housebuilding. Several respondents, such as Countryside Properties, also asserted that this was not a matter for planning but should be left to Building Regulations.

Table for Policy CC/DC

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for policy
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals
56505 (D Clay), 60124 (C Blakeley)
Public Bodies
56617 (Gamlingay PC), 56880 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council), 58412 (Linton PC), 59192 (Cambourne TC), 59723 (Environment Agency), 60435 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Third Sector Organisations
57020 (The Wildlife Trust), 57771 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58619 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59029 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
58210 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd), 58452 (Marshall Group Properties), 58559 (Croudace Homes), 58754 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company a joint venture

between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme), 58755 (Wates Development Ltd), 58765 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy needs to be adopted as soon as possible
Comments highlighting this issue:
56505 (D Clay)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

More detail is needed to ensure commercial developments do not suffer from, or contribute to, flood risk after prolonged periods of rain or flash flooding and their operation does not contribute to released heat production.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56868 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57615 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Agree in principle but changes are needed, including:
• Policy needs to be extended beyond residential to large industrial developments and effort made to convert existing buildings, such as shops.
• New buildings should use alternative entrance methods to preserve heat and reduce CO2 production, and where possible efforts should be made to adjust existing retail buildings.
• Tree cover as a cooling mechanism cannot be achieved quickly in large urban developments but grass cover, which contributes equally to CO2 absorption, has similar effects and green landscaping allows surface drainage.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56868 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In relation to the ‘design-led’ approach on p.33, how does one decide which approach is applicable?
Comments highlighting this issue:
56880 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Could it be considered obligatory to use TM59 on larger developments?
Comments highlighting this issue:
56880 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Would CIBSE TM52 be appropriate for non-domestic buildings

Comments highlighting this issue:

56880 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It would be good to ensure that drainage and SuDS are included in this policy. We are receiving more queries on whether surface water proposals are going to include consideration for climate change, so having this written in policy would be useful.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56946 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The current wording in relation to the cooling hierarchy proposed within this policy is too technical and will be difficult to work in practice. This is contrary to paragraph 16 (d) of the NPPF that requires Plans to contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57170 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57243 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Persimmon Homes state that it is not appropriate to refer to guidance within policy as this can be ever-changing and is guidance not set policy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57383 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Incomplete policy – Expand to include industrial developments

Comments highlighting this issue:

57539 (C Martin), 57615 (J Pratt), 56868 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Passive measures should be the top priority for keeping buildings cool in the heat waves that are to come, as this will reduce the overall cost, reduce energy consumption and improve wellbeing

Comments highlighting this issue:

57771 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

No mention of installing Ground Source Heat Pumps underneath Green Spaces. If these community systems are not put in before the infrastructure, it will be expensive to retrofit.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57808 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The desire for large areas of glass on modern residential buildings without adequate shading results in a large warming effect on the dwelling. Consideration should be given to this with a warming environment and passive solutions mandated to avoid overheating and further energy use for cooling.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57820 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The policy does not set any limits for how many homes need to be passively designed and built, just a priority ordering, which will be left up to the developer to choose from with no clear goals to reach.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57989 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

These and the other environmental policies demonstrate that development should not be promoted on the basis of transport links alone, but rather wider regard has to be had to the scope of the site for development of the highest sustainability standards in terms of energy consumption, access to renewable and sensitivity to, and ability to work with, the immediate environment.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58559 (Croudace Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

BREEAM excellent should be required for all public buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58619 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Aspinall Verdi Viability Study states no additional build cost has been included, as it is assumed heat mitigation can be built into design at no additional cost. Whilst there may be scope to introduce some passive design through materials, the hierarchy also includes mechanical ventilation. Mechanical Ventilation is not included within typical build cost, and we therefore raise concerns whether viability has accounted for sufficient costs to fully deliver Policy across all developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58755 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58765 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The policy direction should apply to the delivery of new floorspace only.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58979 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Not necessarily relevant to high-level policy wording, we would expect GC to develop guidance on design – eg: use of biodiverse and/or biosolar roofs (not sedum), the need for SuDS source control, the necessity for biodiverse planting schemes and trees suitable to the climate conditions we expect etc.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59029 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Although this also relates to CC/NZ, we would also draw your attention to the use of green walls to help regulate building temperature and provide insulation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59029 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Site wide approaches should include appropriate lower densities through good design which allow for beyond minimum garden space and space for SuDS and open space and greening.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60124 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Councils' viability assessment consider this policy to be deliverable at no extra cost. However, there could be additional costs associated with this policy and it will be necessary that these extra costs are factored into the viability assessment to ensure they are fully considered.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60166 (Home Builders Federation), 58979 (Metro Property Unit Trust).

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Whilst the HBF accept that new homes must be designed to take account of the impacts of climate change we do not agree with the Councils' assertion that they should be designed using the Good Homes Alliance Overheating in New Homes Tool and Guidance. As such we would suggest that any references to such toolkits are made outside of policy.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60166 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Comments relating to water, include:
• The reservoir provision alone will not be sufficient for the demand unless water neutrality is assured in new development.
• We agree with the national Environment Agency that only a 60–70% reduction in present abstraction will return our rivers to more normal flow
• We also question the Government's calculation of the overall risks from climate change to future population growth in this region, which seem to be increasing.
• Until the proposed Fens and South Lincolnshire reservoirs come online in the 2030s, the companies must cap abstraction and supply all new demand in Greater Cambridgeshire by water transfers from surface water sources to the west and the north. They also need to invest in compulsory metering, leakage reduction and demand management. The local authorities should do everything in their power to support this dramatic readjustment in our water supplies.
• Companies treating wastewater should invest in spill monitoring, stormwater storage, and phosphate reduction to 0.2 mg/l total phosphorus, at all works that discharge to Chalk streams
• Recognising that all Chalk streams now lie within 'areas of serious water stress', they should establish a new baseline of annual restrictions on water use and tighten these as necessary in response to environmental as well as supply triggers.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60172 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Further research needs to be undertaken to understand the future challenges we face.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60435 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Highlight need to consider impact of extreme weather events on existing buildings as well as new ones, and the need for buildings to be kept in good condition.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60748 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate, is 'closing the stable door after the horse has bolted'.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59575 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In 2021, the government varied out consultation on new building regulation requirements. Policy CC/DC should be deleted on the grounds that its objectives will be required via Building Regulations which have been proposed by the national government and this policy would therefore be unsound on the basis that it is introducing an unnecessary additional burden on development given that it duplicates the requirement of the building regulations.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59547 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59950 (Taylor Wimpey), 60605 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

This policy may be ineffective as it requires each developer to implement the guidance in a manner that is appropriate for their site and which therefore may differ from one development to the next.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59547 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60605 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton Site), 59950 (Taylor Wimpey)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Welcome the reference to site wide approaches to reduce climate risks. However, criticisms of policy include:
• In the context of flooding and climate change it would also be appropriate to reference flood resistance and resilience measures. In their representation, they have referenced specific planning policy guidance.
• Site wide approaches should also include adaptive measures such as setting a development away from a river so it is easier to improve flood defences in the future.
• Making space for water to flood and be stored will be critical to long term adaptation. Planning to avoid future flood risk is as much about creating storage or contributing to nature-based flood risk reduction measures as it is avoiding flooding to new properties.
• Recommend GCSP also consider the ADEPT local authority guidance on preparing for a changing climate (2019) and the new TCPA The Climate Crisis, A Guide for Local Authorities on Planning for Climate Change (October 2021).
• The Fens Baseline Report indicates that rising sea levels to 2115 will mean water will not drain by gravity to the sea, requiring the pumping of vast quantities of water. The carbon and engineering implications of this are significant but not yet calculated. There is a compelling case for surface water to infiltrate into permeable ground

ensuring that water resources are not depleted of water. In areas of less permeable geology, net gains in surface water attenuation and re-use of the water as ‘green water’ in homes, businesses or agriculture has been considered through this study.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59723 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support but would like to see additional emphasis given to existing buildings.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59914 (Fen Ditton PC)

Table of site-specific comments posted under ‘CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate’

Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The site Land to the East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn offers opportunity to deliver low carbon housing, electronic charging points, promote low water consumption/water recycling and is in proximity to sustainable forms of transport
Comments highlighting this issue:
58765 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The site Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn will benefit from the action plan set out in the ‘Pathfinder: Net Zero’ report to deliver its commitments. Key elements include:
• Following a fabric first approach to the design of dwellings to achieve high levels of efficiency through improving window glazing, air tightness, roof insulation, wall thickness and improved floor insulation and underfloor heating.
• Apply the principles of their energy hierarchy to help reduce both regulated and unregulated energy usage. This includes supplying only A-rated energy efficient appliances, using smart meters and smart thermostats to reduce energy consumption by learning living and heating patterns, developing a suite of e-learning packages and support material to help households reduce consumption and live more efficiently.
• The site presents an opportunity to provide significant landscaping as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan. This can contribute to urban greening and increasing tree canopy across the site, which is currently an arable field, reducing climate risks through landscape design.
• In relation to sustainable drainage, it was confirmed through the previous outline

application that a suitable drainage system can be delivered as part of the proposals that incorporates the use of SuDS, doesn't increase the risk of flooding on or off site and accounts for climate change allowances.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58210 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Cambridge East is being designed to mitigate and respond to climate change. Buildings will be designed to reduce overheating given their proposed orientation, ventilation, and through the appropriate design of streets and green infrastructure. Site wide approaches will also be adopted, including SuDS and urban greening.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58452 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

If the Fowlmere site was to come forward, it would be built to the highest building and sustainability standards

Comments highlighting this issue:

58559 (Croudace Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Our scheme for North Cambourne will utilise a site-wide approach to reduce climate risks, including:

• The integration of sustainable drainage systems as part of the landscape design, the use of urban greening to reduce heat build-up in developed areas through increased tree canopy cover and integrated green space.

• Heat gain into buildings will be minimised through fenestration design and external shading where needed.

• Natural ventilation strategies will be employed to ensure buildings are able to purge excess heat effectively.

• All overheating measures will be thoroughly tested in accordance with the Good Homes Alliance Overheating Tool to ensure the risk of overheating is minimised.

• Additional analysis will be conducted where required, accounting for future weather scenarios with increased air temperatures.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57898 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy should be expanded to include Waste Water Treatment Plant proposal to relocate to Honey Hill, especially the office block and visitor centre.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57615 (J Pratt)

CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think'> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of representations for this policy: 48

Executive Summary

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy. Several respondents, including Cambridgeshire County Council and the Environment Agency, thought the policy was going in the right direction by managing water on site at source. There was support for incorporating brown/green roofs where practical, use of permeable surfaces and use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) as ways to reduce flooding in new development. Many comments highlighted the impacts of climate change and the effects on weather and flooding and that this would need to be considered. There were comments from Anglian Water on the benefits of sustainable drainage systems for improving water quality and reducing the amount of water entering the wastewater system.

The Environment Agency thought that the scope of the policy needed to be widened to reduce flood risk in a more holistic manner including securing both mitigation and betterment through growth. Similarly, the Cam Valley Forum proposed including areas for storage of flood waters. Organisations including Historic England argued that the policy needed to ensure that the design of SuDS would not harm other aspects of the built or natural environment. Several organisations, such as the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, objected to the policy on the grounds that it was inadequate to deal with the increased flood risks in the area. Wates Development argued that sites of all scales and not just large sites can adopt ambitious water use targets and implement water recycling systems.

Table of representations for Policy CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for policy approach
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals
60125 (C Blakeley)
Public Bodies
56618 (Gamlingay PC), 59194 (Cambourne PC), 59316 (Cambridgeshire and

Peterborough Combined Authority), 59724 (Environment Agency), 59823 (Dry Drayton PC), 59915 (Fen Ditton PC), 59974 (Natural England), 60436 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 60454 (Anglian Water), 60479 (Anglian Water 2nd comment), 56947 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Third Sector Organisations

56905 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57021 (The Wildlife Trust), 57772 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 59031 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area), 60174 (Cam Valley Forum), 60749 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners

57171 (Southern and Regional Developments Ltd), 57244 (European Property Ventures, Cambridgeshire), 58457 (Marshall Group Properties), 58758 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Development should not be permitted in flood plains or flood prone areas (Flood Zone 3)

Comments highlighting this issue:

56618 (Gamlingay PC), 56742 (Croydon PC), 56881 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59107 (Great Shelford PC), 59481 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Developments should incorporate brown/green roofs where practical

Comments highlighting this issue:

56618 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Water supply is not sustainable due to the lack of rainfall in the area. Reservoirs will just remove water from aquifers and chalk streams and not address the real problem. The only solution is through increased efficiency, less housing in plans and importation of water from other areas.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56798 (Heydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Could there be reference to types of storms that need to be accounted for in drainage calculations?

Comments highlighting this issue:

56881 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Water quality needs to be a standalone point within the flood management policy. It should refer to SuDS management train as multi-stages of treatment through cascading structures.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56947 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Surface water systems should be designed with an allowance of climate change included.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56947 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Reference should ideally be made to the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD or any subsequent version of this. It is noted that the policy will not need to repeat items covered by the NPPF, however, reference should be made to this.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56947 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The County Council are supportive of integrated management including SuDS being incorporated into the design of schools. However, it should be acknowledged that this is likely to increase the size of the site required for a school and currently the Council policy is to request the minimum site size. If SuDS are on the surface as pond, child safety would need to be considered. It would be most appropriate for any targets to be incorporated in policy to be the subject of a technical assessment on their achievability and cost before being formally adopted.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56947 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Careful flood and water management in Greater Cambridge will also facilitate benefits and minimise impacts in the surrounding districts.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57369 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The requirement for hard surfacing to be permeable should ensure that they meet the requirements of the Local Highways Authority for adoptable road standards.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57384 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In addition to requiring that the risk of flooding is not increased elsewhere as a result of new development (including peak runoff rate should be no greater for the developed site than it was for the undeveloped site), in setting out the approach to runoff rates, the Plan should be clear there should be no reduction in runoff rates under non-flood circumstances. This will ensure biodiversity in downstream watercourses is not adversely impacted, and similarly the amenity of flowing streams and rivers is not compromised by upstream developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57793 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Grey water should be used wherever possible

Comments highlighting this issue:

57875 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Before any work starts anywhere with historic flooding, flood management must be implemented and approved by independent experts. SCDC have approved plans where residents have informed them of flooding issues and within a year, the area has flooded. Examples include Hunter's Close, Impington and Park Primary, Histon and nothing is being done to fix it. Next time, maybe use simulations (via independent experts).

Comments highlighting this issue:

57875 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The whole plan is proposed despite the knowledge that in the short-, medium-, and long-term ongoing growth will cause further disruption to the chalk aquifer and habitats on which we all depend. Until an approach to dealing with this is found, massive development on this scale cannot take place without inevitable and irreversible damage to the water ecosystem.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57991 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The fields south of the city are already flooded over the winter months and photos are attached. With climate change this is set to get worse. Permission for development was rejected for the 2018 Plan because of flooding. Why would this have improved now?

Comments highlighting this issue:
58173 (Dr S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy doesn't take adequate account of the local heavy clay soil. A better drainage recommendation is needed for low infiltration areas, together with stronger planning review and enforcement.
If the recommendation includes surface features such as swales, lower housing density may be required to allow sufficient space. This should be explicitly recognised, and this space should be distinct from areas set aside as Public Open Space.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58293 (M-A Claridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

A register of areas with flooding issues should also be maintained, and systematically be consulted in any planning applications. This should include areas with reported local drainage issues, as many villages have flooding problems caused by drainage systems that have been compromised by previous developments, which are not reflected on the Environment Agency risk map.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58293 (M-A Claridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Unfortunately, a significant portion (more than 60%) of the land covered by this Local Plan is unsuitable for infiltration systems. Watercourses will not often be available. This means that over a large part of Greater Cambridge, the only available drainage system will be the already overstretched sewerage system which is not good enough.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58293 (M-A Claridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is a large overlap between the area where SuDS systems will be impractical and the sites submitted for development, especially to the west of Cambridge. Increasing housing density and increased extreme rainfall makes this more critical

Comments highlighting this issue:
58293 (M-A Claridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Made more aware of increasing intensity of summer storms and severity of summer droughts.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58414 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Requests that policy:
• requires reduction of run-off rates from pre-development levels,
• Recognises value of SuDS for greenspace and biodiversity and encourage above-ground SuDS
• Avoids SuDS which encourage wildlife to crossroads (which necessitates avoiding locating SuDS surrounded by roads)
• Policy needs to meet requirements of Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority and water companies

Comments highlighting this issue:
58628 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Assessment recommends growth be concentrated in new settlements or urban extensions that avoid high flood risk and have high standards for design of flood risk management, water usage and re-use, and blue-green infrastructure. Decisions should follow a Location Opportunities and Constraints Categorisation and Scoring which assesses and scores each proposed growth strategies.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58769 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58773 (Wates Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Disputed why development within the Minor Rural Centres and Group Villages have been disregarded as an appropriate growth strategy if they are able to meet ambitious water usage targets and implement water recycling systems.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58769 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58773 (Wates Development Ltd).

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Disagree with assessment that large sites are able to successfully use recycling to reduce demand for potable water. Because actually new development (regardless of scale) is able to adopt rainwater recycling systems.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58769 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58773 (Wates Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The RSPB supports the principles set out for this policy, particularly with reference to source control. Our experience is that this is often an element which is not implemented well due to supposed practical constraints which are not necessarily

justified. We believe that Greater Cambridge have an opportunity to push the boundaries to make this a standard practice in new development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59031 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We suggest that references to green roofs should be changed to biodiverse and/or biosolar (to preclude the use of sedum roofs which have limited utility). Where use of permeable surfaces is not practicable, source control should again be implemented.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59031 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The scale of envisaged growth and development is out of line with the water resources available, and in terms of sewage capacity and nutrient burdens from discharges. This should be an intrinsic consideration throughout the Local Plan. The Local Plan needs to be future-proofed and requires agility to respond to the changing and increasing pressures that are likely to come forward for the water environment over the plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59291 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy is totally inadequate in the face of the increasing flood risks arising in the county, the greatest of which is the likely loss of a high percentage of the Fens to flooding within decades.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59577 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Due to rising sea level and reduction of flow in River Cam, the Council is ‘sowing the seeds of its own destruction’; firstly, it is creating avoidable carbon emissions which will contribute to global temperature rise. Secondly, that temperature rise will cause large parts of the county to flood permanently. Thirdly, the additional run-off from development will increase the risk of flooding and bring forward the date of permanent flooding of large parts of the county. This issue must be taken far more seriously than the token gesture of Policy CC/FM.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59577 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policies should acknowledge the risks to traditional buildings from flooding, especially the need for such buildings to be able to dry out slowly and that care must be taken not to introduce inappropriate retrofitted measures which would prevent effective drying and shorten the life of the building. Historic England ask the Council to refer to their guidance which is attached in the representation.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59669 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policies on SuDS should advise that they need to be designed so that they do not impact on archaeology. Impacts can be caused by draining waterlogged archaeology or introducing surplus water and pollution from surface runoff into archaeological sediments via soakaways. Consideration should be given to the most appropriate course of action to protect buried waterlogged archaeology through the design of SuDS. We advise that waterlogged deposits, such as peat have the potential to preserve organic remains that are relatively rare in the archaeological record. They are of great importance for the information they provide about everyday objects.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59669 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

To maintain the preservation of organic materials, it is essential that the conditions which contributed to their survival remain the same. While saturated with water, oxygen is excluded which limits the presence/action of most soil fauna and fungi which feed on organic matter. The lowering of the water-table in an area could result in the remains becoming exposed to oxygen, which can enhance the degradation and loss of any remains that are present. Historic England ask the Council to refer to their guidance which is attached in the representation.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59669 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Policy states that “Development will be directed to the areas with the least likelihood of flooding from all sources and taking into account climate change”. It would be helpful if such data were to be readily available publicly.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59776 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Look forward to co-operation between SCDC and CCC on sustainable drainage solutions so that developments along the East-West Rail arc do not impact on the Independent Drainage Board areas and Cottenham Lode in particular and

consideration to take varying infiltration rates to accommodate the impact of climate change.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59882 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Would like to see additional emphasis given to:

- existing buildings
- role of flood defences and the expectation that some defended flood plains will continue to be effective
- avoidance of sewage flooding risk being transferred from one location to another

  Comments highlighting this issue:
  59915 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Proposed requirements for developments to provide integrated water management, including sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) where possible and for SuDS and green/brown roofs to provide multiple benefits (including biodiversity and amenity) are welcomed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59974 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

As indicated above the WCS will need to demonstrate how water, to meet growth needs, will be supplied sustainably without adverse impact to the natural environment.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59974 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Infrastructure should be operational before housing occupation. Especially managing hard surface run off.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60002 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We are pressing for a more integrated approach by the Environment Agency, Natural England, farmers and Local Authorities. The Local Plan should recognise that episodic ‘flooding’, may be increasingly likely with climate change. This can be mitigated upstream by slowing river drainage. We have had over 60 years of ill-

advised river dredging in our lowlands to increase arable areas on farms. To reverse this trend would help. This would require a reversion to an earlier pattern of agricultural land-use management with wet meadows and less arable land in the flood plain itself. Other measures could include:

- South Cambridgeshire could develop a larger flood plain basin with a wet woodland as a buffer against future Cambridge City flood events. These sites would also contribute to provide biodiversity and recreational benefits
- Restoring riparian grazing grasslands would sequester carbon efficiently – an added bonus to our carbon depleted soils.
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  60174 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The role of SuDS in improving water quality through intercepting points of pollution such as vehicle fluid spills should also be referenced in support of the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60454 (Anglian Water), 60479 (Anglian Water)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Integrated water management also reduces the amount of wastewater requiring pumping, treatment and discharge through reusing water that would otherwise end up in the sewer network or potentially increase flood risk.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60454 (Anglian Water), 60479 (Anglian Water)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The reduction in water use and integral design of sustainable drainage systems will though in future need to be supplemented by an integrated approach to water management that maximises opportunities to re-use and recycle water so that the residual runoff from developed land is proactively utilised and slowed reducing the frequency, duration, and severity of flooding.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60454 (Anglian Water), 60479 (Anglian Water)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We have issues with water drainage and sewage; what guarantees will there be here?
Comments highlighting this issue:
60493 (Melbourn Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We have the speeding issues increasing the village by a further 160 houses will undoubtably cause logistical issues.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60493 (Melbourn Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Need for investment in flood management infrastructure, and for effective management of water on site to ensure no detriment downstream.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60506 (Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Water from development sites needs to be managed on-site and future new settlements and infrastructure projects should help to invest in flood risk assets in the fens.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60506 (Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Fens pumping station have limited capacity and are ageing assets which need reinvestment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60506 (Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

If the risk of flooding is not increased elsewhere as a result of new development, it will be essential to assess the cumulative impact of development at catchment level.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60749 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Given the water challenges (our comments to Policy S/DS) it should strive to secure both mitigation and betterment through growth. We would also like to see:

1. It should seek to secure betterment and reduce flood risk overall, wherever possible, as part of GC's strategy to adapt to climate change. Making space for water to flood and be stored will be critical to long-term adaptation. Protection of potential flood storage land and financial contributions towards flood risk schemes could also benefit communities at risk of flooding.
2. Provision for water supply and wastewater infrastructure, ensuring water quality and treating and re-using waste water. We recommend that the provisions of Policy CC/7, 'Water Quality', of the South Cambridgeshire Local

Plan 2018 are considered and brought forward into the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Site policies may also need to include specific infrastructure requirements.

3. There needs to be a policy approach that recognises a clear integration encompassing water resources, water quality, flood risk and recognising the role of green infrastructure. Although the value of green infrastructure and river corridors is recognised in policy BG/GI and BG/RC, it is worthwhile including it as part of the integrated water management policy.
4. Restoration of natural flood plains where practicable and provision of green infrastructure can help reduce flood risk along the rivers itself and beyond. Wet woodland will self-set and grow where conditions are right and management allows. Providing the right conditions for trees to grow in appropriate locations in river corridors can support flood risk mitigation and biodiversity

   Comments highlighting this issue:
   59724 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In relation to the Integrated Water Management Study – Outline Water Cycle Strategy (WCS) welcome that the Outline WCS has been amended based on our previous feedback. However, a number of issues raised remain unresolved, including:
• Some of the information presented does not represent the proper ‘baseline’ for subsequent assessments and the extent of the challenge of delivering the quantum of growth proposed in the Local Plan
• The identified assessment methods need to be sufficiently robust, and potential mitigation actions will need to be shown to be viable.
• The Detailed WCS will need to provide evidence to demonstrate the delivery of foul drainage provision can be provided whilst protecting water quality of rivers.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59724 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The local policy approach should be informed by the IWMS Water Cycle Studies, the Level 1 SFRA and other relevant strategies, and in some areas level 2 SFRA.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59724 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It needs to be more obviously demonstrated how the Sequential Test and sequential approach to all forms of flooding has been applied. The Planning Practice Guidance

advises several options for this including a standalone report, Sustainability Appraisal commentary, etc. This will need to be produced in time for the next draft plan consultation so it is clear how the test has been applied and demonstrated.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59724 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We think that a Level 2 SFRA is necessary particularly for those sites located on the fringes of Flood Zones 2 and 3, or partially within those zones. Some sites have unmapped ordinary watercourses running alongside or through them and often these have not been modelled as part of the indicative flood map due to their limited upstream catchment size. As such there is some uncertainty over the level of flood risk to the site, with the potential that fluvial flood risk may be greater than the Flood Map for Planning. These sites will require further investigation to better refine the flood extents preferably by flood risk modelling or utilising the Flood Map for Surface Water
Comments highlighting this issue:
59724 (Environment Agency)

Table of site-specific comments posted under ‘CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management’

Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Land West of London Road, Fowlmere presents an opportunity for delivering a scheme which includes SuDS that provide multifunctional benefits including an opportunity to benefit and enhance designated wildlife sites. It also is located in a Flood Zone 1 and can meet the ambitious water targets of the Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58769 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Land East Side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn presents an opportunity for delivering a scheme which includes SuDS that provide multifunctional benefits including an opportunity to benefit and enhance designated wildlife sites. It also is located in a Flood Zone 1 and can meet the ambitious water targets of the Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58773 (Wates Development Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Caxton Gibbet Site, the prevailing surface water strategy to be adopted is a network of positive drainage consisting of, and not limited to, the following SuDS features:
• Open swales / rills
• Living Roofs
• Blue Roofs (these can also be used in areas of Living Roof)
• Attenuation Basins (with some localised pond/wetland features)
• Porous Paving (where feasible)
• Bio-retention areas
• Rainwater Harvesting

Comments highlighting this issue:
59324 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

North Cambourne is in Flood Zone 1, so is at low risk of flooding from rivers and the sea. However, there are some isolated areas of the site at risk of surface water flooding, adjacent to existing watercourses. Through an integrated site-wide SuDS strategy, this risk will be mitigated within public open spaces and potentially mitigated through a centralised rainwater harvesting system to reduce potable water consumption. The SuDS strategy will aim to ensure that the peak runoff rate post development is no greater than that which currently exists on the site.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57899 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy will be particularly important in high density developments such as NECAAP where appropriate SuDS will be needed and hard surfaces need to be permeable. Stormwater management will also be important to reduce storm overflows, with SuDS and ponds needed to attenuate flow.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56905 (Save Honey Hill Group)

CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of representations for this policy: 30

Executive Summary

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy. There were several suggestions to improve the policy; including the delivery of an accessible anaerobic digestion plant, the incorporation of community power projects into new settlements and the installation of solar panels onto the roof of houses. Some respondents argued that the policy needed to emphasise an holistic, district-wide strategy to renewable energy production, whereas others focussed upon how individual buildings could contribute. One respondent questioned whether the electric cables in South Cambridgeshire’s villages have capacity to support electric cars or heat pumps. Several parish councils noted that the policy should include access to funding to support renewable projects. Public and third sector organisations stated that the policy should consider its impact upon the character of surrounding landscape, biodiversity, the historic environment, and the policy should not encourage development that would interfere with military aviation activities. Objections to the policy included those from the Campaign to Protect Rural England, who argued that the policy would not halt the removal of farmland.

Table of representations for Policy CC/RE Renewable Energy Project and Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for policy
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals
58311 (I Butnar)
Public Bodies
56619 (Gamlingay PC), 56743 (Croydon PC), 56882 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council), 57370 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58416 (Linton PC), 59195 (Cambourne TC), 59670 (Historic England), 59975 (Natural England), 60437 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Third Sector Organisations
56910 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57023 (The Wildlife Trust), 57773 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 60750 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
57172 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57245 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 58462 (Marshall Group Properties), 58760 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is a requirement for localised publicly accessible anaerobic digestion plants to assist agriculture and removal of grass cuttings and tree trimmings to create electricity for the local area. There currently isn't one in Cambridgeshire.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56619 (Gamlingay PC), 58311 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Community power projects should be part of new settlements
Comments highlighting this issue:
56743 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The renewable energy and infrastructure policy needs to address the problems distributing electricity more effectively.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56823 (J Graffy)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There should be greater emphasis on encouraging property owners to fit solar panels to roofs. There are many, many roofs which could have solar panels installed. The Cambridgeshire Solar Together initiative was a small step to improve this, but much more could be done

Comments highlighting this issue:

56823 (J Graffy)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Neighbours tried to install an air source heat pump nearby, but were unable to, because the cable in the road would not take the power load and it was too expensive to improve this. The commentator suspects that many Cambridgeshire villages have inadequate electricity cables, which will block the installation of fast charging for electric cars and Air Source Heat Pumps.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56823 (J Graffy)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Renewable energy projects should be developed early in the plan period to facilitate the move to electric vehicles and heat pumps.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56882 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Would a scoring matrix / reference be useful to rank these projects against biodiversity and heritage?

Comments highlighting this issue:

56882 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Section 4vii needs to be expanded to include that not only visual impacts must be mitigated but also auditory, especially for wind energy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56910 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

This policy may interact with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan, in respect of energy from waste and district heating. Early consultation about the wording of this policy would be appreciated.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56948 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It is considered that any potentially hazardous uses such as battery storage facilities should be accompanied by a risk/safety assessment and appropriate responses to unforeseen events and meet the requirements as set out in the NPPG.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57370 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Huntingdonshire Local Plan supports proposals for renewable and low carbon energy through policy LP35. Consideration of landscape, townscape and heritage impacts must be addressed as part of the development. The Council would expect any such development within proximity of the Huntingdonshire boundary to consider this in its assessment. Huntingdonshire District Council have produced a Landscape Townscape SPD which can be used to assess the effects of any schemes that are in proximity to the Huntingdonshire District.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57370 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Table of site-specific comments posted under ‘CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure’

Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Micro generation, with a mandate for solar panels on all new developments, could help meet the renewables target.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57825 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Battery storage to help balance grid load is also an effective strategy to avoid peak demand requiring non-green energy generation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57825 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

As stated in the section on net zero carbon new buildings, the renewable infrastructure needed will need to be large to meet the housing demand, let alone for the infrastructure. A very clear and integrated plan will be needed, rather than leaving it to individual developers.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57992 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Possible improvements to policy include:
• Is there a scope for district heating/cooling instead of individual homes?
• No mention of smart grids to smooth peaks in demand/supply, which determine the size of required battery storage.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58311 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Would not support onshore windfarms due to effect on landscape, loss of farmland, noise pollution and lack of wind in this area

Comments highlighting this issue:
58416 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Marshall appreciates that there is significant movement towards greening of the centralised national grid, but considers it may be more efficient in the future to utilise green energy from the grid rather than to produce it locally and therefore believes policy should be flexible enough to support that if necessary.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58462 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy must clearly protect the character and appearance of the landscape and need clear guidance on where wind and solar farms and energy infrastructure is acceptable.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58632 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59036 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Impacts on biodiversity from renewable projects need to be minimised. Therefore, we also support the provision of biodiversity impact criteria specific to renewable projects.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59036 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

RSPB’s report Energy Futures has mapped how the UK can meet very high renewable energy provision whilst safeguarding nature and we would be pleased to

discuss with the Greater Cambridge Councils how our Energy Vision peer-reviewed mapping methodology could be used to help identify suitable sites for renewable and low carbon energy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59036 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The policy is totally ineffective to halt the use of scarce farmland for solar energy generation. Instead, the Local Plan should include a policy that halts the use of scarce farmland for solar energy generation and ensure that solar installations are mandated on all industrial buildings, new and existing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59574 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the policy, but include the following changes:

• Include consideration of the impact on the historic environment for all commercial renewable energy technologies.

• Renewable energy policies should include reference to heritage assets and their settings (in conjunction with Local Plan heritage policies) and should seek to ensure that any harm to the significance of a heritage asset is satisfactorily addressed in the planning balance.

• The policy, or its supporting text, should not use arbitrary distance measurements for assessments from heritage assets to locations proposed for large-scale renewables. Instead, the policy should ensure that settings are fully assessed, on a case-by-case basis.

• Biofuel crops such as short rotation coppice (willow) and Miscanthus can have a substantial below ground impact on buried archaeology, especially waterlogged archaeology. Palaeochannels, peats, kettle holes and other glacial features that preserve waterlogged sediments are often the very areas targeted for growing energy crops. Many of these impacts on the archaeological resource are covered by the Preservation of Archaeological Remains guidance. This guidance is linked in the representation.

• Para.155 of the NPPF advises LPAs to consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources in their plans and strategies. Therefore, your plan’s evidence base should include studies assessing areas of potential, particularly for the suitability of wind and solar power generation. An appropriate methodology should be used; i.e. all heritage assets in the area should be identified, arbitrary distance measurements should be avoided, and the setting of heritage assets should also be included as a consideration.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59670 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Broadly support, but object to standalone projects in the Green Belt and the lack of weight given to success of National Grid in importing sustainable energy to GC or role of district schemes in major new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59916 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We recommend that the Plan takes a more holistic approach to securing multi-functional benefits for climate change, flood management, water resources and water quality through the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Natural solutions can achieve significant additional benefits for biodiversity, green infrastructure and associated health and wellbeing benefits, enhanced landscapes, and soil resources.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59975 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Future development and trends will increase the use of electricity so do we have an obligation to consider where we might generate this locally by solar and/or wind?

Comments highlighting this issue:
59998 (Steeple Morden PC), 60080 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There should be clear comments on how and where solar PV farms and windfarms are going to be planned.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59998 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for community led projects but should include access to funding.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59998 (Steeple Morden PC), 60080 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Where development falls outside designated safeguarding zones the MOD may also have an interest, particularly where the development is of a type likely to have an impact on operational capability. Examples of this type of development are the installation of renewable energy generation systems and their associated

infrastructure

Comments highlighting this issue:

60042 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The MOD has, in principle, no issue or objection to renewable energy development though some methods of renewable energy generation, for example wind turbine generators or solar photovoltaic panels can, by virtue of their physical dimensions and properties, impact upon military aviation activities. Where turbines are erected in line of sight to defence radars and other types of defence technical installations, the rotating motion of their blades can degrade and cause interference to the effective operation of these types of installations with associated impacts upon aviation safety and operational capability.

Planning Practice Guidance published on the Gov.uk website acknowledges the potential effect of wind turbine generators and directs developers and Local Planning Authorities to consult the MOD where a proposed turbine has a tip height of or exceeding 11m or has a rotor diameter of 2m or more.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60042 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We need to keep ahead of new renewable technologies and review these yearly.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60437 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Given our net zero commitment for support policy CC/RE on renewable energy. Anglian Water welcomes the policy support for renewables projects at our facilities which coupled with Policies 1 and 11 in the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan enable us to maximise renewable energy generation which reduces our carbon impacts and increases the resilience of our water recycling network.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60456 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

We 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 Environment Agency.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60456 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The potential for the use of on-site and local off-site renewables is also to be investigated as the vision develops and Marshall is currently seeking support to help develop an energy strategy focussed on renewables for Cambridge East.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58462 (Marshall Group Properties)

CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think'> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of representations for this policy: 31

Executive Summary

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy. Respondents, such as Cambridgeshire County Council, included suggestions to make the policy more legible to members of the public. Some organisations, including Croydon PC, suggested ideas to improve the policy, such as ensuring that new settlements have community bins similar to ones implemented in Eddington. Respondents differed in their reactions to the scope of the policy; the Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group for example, argued that targets were needed to ensure developers deliver the policy. Contrastingly, some respondents, such as the Metro Property Unit Trust, sought to narrow the policy's scope, suggesting that the policy should only be applied to major developments. The Home Builders Federation asserted that these requirements should be dealt with via national regulation as opposed to local planning policy. Some developers, such as Martin Grant Homes, used their representations to explain how their proposed site accords with the policy's requirements.

Table of representations for Policy CC/CE Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for policy and proposed scope.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57024 (The Wildlife Trust), 57371 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57672 (J Conroy), 57774 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58418 (Linton Parish Council), 58464 (Quod on behalf of Marshalls), 59037 (RSPB), 59197 (Cambourne Town Council), 60194 (J Preston), 60438 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for policy – where possible existing buildings should be reused and there should be policies covering retrofit.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58638 (CambridgePPF), 59917 (Fen Ditton PC), 60194 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

(Moved from CC/WE) Supports policy to promote the reuse and/or recycling of materials arising from demolition works on development sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57377 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Local recycling and production of local electricity is key – alternative power sources needed west of Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue:
56620 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

More community bins like those at Eddington should be included in new settlements

Comments highlighting this issue:
56744 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Construction Environmental Management Plan should prioritise on-site reuse and recycling over off-site to minimise emissions from transport.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56883 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Could prescriptive waste targets be considered – recognising difficulties in benchmarking different building types but would impose obligations to design out waste from the start.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56883 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support inclusion of policy – give Circular Economy priority over reducing waste in the title as this has much wider scope.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56949 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Explicitly link policy with policy CC/NZ as the two policies interact with one another

Comments highlighting this issue:

56949 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Reference to RECAP Waste Management Guide and Minerals and Waste Policy CC/6 welcomed. The MWPA would welcome further discussion on this topic, potentially as part of a SoCG.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56949 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The waste hierarchy proposed by the Draft Plan reads “Refuse, Reduce, Reuse, Repurpose, Recycle”. It is appreciated that this is based on the “5 R’s”, but to avoid confusion the Councils may wish to either clarify in the policy or supporting text that ‘refuse’ is seeking to minimise avoidable resource use and not the refusal of planning permissions or development outright. The waste hierarchy as set out in Appendix A of the National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014) is: Prevention, Preparing for Re-use, Recycling, Other recovery, Disposal.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56949 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Suggest reference to potential contamination from the reuse of building materials be included to ensure no adverse impacts with regards to water pollution downstream.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57371 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Agree in principle. Should include how removal and transport of materials from demolition and remediation works should be included in the CEMP to reduce impact of carbon footprint of HCVs

Comments highlighting this issue:

57508 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Does this mean planning will be supportive of creative solutions included within domestic design?

Comments highlighting this issue:

57868 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Would be great to have a re-use economy here including library of things – would need top level support and space allocated. The economics don't seem to work (rents too high for domestic recycling or repair operation in this area).

Comments highlighting this issue:

57868 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Need to see absolute metrics of waste and circularity applied to new developments to ensure developers don't depart from them in practice.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57993 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Residential waste also needs consideration alongside construction waste.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58313 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy wording should acknowledge that CEMPs are usually prepared at the detailed design stage when site layout is secured.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58780 (Wates Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy should be applied to major developments only with commensurate requirements for minor developments outlined in the policy

Comments highlighting this issue:

58987 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Concerned that the LPA is not looking at this aspect when looking at increasing jobs and growing business. Growth cannot continue indefinitely as there are simply not enough resources.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59111 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Fully supports objectives around waste reduction and circular economy and requirements related to CEMPs which we already commit to. Happy to provide a Circular Economy Statement but would request that this be proportionate to the size and scale of development and that the policy allows for use of bespoke techniques and practices on site for those with large and efficient supply chains.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59549 (Turley on behalf of Countryside – Bourn Airfield), 59951 (Turley on behalf of Taylor Wimpey), 60606 (Turley on behalf of Countryside – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy is far too weak – all unnecessary construction should be refused and all construction reduced including the excessive building across South Cambs proposed by the Draft Plan. Existing constructions to be reused, repurposed, or recycled

Comments highlighting this issue:
59578 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Broadly support proposals for policy. Should recognise sustainability over the long-term and impacts on embodied energy associated with demolition. Encourage and recognise benefits of sympathetic restoration, retention, refurbishment of historic buildings rather than demolition and replacement.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59671 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Understand the need to reduce waste but Council is placing more and more requirements on applicants without having the resource and knowledge in-house to assess or provide guidance on these matters. Such requirements should be dealt with via national regulation not local planning.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60641 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

No mention of need for different approach to buildings of traditional solid wall construction. Climate Change section of the plan should quote key principles and guidance

Comments highlighting this issue:
60194 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Coordination with the Minerals and Waste Plan will be crucial

Comments highlighting this issue:
60751 (Cambridge and South Cambs Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

How could small-scale projects be brought within this policy?
Comments highlighting this issue:
60751 (Cambridge and South Cambs Green Parties)

Table of representations for CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for Circular Economy principles as best means for ensuring materials stay in their highest use state for longest period. Principles will be adopted for North Cambourne.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57901 (Savills on behalf of Martin Grant Homes)

CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration

Hyperlink for comments

Open this hyperlink- Policy CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think'> click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of representations for this policy: 39

Executive Summary

There was strong support for this policy from a range of organisations and individuals including Parish Councils, The Wildlife Trust, Carbon Neutral Cambridge, Cambridge Past Present and Future, and agents acting on behalf of developers such as Marshall and Countryside Properties. Many of those commenting could see the value in protecting sites and land important for carbon sequestration including undisturbed peatlands and woodlands and the wider benefits that such an approach could bring, including biodiversity enhancement. There were no specific objections to the policy itself. Rather, comments suggested how the policy could be strengthened, how the policy would be implemented, and made some useful

suggestions of how new developments could ensure that green infrastructure provided as part of development could be enhanced to increase its role in carbon sequestration.

Table of representations for CC/CS Supporting land-based carbon sequestration

Summary of issues raised in comments:

(Strong) support for the policy
• Encouraging increasing levels of soil carbon through sustainable land uses including habitat creation and restoration and GI provision helps mitigate climate impacts as well as providing multifunctional environment, societal and economic benefits.
• Links to biodiversity and greenspaces policy and achieving high quality design.
• Support for new wetland environments and a tree strategy to create planned sustainable locations for trees locally

Comments highlighting this issue:
57673 (J Conroy), 58420 (Linton PC)

Public Bodies
56745 (Croydon PC), 56884 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57378 (Huntingdonshire DC), 59199 (Cambourne Town Council), 60439 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Third Sector
57026 (The Wildlife Trust), 57775 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58641 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future), 58939 (National Trust), 60752 (Cambs and South Cambs Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Contribution to carbon storage of soils from new market gardens should be recognised, alongside land management methods that enhance carbon storage in soils, where that is in the power of the Councils (e.g. no dig etc). Need for a corresponding contribution from arable farming management although recognise that this is outside scope of this plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56689 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Protect rural grass bridleway network from inappropriate ‘improvement’ (i.e. tarmac surfaces) to protect their role in sequestration and value for wildlife.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56702 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Developments over a certain threshold should require a soil management plan to demonstrate maintenance of carbon sequestration into the future.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56884 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Need to explain why we have not responded to all the issues highlighted.

Comments highlighting this issue:
56890 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Particularly support protection of undisturbed or undrained peat and approaches that minimise soil disturbance, compaction and disposal during construction projects.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57378 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for policy – perhaps a suitable use of land in the Green Belt or on lower grade agricultural land.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60126 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Help get closer to carbon zero by planting trees and rewilding the Fens. More development and more people defeats that objective.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58061 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy needs to be more closely linked with the policy about environmentally friendly farming to increase coherence between food production and biodiversity/ecosystem protection and enhancement.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58161 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Prioritise land-based carbon sequestration which enhances biodiversity and other natural functions (water quality and quantity, flood prevention, soil quality).

Comments highlighting this issue:
58316 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Look to significantly expand tree cover in Greater Cambridge whilst also protecting and enhancing existing woodlands and other important non-woodland habitats such as peat.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58890 (Woodlands Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Nature-based solutions have an important role to play in reducing carbon emissions including creation of wetlands.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59039 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Welcome the proposed approach and the recognition of the importance of peatlands given the area of peatland that remains in the north of South Cambridgeshire district. Recommend that the plan takes a more holistic approach to securing multifunctional benefits for climate change, flood management, water resources and water quality through protection and enhancement of the natural environment.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59976 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Agree that woodlands and peatlands need protection. New development can also deliver carbon sequestration benefits with creation of multi-functional green infrastructure which should be recognised as part of overall carbon performance of new development. Policy should contain text to support new development if it can be demonstrated that the green infrastructure and woodland it provides will sequester carbon.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59550 (Turley on behalf of Countryside – Bourn Airfield), 59952 (Turley on behalf of Taylor Wimpey), 60607 (Turley on behalf of Countryside – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Puzzled by the policy as there is little undrained peat in Greater Cambridge. Is the policy aimed at justifying re-flooding the Fens due to effects of greenhouse gas emissions and increased run-off that increased construction will cause.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59579 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support aspiration but object to the Plan as stated – too much imprecise generalisation. It is not automatic that the suggested actions in the Plan will always be improvements. Land quality must be considered.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59918 (Fen Ditton PC)

Table of site-specific comments posted under CC/CS Supporting land-based carbon sequestration
Note: the sites are highlighted in yellow

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Agree in principle – this policy along with GP/BB means it is inappropriate to develop the proposed CWWTP relocation to Green Belt at Honey Hill (inappropriate that the development on this existing carbon sink has not been included in Policy S/EOC)

Comments highlighting this issue:

57511 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57523 (Mrs C Martin), 57614 (Mr J Pratt), 57618 (Mr J Pratt), 58068 (Horningsea PC), 58132 (Mr M. Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Pouring a million tonnes of carbon rich concrete on Honey Hill shows your rhetoric to be ludicrous

Comments highlighting this issue:

57534 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

CWWTP should not be moved – will release tonnes of embedded (embodied) carbon

Comments highlighting this issue:

57542 (A Martin), 57600 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Landscape strategy at Cambourne North will be designed to sequester carbon as well as providing biodiversity and landscape benefits. With 400 acres of open space, if 5% (20 ha) is planted as new woodland it would sequester approx. 4,500 tonnes of CO_2 over the next 100 years.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57902 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Marshall is supportive of a policy that seeks to ensure that carbon offsets for net zero are directed locally and support other ecosystem functions. Offsetting embodied carbon from construction of Cambridge East could facilitate creation of significant areas of new habitat/enhancement of existing habitats such as Fenland and soils. Would welcome opportunity to work with GCSPS to scope out planning mechanism to facilitate this. Would query ruling out the afforestation of existing farmland and would seek clarification as to whether this includes all farmland or farmland of a certain quality or which is currently operational.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58481 (Quod on behalf of Marshalls)

Biodiversity and green spaces

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Biodiversity and green spaces > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 68

Notes

Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on the Biodiversity and Green Spaces theme, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific biodiversity and green spaces policies. These comments have been moved to the specific policy. 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

Executive Summary

The majority of comments provide broad support for the objectives and priorities for improved biodiversity was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, with comments that policies must be as strong as can be to protect and enhance existing green spaces and networks. Comments included that the area has good green spaces which add to the rural character, are a huge asset and should be protected from development, but that there is pressure on green spaces, often conflict between recreational use of green spaces and biodiversity, and that sufficient land should be provided for both. It was suggested the Objectives should include the 'Doubling Nature' ambition. A small

number of comments raised concern about the environmental capacity of the area, suggesting that the aims of this theme would be challenging to deliver, and suggesting that the development strategy did not accord with those aims.

Table of Representations: Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the objectives and priorities for improved biodiversity.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56820 (J Mead), 57674 (J Conroy)
Public Bodies
56912 (West Wickham PC), 57704 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58421 (Linton PC), 59201 (Cambourne TC), 59919 (Fen Ditton PC)
Other Organisations
58505 (University of Cambridge), 59168 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
58312 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58705 (Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
RSPB supports general direction outlined. Objective should include doubling nature – councils have signed up to as part of the OxCamArc Environmental Principles.

Comments highlighting this issue
59042 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Share and strongly support vision for biodiversity and green spaces. CBC's Vision 2050 shares Councils' determination to achieve highest standards of development, to integrate and deliver biodiversity enhancement.

Comments highlighting this issue
58819 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supports the aim. Aligns with one of our priorities (Strategy 2020-2025) to increase access to the outdoors, focusing on opportunities for people and nature to connect.

Comments highlighting this issue
58949 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the Aim. Policies must provide for protection and enhancement of existing green spaces, networks and corridors, in urban areas, including provision for buffer zones.

Comments highlighting this issue
57947 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Greater emphasis & protection of these when plans are considered.

Comments highlighting this issue
59826 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Essential not only for the environment but also mental health.

Comments highlighting this issue
58028 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support aim to ensure enhanced biodiversity resource, with new and better green spaces. Better for people and the environment. Ambitions for Cambridge East align, providing significant green infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue
58489 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Overall policy direction is supported and welcomed. Essential policies are as strong as can be. Prioritise the protection of existing sites, emphasising mitigation hierarchy to give a clear statement of intent for any future developments. Assess development / infrastructure proposals before incorporate into plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
58654 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Would like a plan proposing improvements along the lines stated without necessarily waiting for any development proposals to come forward.

Comments highlighting this issue
56824 (M Yeadon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Often conflict between recreational use of green spaces and biodiversity. Green space is needed for people AND for wildlife. In areas of high density housing, sharing doesn't work.

Comments highlighting this issue
56889 (J Prince)

Summary of issues raised in comments
City and area have good green spaces. Should be protected & not destroyed. No building on them, particularly in 2 mile radius of City centre. Most open spaces close to city have a rural touch and are a huge asset. Biodiversity could be broadened in some areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
57252 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
South Cambridgeshire is a green agricultural space. Building the odd park or nature reserve is no substitute.

Comments highlighting this issue
56729 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Infographic: no mention of Local Geological Sites or Geological SSSI. A number of sites within area, designed to provide system of locally valued non-statutory sites (equivalent to Local Wildlife Sites but with wider remit).

Comments highlighting this issue
57787 (R Nicholls)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Many developments will build on and take away well-established green open areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
59225 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Serious environmental capacity issues, particularly in relation to intensification of pressures on green spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue
60195 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Though the plan notes the need for biodiversity and green spaces, it contradicts this position by allowing proposals to release areas of green belt for development. Green Belt has been and is proposed to be eroded, ultimately destroying our village status.

Comments highlighting this issue
57525 (Stapleford PC), 59115 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be explicit requirement for green separation between communities. Without it there is a high probability of piecemeal ribbon development in all areas outside the Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue
58303* (M Claridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerned about flooding. Need to retain quality farmland for food security. Rising sea levels is likely to result in the loss of the Fens. Moving the WWTC to the green belt to facilitate growth is contrary to the goals of the plan. Concerned about approach to BNG.

Comments highlighting this issue
59460 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need a balanced approach to ensure other aims of Plan (i.e. delivery of homes and

jobs) are not overly restricted by aims of biodiversity and green space protection and enhancement.

Comments highlighting this issue
58989 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Monitoring needs to be in place to support this policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
57809 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objectives and policy approach supported. Welcome recognition that development can support on and off-site enhancements and can protect and provide new green spaces for nature. Proposed site can deliver green infrastructure / biodiversity enhancements.

Comments highlighting this issue
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
58017 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58596 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site), 58788 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58914 (Phase 2 Planning), 58965 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 58992 (Jesus College, a private landowner and St John's College), 59086 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Disingenuous and lacking transparency to not mention the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to Green Belt, to unlock a brownfield site for development that was imagined for a living/working community prior to the effects of the global pandemic.

Comments highlighting this issue
58069 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to CBC: detrimental to ecology, loss of green recreational space and opportunities for walking when increasing population, increasing risk of flooding, noise and disturbance to domestic properties, increasing congestion on campus for little proven benefit.

Comments highlighting this issue
57140 (A Barrett)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue
57386 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 84

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading and also from the Biodiversity and Green Spaces theme chapter introduction section, as the comments were specific to biodiversity and geodiversity. 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

Executive Summary

Broad support for the policy principles was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, with comments including that preserving and enhancing biodiversity was important for health and wellbeing, carbon sequestration, place making, and benefits the economy. Comments suggested that the policy and objectives should be strengthened to guide development away from sensitive areas and refuse development that has adverse effects, and that buffer zones are needed to protect wildlife beyond sites and create green corridors. Comments noted that the policy only relates to controlling the impact of developments not improving existing sites (which was considered a missed opportunity).

Many comments, particularly from related organisations, supported the proposal for 20% biodiversity net gain. Concerns were raised by some developers that the

minimum 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) target was double the Environment Bill's proposed level of 10%, that it was not justified, too onerous and not achievable in all cases, and that there needs to be further consideration of viability and deliverability and flexibility to avoid stifling development. Some comments considered that the BNG approach can fail to deliver benefits if new ecosystems are substituted and green networks interrupted. Comments were received from developers promoting sites with the opportunity to deliver BNG. Other comments suggested that the 20% was not high enough, and a higher requirement should be included if doubling nature was to be achieved.

Concerns were raised by some individuals and community groups about how BNG will be calculated. Comments suggested a need for professionally accredited independent reports, and that the assessment should consider all important species, local and special characteristics, and adjoining nature sites.

Comments were expressed about off-site provision of biodiversity that the creation of larger networks will be beneficial to wildlife and support ecological resilience, that clear delivery mechanisms were required which could include purchasing credits, the need to ensure developers deliver before occupation, and encouraging collaborative

working with developers. Others commented that off-site provision might not provide benefits to local residents.

Table of representations: BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support for the policy principles, including
• Commitment to 20% BNG
• Recognition of need to address recreational impacts
• Increasing networks for wildlife and people
• Intention to control biodiversity impacts from development.
• TMLC have already delivered 46% at award winning Trumpington Meadows.
• Recognition of a strategic GC Green Infrastructure Network to encourage biodiversity enhancement
• Biodiversity crisis is severe and one of most affected areas in country due to pressure for development.
• Reverse the decline and loss.
• Welcome that Ox-Cam Arc Environmental Principals have informed the approach
• Wider environmental net gains
• Avoid impact to sites of biodiversity or geological importance
• Councils signed up to 20% BNG with Ox-Cam Arc - ambition justified given low level of designated sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56821 (J Mead), 58867 (B Lockyer), 60128 (C Blakeley),
Public Bodies
56623 (Gamlingay PC), 58422 (Linton PC), 59203 (Cambourne TC), 59306 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority), 59694 (Central Bedfordshire Council),
Third Sector Organisations
57956 (North Newnham Residents Association), 60757 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Other Organisations
57007 (The Wildlife Trust), 58608 (University of Cambridge), 58931 (Woodland Trust), 59047 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area), 59297 (National Trust), 59725 (Environment Agency), 59977 (Natural England), 60463 (Anglian Water Services Ltd),
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
57380 (Colegrove Estates), 57903 (Martin Grant Homes), 58499 (Marshall Group Properties), 58763 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58828 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family), 60223 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60314 (Gladman Developments), 60514 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60552 (Thakeham Homes Ltd). 60571 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site),
Policy should set minimum target based on evidence, legislation and national guidance.
58219 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments on the policy approach that:
• Need to ensure full assessment of impacts, mitigation and compensation, and address harmful developments
• All developments must contribute to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace.
Comments highlighting this issue
58675 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strongly support 20% BNG – Cambridgeshire is one of most nature depleted counties, doubling nature would only bring County to the UK average, Cambridge Nature report identified habitats too small and fragmented, some new habitats will produce less biodiversity than expected, needs to be 50% to achieve doubling nature.
Comments highlighting this issue
58675 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
20% BNG is ambitious, realistic and welcomed. Lack of clarity on procedures should overall progress fall short of target. Policy should prohibit off-site wherever possible to avoid loop holes with smaller developments to detriment of Parish/Neighbourhood Plans. Disappointing no locally defined metrics for assessing, including for developments encroaching on Green Belt. Recognition of recreational impact as a significant issue is welcome and should focus on proactive repair and maintenance.
Comments highlighting this issue
59225* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Preserving and enhancing biodiversity and green space is important for health and wellbeing, as well as carbon sequestration. Makes the region a pleasant place to live, and hence benefits the local economy.
Comments highlighting this issue
57776 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support John Meed's suggestions for strengthening the objectives of this policy [Attachment relates to John Meed's response to Policy BG/GI]
Comments highlighting this issue
57943 (F Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Residential development should avoid adverse impact on natural environment and deliver net gains for biodiversity in accordance with BG/BG.
Comments highlighting this issue
59987* (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concerns with the minimum 20% BNG target, including:

• Considered too onerous and not achievable in all cases.

• Environment Bill is 10%, should not seek to double.

• Further consideration needed of viability and deliverability.

• No evidence to justify need for 20%

• Expensive off-site contributions may be needed which would impact on design and viability of schemes

• Financial and operational implications should be considered in evidence base.

• Issue for all Local Authorities within Ox-Cam Arc. CBC keen to discuss how could be delivered and impacts this might have on site viability and delivery of key services and facilities.

• NEC Ecology Study (2020) recommended 10%

• Reword to aim for 20% with a minimum of 10% to be achieved

Comments highlighting this issue

57173 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57246 (European Property Venture – Cambridgeshire), 57380 (Colegrove Estates), 57385 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 57440 (Mission Street Ltd), 58357 (ARU), 58466 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington – Ltd), 58500 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners – Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell), 58582 (Croudace Homes), 58608 (University of Cambridge), 58787 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58793 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58864 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58953 (St John's College Cambridge), 58991 (Endurance Estates), 59124 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 59694 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 60152 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60159 (Home Builders Federation), 60314 (Gladman Developments), 60328 (Danial Bros Shefford Ltd), 60514 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60571 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60583 (Martin Grant Homes), 60764 (U&I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concerns about calculating BNG and using the DEFRA metric, including:

• BNG calculations can be fudged.

• Excessively simplistic - only looking at habitat features, excluding species measurement.

• Species and 'local and special characteristics' need to be considered

• Does not include all important species, such as red listed swifts.

• Include specific wording on what other measures will be used to assess BNG – mentioning swift boxes and bat boxes.

• Realistic meaningful Preliminary Ecological Appraisals and BNG / mitigation proposals must be based on professionally accredited independent reports, within 1 year of application, cover 1km radius.

• Adjoining designated nature sites must be included in assessments.

• Revisit wording to accommodate changes to national metrics and biodiversity value

• Measurement should take account of adverse effects of general disturbance, noise, light and domestic animals.

• DEFRA metric 3.0 flawed, so should not be sole metric used.

• Value should be placed on longevity of new communities and associated new habitats designed to be retained in perpetuity.

• Existing trees and hedgerows may be given high biodiversity value because of longevity, but it should be recognised older trees will eventually die.

• DEFRA's calculator 3.0 seems weighted in developer favour.

• 4 metrics – size, distinctiveness, condition and strategic habitat - very subjective and measured in difficult to understand way. Excludes 'connectivity'.

• Concerns about how biodiversity is to be measured in a valid manner

• Object to use of land use categories for biodiversity potential calculations if actual species diversity and scarcity is of known important.

• Not very sensitive to some important biodiversity considerations

Comments highlighting this issue

56799 (A Laurie), 56821 (J Mead), 57068 (Fulbourn Swifts Group), 57134 (North Newnham Res. Ass), 57372 (P Heath), 57373 (P Heath), 57440 (Mission Street Ltd), 57591 (R Pargeter), 57814 (J Pavey), 57903 (Martin Grant Homes), 57936 (L Buchholz), 57967 (V Morrow), 59920 (Fen Ditton PC), 60332 (Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments

BNG fails twice as often as it succeeds even with a lower bar of no net loss. Developers are judge, jury and executioner. On site off-setting will not encourage many forms of wildlife and prone to disturbance from trampling or dog fouling.

Comments highlighting this issue

60241 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Research suggests that Biodiversity Net Gain policies and measurement systems are widely unsuccessful in achieving their stated aims.
Comments highlighting this issue
57994* (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
'Doubling nature', BNG and Natural Capital Accounting are being used as bargaining chips by developers – no development means no funding for nature.
Comments highlighting this issue
60241 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments about BNG, including:
• Vague unless parish specific percentages and target for City
• Being used as ineffective compensation for irreplaceable loss of biodiversity and public amenity local to the development
• BNG is good goal but nowhere close to 'doubling nature'.
• BNG has to be realistically evaluated and monitored.
• Require evidence based BNG and funded management regimes for the development site, designated site and wider biodiversity area
• Should not permit development that adversely impacts biodiversity on neighbouring sites
• Need clearer provisions for protection of vulnerable sites from excessive numbers of visitors
• Target is double the national and SPD – be confident that justification and impact of policy is fully evidenced, including viability.
• Wording on ancient woodland and ancient tree protection should reflect NPPF para 175c.
• Needs to align with upcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategy not just GI strategic objectives
• Be clear BNG is in addition to mitigation hierarchy (NPPF para 180)
• Recommend a natural capital evidence approach
• Recommend ambitious maintenance requirements, in perpetuity.
• Focus on area measures to restore ecological networks, enhance resilience and provide overall increase in natural habitat and ecological features
• Projects proposed to help achieve net zero need to be both delivered and safeguarded
• Consider landscape scale connectivity BNG

Comments highlighting this issue
56623 (Gamlingay PC), 56799 (A Laurie), 56891 (J Prince), 57368 (P Heath), 57373 (P Heath), 57988 (J Hall), 58608 (University of Cambridge), 58708 (Church Commissioners for England), 58931 (Woodland Trust), 59047 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area), 59725 (Environment Agency), 59977 (Natural England), 60128 (C Blakeley), 60196 (J Preston), 60463 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Stress the importance of green space and biodiversity in Cambourne as part of the Western gateway GI corridor
Comments highlighting this issue
59203 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Baseline survey work will need to be sufficiently detailed to allow rigorous assessment. Without it risk of missing important elements of ecosystem and failing to set accurate baseline.
Comments highlighting this issue
56821 (J Mead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
BNG calculations should be done by an accredited member of CIEEM. Need to factor in that new sites will not support same range of biodiversity as established sites, and ecosystems take long time to establish.
Comments highlighting this issue
58767* (J Shanklin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy more specific and onerous than OS21, so additional cost (to public purse) to compliance, with knock-on effect to developer contributions. Work with CCC and providers to explore how the education estate might deliver BNG.
Comments highlighting this issue
57482 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments about off-site provision including:
• No advantage for residents in local area in terms of biodiversity or connectivity.
• Questionable whether nationwide benefits would be delivered.
• Suggest developers are required to demonstrate BNG measures before occupation to incentivise BNG work.
• Need to provide a delivery mechanism for off-site projects, including for smaller projects
• Need a system similar to that for the District Licencing for Protected Species.
• LPA should work proactively, positively, and collaboratively with landowners and relevant bodies to bring off-site enhancement measures forward to ensure benefit to the community.
• Consider alternatives such as 'credits' being purchased from other donor sites in order to achieve appropriate levels.
Comments highlighting this issue
57936 (L Buchholz), 57995 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group), 58499 (Marshall Group Properties), 58864 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58928 (bpha), 59762 (Endurance Estates), 60571 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site), 60764 (U&I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
First Conversation consultation showed "very strong support for biodiversity net gain including use of off-site contributions" – I believe there was strong support for biodiversity net gain but would question if there is truly 'strong support' for off-site contributions.
Comments highlighting this issue
57936 (L Buchholz)

Summary of issues raised in comments
How will GCSP ensure net gain offsetting targets are met due to the accelerated growth of WNT? How will it be monitored and manage to obtain "net gain".
Comments highlighting this issue
59846 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Please include the Wildlife Trust's proposals for a Cambridge Nature Network in the Local Plan
Comments highlighting this issue
59495* (D Seilly)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should provide for establishing areas of "Important Natural Habitats" covering areas locally identified for wildlife / biodiversity value, which do not enjoy designated status. Would help proactively inform development decisions thereby avoiding introducing cost and delay when proposals are met with objections based on a site's high wildlife value. Requirements for designating INH would need to be tightly defined. Would complement but not conflict with designations under policy BG/PO.
Comments highlighting this issue
57821 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome GI initiatives identified so far. Can help inform Local Nature Recovery Strategy in identifying valuable sites, sustainable land management and how loss/fragmentation of habitats should be avoided. Creation of larger networks will be beneficial to wildlife and support ecological resilience.
Comments highlighting this issue
59725 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Assessment in Greater Cambridge Chalk Stream Project ignores opportunity to enhance streams and water courses, which could have a significant effect in increasing biodiversity.
Comments highlighting this issue
58085* (Fulbourn Forum for community action), 58774* (Wilbraham River Protection Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Surrounding land forms are part of and support biodiversity of designated sites. Need buffer zones (of set depth) within which no development is allowed to protect wildlife or habitats beyond the site and create green corridors.
Comments highlighting this issue
56799 (A Laurie), 56821 (J Mead), 56891 (J Prince), 57134 (North Newnham Res. Ass), 57368 (P Heath), 57373 (P Heath), 57950 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Whilst off-site provision can offer value, concerned it is an easy opt out for developers, and justification for planners to remove land from Green Belt. Need clarity on Objective 3 - who would agree it, with what consultation and when in the process. Amend Objective 2 to Include additional wording on near-site improvement on adjoining land.

Comments highlighting this issue
56821 (J Mead)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strengthen policy wording to ‘will not be permitted’. Where development is permitted, biodiversity, tranquillity, light, air, noise, amenity must measure 20% BNG across all affected sites.
Comments highlighting this issue
57134 (North Newnham Res. Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Replacement is not like for like and liable to deliver net loss if new ecosystems are substituted for established ones and green networks are interrupted.
Comments highlighting this issue
57368 (P Heath)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development management: need for pre-app discussions and early site visits to ensure all parties aware of site’s characteristics and protection requirements.
Comments highlighting this issue
57372 (P Heath)

Summary of issues raised in comments
First priority must be protection and conservation of existing biodiversity and geodiversity interests. All development should be subject to thorough assessment of impacts. Mitigation hierarchy should be followed with proof it will work. Secure mitigation and compensation in perpetuity.
Comments highlighting this issue
58675 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridgeshire has few nationally designated sites but many locally designated sites. More detail needed on how to measure and mitigate impacts on local sites.
Comments highlighting this issue
58675 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Enable wildlife sites and open spaces to be formally registered in name, so they can be on neighbour notification list.
Comments highlighting this issue
57372 (P Heath)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No specific mention of ponds; can have significant beneficial effect on biodiversity.
Comments highlighting this issue
57591 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Grateful to see the importance of geodiversity has been noted. Local Geological Site should have same protection and force as Local Wildlife Sites. There are a number of Geological Sites (SSSI and LGS) within the area.
Comments highlighting this issue
57788 (R Nichols)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Using "Where Possible" says you are not serious and gives potential developers the option to not do it as it does not say "Must".
Comments highlighting this issue
57810 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Even where 20% BNG is demonstrated development should not be permitted if any nationally or locally designated species of concern will suffer loss of habitat or population impairment unless credible alternative habitat is provided, translocations undertaken if appropriate and funding secured for long-term protection & site maintenance is secured.
Comments highlighting this issue
57814 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Be clearer that biodiversity objectives are about controlling development impacts, not improving biodiversity on existing sites. 20% gain is only being sought if nature is damaged as part of development on new sites. Policy will “seek wider environmental net gains” so perhaps there are greater ambitions - should be spelled out. Missed opportunity to set goals for increasing biodiversity overall.
Comments highlighting this issue
57936 (L Buchholz)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policies must protect and enhance existing green spaces and corridors in urban areas, especially adjacent to areas of major development. Developers underplay negative impacts such as loss of open space, effects of hard surfaces etc. Increasing green spaces for people is a necessary counter.
Comments highlighting this issue
57956 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Refuse development that has adverse effects. More clarity needed on exceptions where public health benefits significantly outweigh.
Comments highlighting this issue
58675 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
BNG must take account of full value of an affected site including any deliberate damage prior to development.
Comments highlighting this issue
58675 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Planning conditions must secure effective long-term management and monitoring.
Comments highlighting this issue
58675 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
BNG conditions should include developer funds for monitoring and remedial action if required.
Comments highlighting this issue
60003 (Steeple Morden PC), 60081 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Adopting a green-washing approach to biodiversity. Best to leave natural environment undeveloped in its natural state. Take steps to improve biodiversity of unbuilt land with appropriate planting and management.
Comments highlighting this issue
59580 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Recommend policy acknowledges significance of invasive non-native species impacts on wildlife and environment.

Comments highlighting this issue
59725 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Recognise the hierarchy of international, nationally and locally designated sites. Accompany with map of existing ecological network and enhancement opportunity areas to guide development away from sensitive areas and deliver BNG.
Comments highlighting this issue
59977 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Creation of winter wet areas, water space and Suds designed to benefit enhanced biodiversity should be planned into developments at an early stage
Comments highlighting this issue
60128 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Incorporate flexibility to achieve required BNG requirements by measures most appropriate to that site, including off-site, to ensure do not stifle development.
Comments highlighting this issue
60223 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60552 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Clarity needed on what the concept of doubling nature means and how will it be measured.
Comments highlighting this issue
60241 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Natural Capital Accounting is an untested concept. Monetary assessment of ecosystem services and stocks is inadequate and used to trade away environmental for economic assets with greater yield.
Comments highlighting this issue
60241 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Dasgupta defines wealth as sum of natural, human and economic capitals and yields, and sustainability as the condition where this sum is either stable or increasing. Request Local Plan adopts Dasgupta definition of sustainability, not NPPF's false definition of 'sustainability', especially the false or under-valuation of natural capital.

Comments highlighting this issue
60241 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Give great prominence to green networks and allow for damage to designated sites from adjacent development
Comments highlighting this issue
60332 (Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Outputs must be 'sense-checked' by qualified ecologists. Concerns policy allowing off-setting off-site. New habitats created need explicit protection from development in perpetuity. Need strong statement that existing designated sites (with national or local designation) remain protected and undeveloped.
Comments highlighting this issue
60757 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Avoid noise and light pollution near biodiversity due to negative impacts. Do not propose 20% net gain in locations where wildlife will not thrive. Developers reduce biodiversity baseline. More consistency needed between developments to provide and encourage more biodiversity.
Comments highlighting this issue
56486* (A Coghlan)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Litter along roads and hedges must impact wildlife – developers should contribute to litter clean-up fund.
Comments highlighting this issue
56486* (A Coghlan)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Note the ambitious target for 20% net gain. Support ambitions but this is double the target in Biodiversity SPD and national target. Should be proportionate to the potential of specific sites, recognising the limited potential on brownfield sites.
Comments highlighting this issue
57205* (Abrdn), 57271* (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 58206* (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome requirement for net gain. Metrics take no account of disturbance factors. An interconnected distribution of havens remote from severe disturbance should be maintained. Ditches and hedgerows are important and should be protected. Business developments have greater potential for net gain as less disturbance, particularly outside working hours, and no domestic animals. Important sufficient space is set aside within such developments.
Comments highlighting this issue
57590* (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support ambition for 20% BNG. Challenging to deliver given other constraints. Need clear mechanism for off-site provision, including directing it to locations where it will provide most value. Want to engage with GCSP on developing this mechanism.
Comments highlighting this issue
58494* (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should include minimum 50m buffer zones around all designated sites. Opportunity for BNG through Environmental Land Management Schemes, particularly for sites which currently have no buffer protection.
Comments highlighting this issue
58757* (J Shanklin), 58761* (J Shanklin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Any offsetting area needs to have a management plan and funding to enable that management to be carried out.
Comments highlighting this issue
58775* (J Shanklin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Metrics should consider all species of conservation concern, including rare and threatened species, not just protected.
Comments highlighting this issue
58781* (J Shanklin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Require surveys within last 5 years. Also consider overall habitat which may support a range of species that are not of individual significance.
Comments highlighting this issue
58783* (J Shanklin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Amenity grassland can cover a wide variation from a monoculture of hard-wearing grass to species rich that is only apparent during periods such as “no mow May”. Often lawns of older properties retain many species that persist from when the lawn was created.
Comments highlighting this issue
58785* (J Shanklin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Biodiversity should be integrated into the whole landscape and should be included in all new developments, for example
• bee-friendly plantings,
• wild flower meadows,
• tree planting and space for woodland
• fruit trees in public spaces
• Local composting facilities
• Space for wetlands – ponds, lakes and rivers
Comments highlighting this issue
59069* (Cambridge Sustainable Food CIC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Insects are essential to all larger animals - Cambridge should become a pesticide free town.
Comments highlighting this issue
56486* (A Coghlan)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No mention of pressure from the significant number of large housing developments on chalk stream network. Major omission that needs addressing. Disappointing not see to see any quantitative targets in this section.
Comments highlighting this issue
59225* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy being contravened by allowing industrial scale development on Green Belt at Honey Hill. Lighting, construction traffic will disturb wildlife. Contamination risks to Quy Fen SSSI and flood risk being minimised by developer. BNG is meaningless. Wicken Fen Vision will be compromised.
Comments highlighting this issue
57475 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Any plan which does not include Honey Hill is a fake plan. Please tell the truth.
Comments highlighting this issue
57536 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support 20% BNG and seek to achieve at Cambridge East, on-site but off-site provision will also be required. Need for clearly identified mechanisms for achieving off-site BNG. Engage with GCSP.
Comments highlighting this issue
58499 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposing new habitat credit site at Steeple Morden to be available for off-setting BNG.
Comments highlighting this issue
59741 (Henley Real Estate Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Promoting site for development with opportunity to deliver BNG.
Comments highlighting this issue
58219 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd), 58763 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58787 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58828 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family), 59762 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
University's Biodiversity Action Plan has vision to improve biodiversity on University estate and Greater Cambridge area to educate, inspire appreciation and encourages interventions, research and innovation.
Comments highlighting this issue
58608 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue
57390 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

BG/GI: Green infrastructure

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy BG/GI: Green infrastructure > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 87

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to green infrastructure. 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

Executive Summary

Broad support for the policy intention was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, with comments that multi-functional, connected, green infrastructure is a key part of a successful spatial strategy.

Comments also included that the policy direction was good but ambiguous and needed clarification, including how it relates to other Aims and policies within the Plan and to Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards. Comments that green infrastructure doesn’t respect boundaries, encouraging partnership working, and the need for clear funding mechanisms for delivery.

Some developers commented that the policy should be a recommendation not a requirement, should recognise some sites may not be able to deliver due to locational constraints, site size and viability, that development should not be opposed where reasonable steps have been taken to protect and incorporate GI. Some comments from individuals expressed concern how the policy would be delivered via the planning process to ensure contributions will invest in strategic initiatives, and that the policy approach did not include a standard for measurement or achieved performance of developments.

There was widespread support for the green infrastructure initiatives, with many comments about specific initiatives including suggested amendments to their boundaries, joining up with other initiatives such as National Trust's Wicken Fen Vision, and proposing other ecological measures for inclusion.

Comments suggested the policy should consider the additional recreational pressure arising from developments, encourage increased access to green spaces through joining up spaces, and that all homes without gardens must have easy access. Comments included that the policy lacked specific proposals for improving public access and connectivity, including for horse riding.

Table of representations: BG/GI: Green infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the policy

Comments highlighting this issue
58425 (Linton PC), 60404 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of the green infrastructure strategy, minimising land use for development.

Comments highlighting this issue
59482* (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strongly support this policy. As a Parish with several disconnected woodland areas would like to highlight the importance of linking natural habitats with diverse hedgerows or belts of trees.

Comments highlighting this issue
56913 (Cllr D Sargeant, West Wickham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support approach and need for clear requirements for new development to support GI infrastructure provision. Accessibility and locational relationship of development to GI strategic areas should be a key consideration.

Comments highlighting this issue
59054 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Identification of 14 strategic green infrastructure initiatives will assist delivery of Environment Bill mandatory 10% minimum biodiversity net gain where on-site provision cannot reach this level.

Comments highlighting this issue
58679* (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strongly support policy. Welcome inclusion of 14 strategic GI priority areas and themes. Provision of significant strategic natural greenspace is essential and will need significant funding through new development. Use of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace standard at 8 Ha / 1000 population is a good start. Open space standards (BG/PO and BG/EO) woefully inadequate without corresponding strategic GI provision.

Comments highlighting this issue
57008 (The Wildlife Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy. Two strategic GI initiatives append important landscape character areas in Huntingdonshire; Areas 5 & 8. Area 8 - suggest working together to protect and promote interconnectedness between the woodlands.

Comments highlighting this issue
57392 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support ambitious targets for green infrastructure provision. Marshall is developing ambitious plans that provides a high value biodiversity resource. Proposes to make green infrastructure multi-functional. Keen to enhance Eastern Fens. Would welcome Plan requiring all, or at least developments of a significant scale, to seek green infrastructure accreditation, for example through Building with Nature scheme.

Comments highlighting this issue
58506 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy intention for development proposals to include green infrastructure, providing benefits for people, wildlife and planet.

Comments highlighting this issue
58614 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support intent of policy, reference to Cambridgeshire Nature Network and adoption of standards for provision of GI. Protection of existing sites should be first priority. Support requirement for financial contribution, where cannot be provided on-site, to support existing and create new areas off-site. Would like to discuss Opportunity Mapping report.

Comments highlighting this issue
58690 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supports objective to enhance existing green infrastructure network and address how development proposals can link with green infrastructure. Aim for all development to include green infrastructure is beneficial for people of Greater Cambridge.
'Trumpington South' is surrounded by extensive green infrastructure, includes 150 acre Country Park and River Cam corridor, to North West. Propose potential expansion by further 33%. Management could be integrated with Country Park.

Comments highlighting this issue
58766 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green infrastructure is a key part of a successful spatial strategy. Welcome identification of Strategic Green Infrastructure Initiatives, and the statement that "Explicitly identifying these initiatives and their objectives in the Local Plan will not restrict development in the broad areas they cover." Engagement with landowners in the identified areas will be essential.

Comments highlighting this issue
58959 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the principle of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Initiatives and policy which requires delivery of on-site greenspace in new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
59296 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy to require all development to include green infrastructure and protect/enhance water environments. Welcome list of initiatives. We consider ‘connectivity’ a key component; support references to ‘providing links’ and connecting wider ecological network. Existing habitats and green spaces within development footprints should be protected and incorporated where possible.

Comments highlighting this issue
59726 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome the comprehensive approach in developing the GI evidence base, including Opportunity Mapping and identification of 14 Strategic GI initiatives. Multifunctional benefits of GI are fully recognised, as well as links between GI provision and delivery of other strategic policy areas including wider natural environment, sustainable transport and social inclusion. These threads/links should continue through future drafts to ensure the value of GI for people and natural environment is fully reflected. Clear value in having funding mechanisms and a recognised GI standard in place.

Comments highlighting this issue
59978 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support identification of 14 strategic GI initiatives and enhancing linkages between GI and open spaces to provide corridors for wildlife. Support use of a GI standard, particularly on larger developments. In particular early identification of GI and biodiversity assets and potential gains as an early part of design process and/or planning brief.

Comments highlighting this issue
60127 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
One of the key policies; identifies existing green infrastructure network and strategic initiatives intended to enhance it and addresses how development proposals should relate to green infrastructure. CEG fully support Councils' aims and ambitions in this regard. Policy should encourage increasing access to green spaces through a joined up green infrastructure approach.

Comments highlighting this issue
60280 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support BG/GI seeking to protect and expand green (and blue?) infrastructure which benefits people, wildlife, and the planet.

Comments highlighting this issue
60471 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for recognition of Pollinator corridors. Strategic Green Infrastructure should include protection and enhancement of chalk aquifer spring line.

Comments highlighting this issue
60004 (Steeple Morden PC), 60082 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
We support the policy to protect and improve chalk streams.

Comments highlighting this issue
57706 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome focus of Policy and support objectives and proposals. Initiative 3 - need to improve biodiversity of arable land across an important area of chalk farmland. Initiative 14 is lighter on content than others; problematic and have suggested ways could be strengthened through additional objectives.

Comments highlighting this issue
56822 (J Meed)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supports requirement for new developments to include GI and emphasis on River Cam corridor and Gog Magog hills and chalkland fringe. Stress importance of maintaining and improving Hobson's Brook/Vicar's Brook Green Corridor. Increase investment in assets such as Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Hobson's Park and protect them from development. Concern about water demand and risk to River Cam and Hobson's Brook from Nine Wells.

Comments highlighting this issue
56975 & 56976 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Any development at S/CBC/A detrimental to well-being of existing Queen Edith's residents. Policy should protect Nine Wells Nature Reserve, already under stress and being gradually degraded. Field between NWNR and railway line should be allocated for protection and enhancement.

Comments highlighting this issue
57952 (F Goodwille), 58171 (S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy needs greater coherence as proposals and sites are not linked by an overarching policy that makes them ecologically contiguous.
Existing green infrastructures around Babraham (unlinked) need to be more ecologically coherent and given greater protection. No 3 Gog Magog should extend to A11 to protect valuable riparian forest and flood plain habitats, include river (i.e. link with no1), as Granta tributary is over abstracted and being managed in a piecemeal fashion.

Comments highlighting this issue
58155 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Area 4 is described as Enhancement of the eastern fens. Appears to contradict proposed CWWTP relocation to that area. Policy requires new development to help deliver or support delivery of GI strategic initiative objectives. Putting development on an area of Green Belt contradicts this principle.

Comments highlighting this issue
57514 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57619 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supported: Note S/NEC Policy will impact on aspirations for Enhancement of Eastern Fens GI as a result of required relocation of CWWTP to fulfil S/NEC policy identified as Honey Hill.

Comments highlighting this issue
57675 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Principle of enhancing existing green infrastructure is supported but clarity is required regarding proposed relocation of Waste Water treatment Works to green belt, which appears to conflict with Area 4, Enhancement of Eastern Fens.

Comments highlighting this issue
58133 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Contradicting policy by allowing CWWTP to be rebuilt in Area 4, an area intended to be enhanced, and part of Wicken Fen Vision. Will also compromise River Cam corridor.

Comments highlighting this issue
59160 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
'Enhancement of the Eastern Fens' initiative should be extended to include Wicken Fen vision. One of key delivery programmes for Natural Cambridgeshire 'doubling nature' vision. Green infrastructure is a cross boundary issue and initiatives should not stop at local authority boundaries. Acknowledge that delivery would require partnership working. By thinking across boundaries, we can create a network of greenspaces. National Trust committed to enhancing urban green spaces and linking access to countryside to create 20 green corridors (by 2030); identified Wicken Fen to Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
59296 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Unfortunate the Opportunity Mapping Final Report unavailable. North Cambridge

Green Space should cover area south west of Histon - four woodlands with high levels of community use (two designated in Neighbourhood Plan); also meadows. Footpaths have high use for amenity. Opportunity to contribute to doubling nature.

Comments highlighting this issue
57806 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Barton Road Riffle Range falls within Strategic Initiative 7. Would introduce constraints and potential incompatible uses that could place unreasonable restrictions on how MOD use the land. Strongly recommend boundary is amended.

Comments highlighting this issue
57480 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation – MOD)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Couldn’t see detail of maps. Essential policies and map identify the importance of green infrastructure provided by network of linked green spaces in West Cambridge, unique to the setting of city, for green wildlife corridor they provide. Policies need wording to ‘Reinforce and enhance landscape and townscape’.

Comments highlighting this issue
57954 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is paramount Grantchester meadows be included as an integral part of Cambs green infrastructure. Has been left out of W Cambridge GI Buffer Zone. Create a conservation covenant across the Grantchester Meadow area to mitigate impacts of high pressure from recreational visitors; lack of public transport, no parking, no management of litter are directly damaging environment.

Comments highlighting this issue
60488 (Grantchester PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The section will achieve the aim of the plan and should be supported. The importance of existing green space and biodiversity in Cambourne should be stressed especially as Cambourne is part of the Western gateway multifunctional green infrastructure corridor.

Comments highlighting this issue
59205 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Purpose of policy should be strategic and Western Gateway Multifunctional Green Infrastructure Corridor should be focused on strategic developments at Cambourne and Bourn Airfield.

Comments highlighting this issue
56484 (V Chapman), 56493 (D & B Searle), 56502 (W Grain), 56520 (RJ & JS Millard)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Western Gateway proposal. Consider extending boundary to cover whole of parish up to Central Bedfordshire border.

Comments highlighting this issue
56568 & 56624 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Western Gateway proposal. Consider extending boundary to cover whole of parish up to Central Bedfordshire border.
Comments highlighting this issue
56568 & 56624 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Map shows Land at St Peter’s Street being within Western Gateway Multifunctional Green Infrastructure Corridor (WGMGIC) (8). WGMGIC covers a large area of land and should be focused on large strategic developments at Cambourne and Bourn Airfield. Unreasonable to cover the whole of Caxton.
Comments highlighting this issue
58733 (R Grain)

Summary of issues raised in comments
National Trust's Wimpole Estate falls within Western Gateway and two pollinator corridors. Welcome discussions about working together to deliver greater connectivity to these spaces. Also fulfil 11, 13 and 14 of the dispersed green infrastructure initiatives and keen to engage with partners.

Comments highlighting this issue
59315 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy highlights areas considered appropriate for green infrastructure initiatives. With regards to promotion of land in Coton, area 7 (West Cambridge green infrastructure buffer – Coton Corridor) is relevant to land at Silverdale Close given it washes over the site. Policy should be drafted so as not to inhibit development within these areas and set out potential requirements to be included within such development.
Comments highlighting this issue
60587 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strategic Initiative No 8: recommend extend to include Orwell Clunch pit and village. Collaboration with landowners could improve planting, providing a corridor for wildlife.
Comments highlighting this issue
57127* (M Gould), 58451* (Orwell PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Area 8 - policy misses out half of Gamlingay ward which will create problems; excludes protected green sites at The Heath and The Cinques. Scope for cross border projects enhancing Acid Heath, stretches west to Potton and Sandy. (Gamlingay is part of The Greensand Ridge which has funding for enhancement work as part of Greensand Country). Gamlingay is in River Ivel catchment.
Comments highlighting this issue
60366 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Only refers to cycling and walking not horse riding - discriminatory. Roman Road at Babraham is not a footpath. Good ideas regarding health and wellbeing. Supports protection of bridleways for soft surface users. Essential public access, links and enhancements to PROW and green spaces built into development conception not an afterthought. Urban greening and de-paving supports protection of rural grass paths.
Comments highlighting this issue
56698 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It appears our bid (GO23) has not been properly considered in LUC work, and subsequently the strategic GI map and policy. Included in Neighbourhood Plan policies.
Comments highlighting this issue
59759* (Foxton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Call for Green Sites submission (Ref 53032) has not been properly considered. Superb opportunity to create new chalkland habitat, open to informal recreation, with enhanced hedgerows and woodland management.
Comments highlighting this issue
57437 (Foxton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Yes, but do not provide concrete busways or cycle lanes that disfigure the landscape.
Comments highlighting this issue
56712 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Honey Hill is not mentioned. It will be destroyed if WWTP is moved, it goes against principle of doubling nature and net biodiversity gain. You can't have one without consequences of other.
Comments highlighting this issue
57500 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Appraisal Scoping Report flagged risk associated specifically from phosphates and nitrates arising from development, agriculture and GARDENS. Use of chemical herb / pesticide, fertiliser in domestic gardens adjoining nature reserves should be accounted for in BNG and long term management to reduce pollution and impacts on flora and fauna and insects.
Comments highlighting this issue
57135 (North Newnham Res. Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy appears more specific and onerous than OS21, but strategic outcomes are same. Request a degree of flexibility and pragmatism.
Comments highlighting this issue
57483 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be a recommendation not a requirement. Developments should not be opposed where all reasonable steps have been taken to protect and incorporate green infrastructure. Useful to include further guidance in an SPD.
Comments highlighting this issue
57095 (C King), 57297 (C Sawyer Nutt), 59152 (Endurance Estates), 60288 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60339 & 60350 (FC Butler Trust), 60361 (HJ Molton Settlement), 60373 (The Critchley Family), 60378 (S & J Graves), 60388 (D Wright), 60470 (P, J & M Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is definitely worth using an objective and professionally respected scheme to judge plans and proposals, and to measure performance.
Comments highlighting this issue
57593 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Include protection of Geodiversity; many Strategic GI areas have geological dimension. Developers should be encouraged to facilitate any request from a suitably qualified group to view results of groundworks to identify and record any potential geological features exposed prior to them being covered / destroyed.
Comments highlighting this issue
57790 (R Nicholls)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Some developments will have no gardens particularly urban areas. All homes with no gardens MUST have recreation space within a 5 minute (for example) walk.
Comments highlighting this issue
57811 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should include specific reference to implementation of government's objective of protecting 30% of land for nature by 2030. It should embrace "wildbelt designation" concept in Wildlife Trust's "Planning A new way forward"
Comments highlighting this issue
57816 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strongly support increase in green infrastructure. Question how this will be embedded and upheld in the planning process. NEC falls short of ANGST standards. Wiggle room for allowing development which could overwhelm creation of new GI. Worry developers will opt for off-site benefits - how can we be sure contributions will invest in strategic initiative areas.
Comments highlighting this issue
57937 (L Buchholz)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green infrastructure is a good idea, especially in terms of creating wildlife corridors. How does plan meet Natural England's Accessible Greenspace Standards in terms of 100 hectares of greenspace for (for example) Northeast Cambridge?
Comments highlighting this issue
57970 (V Morrow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is no absolute standard for measurement or achieved performance of developments.
Comments highlighting this issue
57997 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Council has agreed with Natural England to prepare a mitigation strategy for Therfield Heath SSSI, west of Royston. Additional recreational pressures arising from developments, particularly within SSSI Zones of Influence will need to be considered in the future.
Comments highlighting this issue
58681 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should recognise that some sites, given locational constraints, especially within City, may not be able to deliver enhancements envisaged and may not be viable.
Comments highlighting this issue
58994 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy requirement for all new development to help deliver or contribute to support delivery of the green infrastructure strategic initiative objectives. Policy conflicts with paragraph 57 of NPPF (planning obligations), particularly for small scale developments. Wording should be amended to reference major developments.
Comments highlighting this issue
59171 (Silverley Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Consider how to work with private landowners to create more food growing spaces in central Cambridge (where allotment demand is greatest), bearing in mind two colleges already provide small allotments on outskirts of city.
Comments highlighting this issue
59238 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broadly welcome policy on Green Infrastructure; reference to reinforcing and enhancing landscape and townscape; consider the role it can play in conserving and enhancing historic environment. Helpful to highlight important synergy between historic and natural environment. Maintenance of spaces should also be considered to ensure remain high quality places. Landscape Character Assessment and Historic Landscape Characterisation should be used to inform future GI plans.
Comments highlighting this issue
59672 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments included were: • Green space and more diversity
Comments highlighting this issue
59713 (Caldecote PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments included were: • Farming community to [be] consulted.
Comments highlighting this issue
59714 (Caldecote PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Waterbeach parish abuts Green Belt, green open space and river Cam corridor. Extremely important that designated and other protected areas be enhanced and not a means to compensate for lack of green space in high density settlements such as Cambridge North Eastern Fringe development. Important to protect abundant biodiversity and habitat in the parish. WPC request this matter is treated as a priority if development is accelerated in WNT and GC area.
Comments highlighting this issue
59845 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broadly supportive but again concern that this is too general a concept that requires further precision.
Comments highlighting this issue
59921 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green infrastructure appears extensively mapped and broad areas for projects identified. GI is a cross boundary matter as ecosystems do not stop at administrative boundaries; policies should enable development of green infrastructure across boundaries where relevant. Recommended the plan takes a positive stance towards contributing to aims of statutory Nature Recovery Strategies established by Environment Act 2021. While await secondary legislation to specify details, policies could still take a positive stance towards them pre-emptively.
Comments highlighting this issue
59956 (Suffolk Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
We fully recognise the benefits of open spaces as key aspect of the environment; fundamental to the character of an area. More conservation management staff are needed. Riparian pasture is essential to future of our green spaces. Tree planting and appropriate species selection is important, but greatest losses of habitat have been lowland florally rich grassland. This is a more appropriate target for river

corridors than extensive tree planting.

Comments highlighting this issue

60177 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Flawed that green infrastructure and historic environment are considered separately. A holistic approach is essential – see NPPF definition of the historic environment.

Comments highlighting this issue

60197 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need to identify a clear list of projects for NMU routes and public access which development should fund. Proposals are extremely vague and do not focus on specifics. They are well-meaning but toothless and we will finish up without ANY much-needed schemes being built into the Plan

Comments highlighting this issue

60495 (Cambridge Local Access Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Primary concern is lack of specific proposals for improving access and connectivity for people on foot, away from traffic. No areas are identified for safeguarding open space as access land. Does not address funding of paths and open access. Propose a list of proposals for inclusion.

Comments highlighting this issue

59842 (Cambridge Group of Ramblers)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy wording states all development proposals will include green infrastructure appropriate to its type, scale and location. Further clarification should be provided to avoid any ambiguity.

Comments highlighting this issue

60515 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60572 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy is good but direction is ambiguous in explanation; needs clarification to avoid misinterpretation. Policy should clearly relate to Great Places/Climate Change. Unclear interaction with open space standards in BG/EO. Strongly advocate specific

targets for provision of GI. Clarify that provision of green space should respect the Natural England Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards. Support that development should meet GI Standard in Building with Nature. Support list of strategic GI initiatives, Expanding Greater Cambridge's 'urban forest'. Pleased to see Allotments and Community Gardening listed.

Comments highlighting this issue

60759 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Residential development should contribute towards delivery of Strategic Green Infrastructure initiatives.

Comments highlighting this issue

59987* (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Active site allocations for green infrastructure should be made on the same scale as allocating land for housing/business/employment development.

Comments highlighting this issue

56622* (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need clarity on Biodiversity and Green Spaces Topic Paper and Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Opportunity Mapping. Recommend the objectives in supporting documents be included within local plan to give them more weight.

Comments highlighting this issue

56820* (J Mead)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy needs to recognise that dogs are not compatible with biodiversity. Some sites need to be designated as dog free, others will need limited public access.

Comments highlighting this issue

58764* (J Shanklin)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Positive to see policy explore proposal for all significant developments to align to the Building With Nature standard. Will strengthen the framework for protecting green spaces identified in local neighbourhood plans, for example.

Comments highlighting this issue
59225* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Not justified to reject the alternative approach to restrict development within respective GI strategic areas on the basis that these areas are too broad. To redress the balance wherein the value of GI is greater than that of new developments, the policy should be to define the strategic areas more specifically.
Comments highlighting this issue
59225* (Teversham PC)

BG/TC: Improving Tree Canopy Cover and the Tree Population

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy BG/TC: Improving Tree Canopy Cover and the Tree Population > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 43

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There was broad support for the objectives and priorities for improving tree canopy cover and tree population was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, noting the existing low level of tree cover in Cambridgeshire, with comments that policies must be robust to protect trees and to deliver enhancements through development. Comments were made proposing specific tree canopy cover requirements on all new development, with the inclusion of ongoing maintenance, and replacement of trees when felled. Comments noted the importance of planting the right tree species in the right location. Comments were expressed by one parish that a community forest or strategic plan is needed with allocated sites within the district, linking existing ancient woodland habitats, providing wildlife corridors.

Concerns from some developers on the wording stated the policy was contradictory stating both that “all trees should be protected” and “only trees of value should be protected”, and that policy detail is vague and did not provide details on when its applied. Additionally, there were requests for policy flexibility on tree removal due to disease, age or safety concerns.

Further responses requested a more flexible approach applied to the policy, balancing priority for tree planting with provision of sustainable development, suggesting an explicit policy direction toward “trees of value” rather than blanket

protection and balancing tree removal against the benefits of bringing development forward.

Table of Representations: BG/TC Improving Tree Canopy Cover and the Tree Population

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support/ Strongly Support Policy:

• Objective 3, as relevant to improving the farmed landscape of Greater Cambridge.
• Objective should be strengthened about how achieved in practice
• Policy should be a requirement in all new development.
• Establish specific requirements for tree canopy cover in new development areas and set targets for improving tree populations in the rest of the city.
• Need to develop and maintain the tree/hedge network, and surrounding land
• Importance of maintaining trees once planted in new developments
• Include irrigation and maintenance of areas and trees
• Ensure additional tree cover is in suitable locations and provision of species resilient to anticipated climate change.
• Should be recognised in some locations other habitats have priority over trees.
• Current depletion of the chalk aquifer with dry summers adversely affecting tree health, mostly conifers. In favour of proposals like Cambridge Great Park.
• Policy inclusion of tree canopy, enhance river corridors, and protect and enhance open spaces. Include robust policy to deliver enhancements through development ensuring achievement of multi-functional benefits for climate change, biodiversity, water quality, access and green infrastructure. Tree planting needs to be targeted in appropriate locations and considered in the context of wider plans for nature recovery, not simply planting of trees and protecting / enhancing soils, particularly peat soils.
• Support, especially enhanced protection to existing mature trees.
• Support opportunity for rural field margins of agricultural land helping increase linkages, biodiversity gains and in specific places the creation of woodland belts in open countryside, green belt land and around villages.
• Urban areas, with existing trees there’s need to plan replacement with adaptation species to gradually adapt to a changing climate.
• Provide sufficient future tree cover to mitigate the urban heat island effect, provide shade and mitigate microclimatic effects.
• Would require that best practices followed.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals:
56693 (J Meed), 57676 (J Conroy), 57939 (L Buchholz), 57971 (V Morrow), 58924 (A Sykes), 60129 (C Blakeley).
Public Bodies:
56730 (Croydon PC), 57302 (Foxton PC), 57394 (Huntingdonshire District Council), 58426 (Linton PC), 60005 (Steeple Morden PC), 60083 (Guilden Morden PC).
Third Sector Organisations:
56977 (Trumpington Residents Association), 58618 (University of Cambridge), 58698 (Cambridge Past Present and Future).
Other Organisations:
57014 (The Wildlife Trust), 59979 (Natural England), 60761 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties).
Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners:
59765 (Endurance Estates).

Summary of issues raised in comments
• Protect existing hedgerows and supporting surrounding land.
• Plant new hedgerows/trees where appropriate.
• Improve maintenance by hedge owners, reduce spraying and incorrect cutting.
• Hedges recognised as character of an area, streetscape or public realm in Conservation areas, cannot be removed for more parking of cars, bins or cycles.
• Wooden or metal fencing not viable substitutes for natural hedges.

Comments highlighting this issue
57136 (North Newnham Residents Association).

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy addresses aims contained in the vision.

Comments highlighting this issue
59206 (Cambourne TC).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Forestry Commission report on the vital importance of improving, enhancing, protecting and preserving tree cover. This must be delivered everywhere in and around Cambridge, but especially where tree canopy cover falls below the meagre average for our area.

Comments highlighting this issue
60211 (JV Neal).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Where trees felled or hedgerows removed, they should be replaced. Policy should recognise, preserve and protect Forestry Commission Woodland Priority Habitat Network, Natural England Priority Habitat Network Woodland and Natural England National Forest Inventory.

Comments highlighting this issue
57707 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC).

Summary of issues raised in comments
This is a priority, and a proper evolving plan needs to be put in place.

Comments highlighting this issue
60405 (Great and Little Chishill PC).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome the policy direction to “provide sufficient space above and below ground for trees and other vegetation to mature”. Strongly support that the first five bullet points are about “protecting” existing trees on a development site.

Comments highlighting this issue
60761 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridgeshire has low woodland compared to other counties – would be great value to create managed broadleaf woodlands near Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
56486* (A Coghlan).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Be mandatory that already approved plans plant many trees on site. Include roads that are redeveloped, eg. Histon and Milton Roads. Consult & encourage residents to contribute to cost of planting more trees if funding an issue.

Comments highlighting this issue
57252* (D Lott).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strategic plan required:
• Community forest/strategic plan needed, with allocated sites for tree belts/mini forests within the district.
• Propose necklace of mini forests surrounding parish linking existing ancient woodland habitats, providing wildlife corridors (8 Western Gateway area).

Comments highlighting this issue
56625 (Gamlingay PC).

Summary of issues raised in comments
• More weight to be given to environmental benefits of Tree Protection Orders (TPO).
• Hedgerows around developments should be protected from 'sanitisation', and wherever possible occasional trees along hedgerows should be preserved or replaced.
• Funding and compensation needed to enable 'Farmland near Balsham Wood' as a GI site.

Comments highlighting this issue
57594 (R Pargeter).

Summary of issues raised in comments
• Refer to use of native species (local provenance) for tree/hedge planting, subject to viability due to climate change.
• Plant scrub species recognising important habitat for farmland birds.
• Be clear woodland species not always appropriate nor desirable.

Comments highlighting this issue
57818 (J Pavey).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Beneficial to increase tree and woodland cover, but care should be taken determining how/if this approach is consistent with maximising net biodiversity gains.

Comments highlighting this issue
57905 (Martin Grant Homes).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be an objective measure for tree canopy cover, a method of measurement.

Forestry Commission suggest urban targets of 20% canopy cover in its website: https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/fthr/tree-canopy-cover-leaflet/

Comments highlighting this issue
57998 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Tree planting and additional tree canopy is extremely important, the policy should avoid cheap, poorly planned tree planting, wrong species planted in the wrong places, be consistent with the local ecological conditions and place emphasis to recover and restore existing woodland areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
58162 (H Thomas).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Tree and hedgerow planting are fundamental part of the Cambridge East proposals including the green corridor, developed areas (including street trees), and carbon sequestration elsewhere in Cambridgeshire. Trees within the airfield occur rarely, there is significant potential for major gain.

Comments highlighting this issue
58509 (Marshall Group Properties).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supports the provision of new woodland within landscape lead masterplans for new development, Trumpington South being a significant opportunity for this.

Comments highlighting this issue
58770 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Apply policy to the S/EOC/GB2 development to maintain the green hedgerow and tree lined footpath along Worts Causeway.

Comments highlighting this issue
57815 (D Lister).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Right tree right place.

Comments highlighting this issue
59057 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Poor tree canopy cover across Cambridgeshire – target of 19% is welcome. Disappointing not see to see more recent re-evaluation of wet woodland in evidence base. Greater need for targets to align to BNG and TC target. Need greater emphasis on improving quality and diversity.

Comments highlighting this issue
59225* (Teversham PC).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Agree tree cover is an important issue and have taken advantage of some of the tree offers that have been around. Fail to see that Chalk Hills will support planting of numerous trees in our near area. Wandlebury have strong policy for tree planting and maintenance, moving towards meeting this need in our area.

Comments highlighting this issue
57525* (Stapleford PC).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support but feel the policy should be stronger in encouraging provision of new woodland of locally appropriate species. Sees real opportunities in the south west of the area to create some great woodland, such as West Cambs Hundreds and towards Wimpole as per Cambridge Nature Network plans.

Comments highlighting this issue
59070 (National Trust).

Summary of issues raised in comments
• Requests more flexible approach applied to policy on trees.
• Need to balance priority for tree planting with provision of sustainable development, tree protection should not be at the expense of the provision of housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
57174 (Southern & Regional Development Ltd), 57247 (European Properties Ventures (Cambridgeshire)).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy detail is vague and does not provide details on when it will apply.

Comments highlighting this issue
60585 (Martin Grant Homes).

Summary of issues raised in comments
Site specific constraints and other policy directions in emerging Plan, to allow the most efficient and sustainable development of sites. Policy direction to be explicit that ‘trees of value’ should be protected as opposed to the blanket protection of all tree cover on sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
59003 (Metro Property Unit Trust).

Summary of issues raised in comments
• Current policy direction somewhat contradictory: one bullet states all trees should be protected; another suggests only trees of value should be protected.
• Consider introducing additional flexibility allowing for instances of trees removal due to disease, age or safety concerns.
• Consider the removal of trees, in whole or part, in order for development to be brought forward; loss should be weighed against the benefits of the proposals.
• Questions necessity or justification of stipulating a tool such as iTree.

Comments highlighting this issue
59528 (Countryside Properties - Bourn Airfield), 60516 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.), 60573 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton Site).

Summary of issues raised in comments
In managing the trees and hedgerows around the existing Milton WRC (as well as other sites) and looking to make significant provision as part of CWWTPR as shown by our Consultation, we have provided a good starting point for the development of the site through the NE Cambridge allocation.

Comments highlighting this issue
60464 (Anglia Water Services Ltd.).

BG/RC: River Corridors

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy BG/RC: River corridorshttps://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/greater-cambridge-local-plan-first-proposals/explore-theme/biodiversity-and-green-spaces/policy-1 > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 39

Notes

- Some comments attached to this section relate to development strategy, climate change and specific site policies. These comments are presented at the end of the section. Where appropriate we will review placement of these comments in the final version of these representation summaries which will accompany the draft plan.

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council PROWs: Public Rights of Way

Executive Summary

Broad support for the policy direction was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, public bodies, organisations and developers, in particular for policy to both manage development on and require development to conserve and enhance the River Cam corridor (with comment this is particularly important due to the corridor's role in the wider cityscape). Support for policy to protect/enhance/and restore natural features, and to support re-naturalisation. Comments that natural flood management techniques should be encouraged and comment that large schemes which improve water quality or tackle flooding should have assumption in favour of development within plan.

Some comments suggested the policy direction is too general and needs more precision, including a clear definition to ensure it is enforceable. Comments included that the policy, and wider draft plan, should recognise the river corridor as an important heritage asset as well as an environmental asset, and consider townscape impacts including overshadowing by tall buildings. There was comment that there is

need for integrated policy approach encompassing water resources, water quality, flood risk and recognising the role of green infrastructure. Some comments were made in support of the need to balance tourism, improving people's access to high quality green spaces and multiple uses of the river (and its corridor) whilst protecting the river environment and wildlife. Anglian Water proposed that they and the two Councils enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to support the landscape scale integrated water management case for new strategic water supply provision.

Other comments suggested the that the policy approach be extended to explicitly include: chalk streams (including those around Fulbourn and Great Wilbraham), the river Great Ouse Corridor, the Ivel tributary and Ivel drainage board area and brooks from the aquifer spring line, the Wilbraham River, the Rhee, the Granta and surrounding woodland around Babraham, and that protection of upper Cam valley should extend into Uttlesford.

Table of Representations: GB/RC River Corridors

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broad support for policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56690 (J Meed), 58134 (M Asplin), 58157 (H Thomas), 58932 (A Sykes)

Public Bodies
56626 (Gamlingay PC), 58427 (Linton PC), 59922 (Fen Ditton PC), 60006 (Steeple Morden PC), 60084 (Guilden Morden PC)

Third Sector Organisations
56978 (Trumpington RA), 58736 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60176 (Cam Valley Forum), 60766 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Other Organisations
57013 (The Wildlife Trust), 59058 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts), 59673 (Historic England), 60446 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
58513 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A policy to manage development that has an impact on river corridors and proposes to protect, enhance and restore natural features, supporting re-naturalisation is particularly important for Cambridge due to the role the following play in managing

flood risk and provision of habitats:
• Chalk Streams
• Role of Rivers
• Floodplains

Comments highlighting this issue
59727 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy which protects river corridors by ensuring ‘the location, scale and design of development, protects and enhances the character, visual amenity and historic significance of river corridors and connected locations, including in particular considering views to and from rivers’.

Comments highlighting this issue
56510 (C Martin), 56731 (Croydon PC), 57945 (L Buchholz), 57974 (V Morrow), 60130 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Rivers need protecting and enhancing

Comments highlighting this issue
60406 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should include provision of appropriate setback of developments from rivers to provide sufficient space for flood waters as well as safeguarding the integrity of the riverbanks and the development itself. This is needed as rivers, unless they have been artificially straightened, move through their landscapes through natural processes of erosion and deposition. Although river migration occurs over long time periods, developments should be set back generously to account for this alongside climate change.

Comments highlighting this issue
59727 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to balance tourism with protecting river environment (noting need to work with landowners).

Comments highlighting this issue
56978 (Trumpington RA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Plan should not only include River Cam corridor (including south of city) and its tributaries but should also:
• reference the Ivel tributary and Ivel Drainage Board area
• enhance tributaries, for example Hobson's Brook
• recognise the Wilbraham River as part of the River Cam corridor (see Submission Draft of the Fulbourn NP)
• note that Steeple Morden has important tributary (The Rhee) from river Cam which flows through parish

Comments highlighting this issue
56626 (Gamlingay PC), 56978 (Trumpington RA), 57071 (Fulbourn Swifts Group), 60006 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Suggest the policy approach be extended to include the River Great Ouse Corridor (which passes through northern edge of plan area).

Comments highlighting this issue
57396 (Huntingdonshire DC), 59058 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Under the Duty to Cooperate with Uttlesford DC protection of the upper Cam valley should extend into that District.

Comments highlighting this issue
57931 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the protection and restoration of the chalk aquifer and related chalk streams.

Comments highlighting this issue
56826 (A Sykes), 57071 (Fulbourn Swifts Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to not overlook both:

• the chalk streams around Fulbourn and Great Wilbraham that feed Little Wilbraham River (which flows into Quy Water and into the river Cam) as they support significant biodiversity within Fulbourn Fen Nature Reserve (SSSI).
• The drainage ditches to the east of Fulbourn which connect to the Little Wilbraham River (which flows past SSSI at Wilbraham Common) as this SSSI also supports significant biodiversity and in turn feeds reed bed at Wilbraham fen.
These chalk streams and the Wilbraham River should be recognised as part of the River Cam corridor south east of Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
57071 (Fulbourn Swifts Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should be broadened to explicitly include chalk streams and it should apply to nearby developments (i.e Biomedical Campus/Hobson's Brook nearby and adjoining).

Comments highlighting this issue
58932 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Ensure appropriate support is given for projects to re-naturalise:
• sections of River Great Ouse, protect floodplains and ensure that any nearby development protects and enhances the character of the river corridor.
• the Cam by restoring flood plains and habitats, for example at Logan's Meadow, Stourbridge and Jesus Green. Such Projects should be prioritised because of their potential to benefit wildlife and water quality while helping reduce flood risk.

Comments highlighting this issue
57396 (Huntingdonshire DC), 60766 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should include recognition enhancement and protection for the brooks which emanate from the aquifer spring line and help feed the river system

Comments highlighting this issue
60006 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Previously urged the planning designation of ‘Riverscape Opportunity Areas’ (via 2020 Green Infrastructure consultation response) extending at least 50 metres each side of the main rivers, streams and brooks within Greater Cambridge. Aim for these areas to encourage natural processes e.g. buffering watercourses (full list of aims included in full rep). Suggest four opportunities which should be sought within ‘Riverscape Opportunity Areas’:
• Vary mowing regimes in urban parks
• Reintroduce meadow species on urban commons/parks
• Recreate scrapes and ditches on riverine commons in Cambridge
• Create further inlets and ponds to create new water habitats

Comments highlighting this issue
60176 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy is flawed as:
• Only references walkers and Cyclists
• Should reference horse riding as definition of Active travel in CPCA Local Transport Plan includes it alongside cycling/walking
• Contrary to the Equalities Act as majority of horse riders female
• Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan states bridleway is fragmented, inadequate and in need of improvement
• Contribution to Cambridgeshire Local Economy by equestrians is £100 million pa and a safe bridleway network supports this industry

Comments highlighting this issue
56700 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the goal of improving people’s access to high quality green spaces, but care must be taken that multiple uses of the river and its corridor do not threaten its environmental value. The possible damage to vital habitats by high numbers of visitors is recognised in the evidence document; Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Opportunity Mapping (2020)

Comments highlighting this issue
60766 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
If linkages are made which increase recreational pressure on nearby recreational and tourism locations, it may be wise to ask for impact assessments to address any adverse effects in relation to increased recreational pressure.

Comments highlighting this issue
57396 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should both recognize the Forestry Commission Keeping Rivers Cool areas (of which some of the areas proposed for development are in) and it should seek to mitigate the impact of development on water temperature.

Comments highlighting this issue
57708 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policies to control development that impacts the River Cam, especially with regard to protecting habitat and revitalizing chalk streams (both from a biodiversity and an over-abstraction of water point of view).

Comments highlighting this issue
57945 (L Buchholz)

Summary of issues raised in comments
How do high rise blocks, (example under development is Novotel at Cambridge North Station), ‘enhance visual amenity’?

Comments highlighting this issue
59774 (V Morrow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
What plans are there to mitigate the effects of bright lighting on biodiversity?

Comments highlighting this issue
59774 (V Morrow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The River Granta (specifically the flood plain, riparian habitat) and surrounding mature woodland matrix around Babraham needs better protection.

Comments highlighting this issue
58157 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policies that aim to protect and enhance rivers need to not be undermined by consequential effects of other development in new Local Plan i.e. water supply and quality).

Comments highlighting this issue
58736 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Encourage approach of Natural Flood management techniques (applied to ditches, drains and streams in catchments of River Cam & tributaries) and suggest this be added as item which can be supported by development proposals.

Comments highlighting this issue
58736 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There are multiple potential benefits of Natural flood management

Comments highlighting this issue
59727 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The draft plan should have an assumption in favour of application for large scale schemes (such as treatment wetlands) which improve water quality or tackle flooding

Comments highlighting this issue
58736 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Would like to see the river corridor recognised as an important heritage asset (as well as environmental asset) in the wording of the draft plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
58736 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Floodplain restoration opportunity in both Gt River Ouse Corridor and Cam catchment (EA currently undertaking a Gt Ouse Flood Storage & Conveyancing study looking at further opportunities for this).

Comments highlighting this issue
59058 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The River Cam corridor represents a crucial defining role in the city and surrounding area, part of the setting of the City. It is an important aspect of the historic environment and this inter-relationship needs to be referenced in the policy. Suggest policy should require development to conserve and enhance the River Cam corridor in particular its role in the wider cityscape.

Comments highlighting this issue
59673 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
River Cam Corridor initiative does not mention the historic environment, historic environment designations, or conservation area appraisals.

Comments highlighting this issue
60198 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No consideration of historic / characteristic uses and land management. The whole river corridor from Byron's Pool to Baits Bite should be safeguarded as the corridors historic uses are vital parts of the historic and cultural as well as landscape character of Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
60198 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Grantchester Meadows, one of the key river corridor historic and cultural spaces, is the only vital section of the corridor currently without Conservation Area designation. It is threatened by visitor pressures and the possible removal of the grazing cattle which are vital to traditional water meadow management.

Comments highlighting this issue
60198 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to have integrated policy approach encompassing water resources, water quality, flood risk and recognising the role of green infrastructure. Although the value of green infrastructure and river corridors is recognised in policy BG/GI and BG/RC, it is worthwhile including it as part of the integrated water management policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
59727 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Tall buildings can have an adverse effect if located too close to a watercourse by introducing overshadowing impacts and artificial lighting which disrupts natural diurnal rhythms of wildlife such as bats

Comments highlighting this issue
59727 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerned too general a concept that requires further precision.

Comments highlighting this issue
59922 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy will need precise and clear definition to ensure that it is enforceable

Comments highlighting this issue
60766 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the restoration of natural features and use of GI to support the alleviation of flooding risk.

Comments highlighting this issue
60130 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the delivery of the continuous Cam Valley Trail

Comments highlighting this issue
60130 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Insufficient information on the proposed Cam Valley Trail, this prevents useful comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
56826 (A Sykes), 58932 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Promotes river corridors as an amenity for recreation as if rivers are in good health and can take increased human pressure. However, because of low river flows, our water quality status is ‘poor’ in the upper Cam corridor. Summer Cam runs pretty much with only treated sewage effluent. On the tiny Mel river (tributary of the Rhee) the summer flow pulses with the periodic discharge from their local sewage treatment works. Water testing shows bulk of E coli in the river Cam comes from these treated effluent sources.

Comments highlighting this issue
60176 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The plan should fully map a ‘nature recovery network’ which:
• has set targets for improvement
• includes aquatic elements (drains, streams, rivers, lakes and ponds) at the same time as identifying new large scale areas for habitat creation
• includes woodlands and areas for natural regeneration
• provides opportunities for linking all above

Comments highlighting this issue
60176 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Rural access provides health benefits but wildlife (presently limited by pollution, habitat and biodiversity losses) are also vulnerable and need more protection.

Comments highlighting this issue
60176 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Pressures on open spaces with public access along corridors are already hard to manage & considerable but sites like Trumpington Meadows show positive change a possibility.

Comments highlighting this issue
60176 (Cam Valley Forum)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No mention of environmental capacity issues or recognition that there may be capacity limits to growth or access by either/both local people and visitors (impacts of punt operators on Cam, etc).

Comments highlighting this issue
60198 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
As part of Anglian Water's Statement of Common Ground with the two councils, would welcome support in Price Review 2024 submissions for our case for greater investment in river health in AMP8 (2025-2030). Want stronger governance of overall river health.

Comments highlighting this issue
60446 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Propose Anglian Water and the two Councils enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to support the landscape scale integrated water management case for new strategic water supply provision which could serve existing and new communities and business in the Cambridgeshire and wider East of England area. The strategic schemes will underpin the long-term environmental gains sought on water resource planning by policy BG/RC.

Comments highlighting this issue
60446 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy is incompatible with current GCP CSET plans.

Comments highlighting this issue
58157 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy difficult to implement in Babraham if Research Campus removed from Greenbelt. This would cause fragmentation of landscape which would leave fragments under pressure from over development.

Comments highlighting this issue
58157 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Planning applications (including current) should be reviewed if they encroach on policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
58427 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge East proposals have limited direct benefits as no river corridor affected but the proposal may have indirect benefits; such as recharging the groundwater aquifer (hence aquifer protection is important) and mitigating effects of development on other parts of the Cam corridor

Comments highlighting this issue
58736 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge WRC relocation project will seek to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain; this could include green infrastructure improvement on the Cam (given planned increases in discharges of recycled water) and green infrastructure biodiversity net gains in the eastern Fens. The relocation project will enable us to consider options for improvement on the Cam in accordance with draft policy BG/RC.

Comments highlighting this issue
60473 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project (CWWTPR), if sited on Honey Hill, will impact on those using footpaths in this area, due to the scale of the structure (development will be visible from River Cam Corridor) and the odour coming from the site.

Comments highlighting this issue
56510 (C Martin), 57492 (C Martin), 57577 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57625 (J Pratt), 57677 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Rebuilding CWWTPR on flat fen landscape is at odds with this policy and will be visible from many Public Rights of Way (PROWs) in this area.

Comments highlighting this issue
57492 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of the approach to protect, enhance and restore River Cam and its tributaries. River Granta is such a tributary and runs along the northern edge of site Land north of Cambridge Road, Linton. Development of the site could help achieve policy approach.

Comments highlighting this issue
60517 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy S/NEC should reflect that both the current proposed development under the policy and the green belt site proposed for the relocation of the current operational Waste Water Treatment Work, will be clearly visible from the River corridor and surrounding landscape.

Comments highlighting this issue
58134 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
If policy S/NEC is fulfilled, then new housing development will be highly visible and impact the River Cam corridor landscape.

Comments highlighting this issue
57577 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57625 (J Pratt), 57677 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcomes guidance for integrating development into the landscape but concern raised regarding NE Cambridge which is already intruding on the river corridor visual amenity.

Comments highlighting this issue
57945 (L Buchholz)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Thought should be given to flood risk and prevention in relation to development.

Comments highlighting this issue
57812 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Suggest a moratorium on large development proposals in the upper Cam valley (Stapleford to the boundary with Essex) until impacts of developments (including cumulative impacts) given permission in recent years or planned for in this and the adopted Local Plan are properly considered following the rollout of such developments. E.g., Huawei, Genome Campus, Sawston housing, Unity Campus, Whittlesford Parkway Area. This is essential to protecting the River Cam and surrounding landscape.

Comments highlighting this issue
57931 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Streams at the springs adjacent to the Fulbourn Nature Reserve east of the village which have historically maintained wetland within the Fulbourn Fen Nature Reserve (SSSI) are often dry due to the depleted water table level. This is largely due to the scale of water abstraction from the underlying aquifer by the Cambridge Water Company from the Fleam Dyke Pumping Station, which is not considered to be a long-term sustainable solution to protect the biodiversity of the local flora and fauna.

Comments highlighting this issue
57071 (Fulbourn Swifts Group)

BG/PO: Protecting open spaces

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy BG/PO: Protecting open spaces > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 54

Notes

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council RA= Resident Association

  NPPF=National Planning Policy Framework ESFA= Education and Skills Funding Agency

Executive Summary

Broad support for the policy intention was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations, and public bodies. Comments were received that policy needs to be considered against competing policy requirements, that it needs to address the future stewardship of open space and recognise its value in reducing recreational pressures on vulnerable sites and the heritage value of sites. Comments were made that the policy should recognise that open spaces are historic and part of the historic environment (not just viewed in terms of green infrastructure). A number of comments were made by individuals and parish councils regarding the impacts of development on landscape and open space in specific locations.

Table of Representations: BG/PO Protecting open spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Policy

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56691 (J Meed), 56812 (M Colville), 57946 (L Buchholz), 57976 (V Morrow), 60131 (C Blakeley)

Public Bodies
56627 (Gamlingay PC), 57934 (Ickleton PC), 58429 (Linton PC), 59210 (Cambourne TC), 59923 (Fen Ditton PC), 60007 (Steeple Morden PC), 60085 (Guilden Morden PC), 60407 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Third Sector Organisations
56678 (The Ickleton Society), 56979 (Trumpington RA), 57080 (Fulbourn Swifts Group)

Other Organisations
57010 (The Wildlife Trust), 58631 (University of Cambridge), 59059 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area), 59099 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Object to Policy 67 which is unduly restrictive in that it states a specific distance within which replacement facilities should be located.

Comments highlighting this issue
56847 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should identify important ecological areas which can be augmented, connected and protected from development. E.g. City and County Wildlife sites and pockets of special habitat in Conservation Areas. Registration of Open spaces as neighbourhood sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
57137 (North Newnham RA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Lack of sheltered areas for sports and lightning which is impacting a huge number of people

Comments highlighting this issue
57605 (L Cucurachi)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Criteria for designation of Local Green Space are quite restrictive and therefore policy-makers should consider other options for protecting existing open space just outside the development framework valued by the community. Existing Local Green Spaces, Protected Village Amenity Areas and Important Countryside Frontages should be retained. Two sections of The Causeway, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth are an important connection between the street scene and the East Anglian Chalk landscape and should be considered for ICF designation.

Comments highlighting this issue
57712 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

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

Comments highlighting this issue
57841 (S Nickalls), 57872 (A Nickalls), 57916 (S Foulds), 57925 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57958 (C Mackay)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy 67 needs strengthening to reflect environmental location; environmental aspects of open space are inherent to the location of the space itself and cannot/ should not be relocated; needs to create buffer areas around wildlife sites as per Wildlife Trust and national standards

Comments highlighting this issue
57884 (North Newnham RA), 57961 (E Davies), 58176 (H Brown)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There are no all-weather skateparks in Cambridge. Existing skateparks lack lights and rain coverings. Currently skating is summer-only sport. More skateparks are needed in the north of Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
57990 (J Humphrey), 58108 (G Gardner), 58111 (K Enright)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Impact of LED lighting on natural open spaces, sports fields and clubs, green belt, urban fringes and residential areas needs to be reviewed. A more balanced provision is needed with better technical cowls and restricted times.

Comments highlighting this issue
58299 (North Newnham RA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy. Do not support loss of open space where applied to private benefit. The policy needs to address the future stewardship of open space and recognise its value in reducing recreational pressures on vulnerable sites and the heritage value of sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
58751 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Consideration needed for competing policy requirements

Comments highlighting this issue
59012 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Clarify allotment protection including sites with statutory protection requiring government approval for disposal. All allotments should be declared statutory.

Comments highlighting this issue
59245 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The department welcomes Policy 67’s approach towards education sites. It

recommends that on education sites, the loss of open space is considered on the basis of whether it is still needed (as demonstrated by the applicant) and what mitigations are proposed, such as enhanced quality of remaining open space or more inclusive accessibility.

Comments highlighting this issue
57484 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should allow for an appropriate assessment on the basis of need for the site/its use against which a planning application can be assessed. The policy should reflect the wording of NPPF paragraph 99 and allow for qualitative criteria, in order to allow an appropriate assessment to the merits of each individual case.

Comments highlighting this issue
59537 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No mention that open spaces are historic and part of the historic environment. Should consider their significance as a whole, not just in terms of green infrastructure

Comments highlighting this issue
60199 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Give great prominence to green networks and allow for the benefits of only visual accessibility.

Comments highlighting this issue
60333 (North Newnham RA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Lack of direction and information associated with this Policy - impossible to comment on.

Comments highlighting this issue
60769 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development at Cambridge East will not have an impact on existing accessible open spaces but plenty of opportunity to create new spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue
58518 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Contrary to this policy is destruction of Green Belt at Honey Hill. Proximity to villages of Fen Ditton, Quy, Horningsea and Teversham where there has been lack of consultation.

Comments highlighting this issue
57496 (C Martin), 57505 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to an area of Green Belt does nothing to protect open spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue
58070 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Agree with this policy in principle. However, the achievement of Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge, appears to contradict this policy as the development on Cambridge North East Area is predicated on the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to an area of Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue
57517 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57620 (J Pratt), 57678 (J Conroy), 58135 (M Asplin), 59217 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No Comment

Comments highlighting this issue
57400 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 52

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council BDG= Biodiversity Net Gain

Executive Summary

General support for the policy direction from a range of individuals, organisations, developers, and public bodies, with new provision of open spaces widely supported.

Comments regarding the application of this policy for new development included those suggesting that: the policy should be applied on a site-by-site basis; smaller developments should ensure provision of open space; onsite provision not off-site financial contributions should be required; new dwellings should have provision for food growing space (this point was also supported in response to the quick questions); open space should be provided within reasonable walking distance of residents’ homes; standards should continue to differentiate between Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire to reflect the differences between the two areas; SUDs should not be treated as open space; and open space should include provision for biodiversity. A few developer comments wanted more clarity regarding the specific policy requirements.

Broader comments about open spaces included: Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties suggested that the policy direction under BG/GI should also be applied to BG/EO, and that multifunctionality should not reduce amount of overall public space; Historic England comments highlighted how open spaces can form an important part of the setting of heritage assets; support for provision of allotments, concern relating to multi-storey buildings which risk dominating open space and affecting the character of Cambridge; requests for provision of new skateparks and growing spaces; and requests that open space was

provided to meet the needs of equestrians. A few developers identified that their site would provide open space to meet needs.

Table of Representations: BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Policy

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
56692 (J Meed), 57626 (J Pratt), 58136 (M Asplin), 60132 (C Blakeley)

Public Bodies
58432 (Linton PC), 60008 (Steeple Morden PC), 60086 (Guilden Morden PC), 60408 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Third Sector Organisations
56980 (Trumpington RA), 58776 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60770 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Other Organisations
57011 (The Wildlife Trust), 58636 (University of Cambridge)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
(58777) Trumpington Meadows Land Company, 58832 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 59300 (National Trust), 60520 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
We fully support policies that aim to increase greenspace provision and access, whilst also helping to meet biodiversity objectives.

Comments highlighting this issue
59072* (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments
All new homes should have provision for food growing and everyone should have access to growing spaces. All new community buildings should offer space for cooking, eating, sharing and learning about food.

Comments highlighting this issue
59079* (Cambridge Sustainable Food CIC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Access to open spaces must be available to all users including equestrians. This policy excludes equestrians. Policy should include equestrians if it includes cyclists unless there is good reason for their exclusion e.g. central urban areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
56699 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy needs to be balanced with less development, if possible.

Comments highlighting this issue
56732 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Allocation of new sites is needed. Public access needs to be included in planning decision making from the outset.

Comments highlighting this issue
56628 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No new housing should be shoe-horned into existing villages. New developments of greenfield sites NEVER result in a net increase in open spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue
56813 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised in comments
On many new housing developments, the landscaping close to homes tends to consist mainly of miniature ornamentals, which are often of little value for nature and are cut back so hard in maintenance regimes that they provide little green vegetation to enhance the appearance of the limited open space.

Comments highlighting this issue
57086 (Fulbourn Swifts Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Open Space Standards will be required to be reviewed through the Local Plan to

reflect the differences between the City with its urban character and the more rural environment of the villages.

Comments highlighting this issue
57175 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57248 (European Property Ventures -Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There must be no reduction in the previous plan's requirement for both informal and formal open space per 1000 new residents. New open spaces including allotments MUST be created especially where developments have no gardens. These should be within a reasonable walking distance (15 minutes) but 5 minutes for open spaces generally.

Comments highlighting this issue
57813 & 57876 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There should be lower limits so that smaller developments also meet the limit allocations, to ensure piecemeal developments avoid not providing open spaces. Developers should not be permitted to double-count open spaces that are intended to meet two functional and incompatible criteria. Eg. the play area and a [SUDS] rainwater catchment area, the play area is often submerged for large portions of the year.

Comments highlighting this issue
58004 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Open Space standards should continue to differ between Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to reflect the differences between these areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
60520 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60574 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy direction should be applied on a site-by-site basis. Development proposals for enhanced, or rationalised facilities may already have open space or recreational facilities and capacity elsewhere.

Comments highlighting this issue
59013 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy should acknowledge the requirements for providing BNG when calculating the typologies of open space provision.

Comments highlighting this issue
57387 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development should provide onsite provision and not off-site financial contributions. Other spaces should include green jogging and cycle routes for their high value for both recreation and transport.

Comments highlighting this issue
57817 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Off-site open space S106 contributions has resulted in residents of new developments being denied access to green areas adjacent to their homes. Residents of Mill Park flats in Cambridge were told Section 106 money had been spent improving facilities at Coleridge recreation ground at half mile walk away.

Comments highlighting this issue
59257 (F Gawthrop)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support however further clarity is required about how this is calculated and what will be expected on-site.

Comments highlighting this issue
59767 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Greater clarification is needs about the Open Space requirements for site allocation inform site capacities and viability.

Comments highlighting this issue
60574 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should explicitly refer to enhancing biodiversity as a component of open space provision for their health, ecological and recreational benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue
57822 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Open spaces risk being dominated by multi-story buildings. An essential part of the character of Cambridge stems from its lack of high-rise buildings and careful earlier planning controls, for example along the tow-path in Chesterton where, for a long period, single storey houses only were permitted.

Comments highlighting this issue
57979 (V Morrow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Skateparks would be a great way to provide play space for children and teenagers, as well as many adults. More skate-able facilities (particularly covered) would have tremendous positive spill over on the youth of the city who feel particularly isolated and bored during winter months.

Comments highlighting this issue
57996 (J Humphrey), 58113 (G Gardner)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should encourage connections between opportunities for multi-functional use and potential links with Green Infrastructure targets and biodiversity enhancement.

Comments highlighting this issue
59063 & 59067 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is important to have high standards for the provision of open spaces especially for sport.

Comments highlighting this issue
59211, 59214 & 59220 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Demand continues to outstrip supply for allotments, a new higher target level of provision should be included in the plan, to account for current, new and future growth in demand, within and outside the city.

Comments highlighting this issue
59288 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Open spaces can form an important part of the setting of heritage assets. Both providing and enhancing such spaces is very much linked to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. This should be referenced in the policy and supporting text.

Comments highlighting this issue
59674 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to consider other spaces, e.g. market square & Quayside. Need to: manage existing pressures, avoid harmful intensification of use, and ensure that new development does not increase these pressures, e.g. the river corridor.

Comments highlighting this issue
60200 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy wording should be amended to the effect that new open spaces will be required where justified.

Comments highlighting this issue
60520 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Open spaces should be managed to maximise biodiversity. The policy direction under BG/GI should also apply here. Multi-functionality should not be used as an opportunity to reduce the overall amount of open space made available. Should SUDS be treated as open space? Current open space standards should be treated as a minimum requirement.

Comments highlighting this issue
60770 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A simpler route to obtaining planning permission for community orchards and allotments is required.

Comments highlighting this issue
59225* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome recognition that wellbeing and open spaces are linked, particularly a focus on formal sports pitches. No mention of partnerships with major charities. No mention of support for grass roots clubs and this omission should be rectified.

Comments highlighting this issue
59225* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be greater planned allotment provision. Growing unmet demand, outstrips supply. Provide flexible open space capable of conversion in future.

Comments highlighting this issue
59227* (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Open spaces already exist on the Honey Hill land that is Green Belt. No operational need to move the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP) to Honey Hill. The public has the right to robustly question whether this relocation is a nationally significant infrastructure project when in fact there is already a fully functioning sewage works in place.

Comments highlighting this issue
58071 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue
57402 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Site related open space comments

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge, appears to contradict this policy. Unclear where this is recognised within the Plan to allow informed land use decisions to be made.

Comments highlighting this issue
58136 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Fulfilment of S/NEC Policy through relocation of CWWTP to the Green Belt would be completely contrary to this Policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
57626 (J Pratt), 57679 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land off The Lawns, Cambridge HELAA site 40425

Comments highlighting this issue
56847 & 59537 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Note the potential for Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Hobson's Park being designated as Local Green Spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue
56979 (Trumpington RA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposed Important Countryside Frontage on The Causeway.pdf

Comments highlighting this issue
57712 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Access to the Local Green Space Gamlingay First School Playing Fields (Green End, Gamlingay SG19 3LF) is currently restrictive and difficult for residents (owner

Cambridgeshire County Council). Access rights to any public green space needs to be specified in the planning permission.

Comments highlighting this issue
56629 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Small green spaces provided throughout development increase the amounts of physical activity that residents carry out, and these spaces are supportive of good mental health and wellbeing.
- MGH propose new green infrastructure as part of the proposals at North Cambourne, where significant areas of the site will be used for green space in conjunction with sport, recreation, natural habitats and biodiversity offsetting.

Comments highlighting this issue
57906 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Cambridge East proposals align with the Local Plan requirements, with significant formal, such as sports pitches and urban squares, and informal, such as new accessible ‘countryside’ in the green corridor, proposed.
- The greenspace is to be dispersed, occurring throughout the development and within the developed areas themselves.
- The ambition is to ensure that where appropriate green spaces are multi-functional.

Comments highlighting this issue
58520 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Trumpington South can provide double the open space requirements, this will:

- Enhance access to existing open space provision in the Trumpington Meadows Country Park.
- Augment the strong landscape setting to the City established as part of the Trumpington Meadows project.
- Provide major additional recreational opportunities for people of all ages and abilities.

- Help to integrate new and existing communities at Trumpington.

Comments highlighting this issue
(58777) Trumpington Meadows Land Company

Summary of issues raised in comments
The provision of high-quality open space that enhances the Campus' integration with Cambridge is one of the main aims of the Spatial Vision. The Campus expansion into the identified Area of Major Change represents an excellent opportunity to provide and enhance access to open space for all Campus users and visitors, especially if integrated into other existing initiatives and provision.

Comments highlighting this issue
58832 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Great Places

GP: Great Places

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Great places > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 35

Notes

- The representation 57180 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd) has been incorrectly placed here.
- The representation 57255 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire) has been incorrectly placed here.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many individuals, public bodies, third sector organisations and developers expressed support for the aims of the Great Places policies.

A number of respondents emphasised the importance of including policies which will protect Cambridge's historic environment. Cambridge Past, Present and Future

commented that the Local Plan needs to not only focus upon historic assets, but also recognise the historic significance of the whole of Cambridge and ensure that its historic setting is protected from cumulative impacts. Historic England (HE) provided a detailed representation, in which they expressed concerns about the density and height of some of the site proposals and the need for Heritage Impact Assessment to be carried out to inform the next stage. HE also noted the need to have policies covering designated and non-designated historic assets, heritage at risk, historic shopfronts, and tall buildings. Comments also noted that Great Places are more than just about the design of buildings but creating communities with access to services, facilities, nature and open spaces.

Some comments considered that development proposed would impact negatively on the delivery of the goals set out in this chapter. A few developers commented that the sites that they were proposing would fulfil the aims of the policies. Several commentators emphasised the importance of delivering facilities and infrastructure to ensure that new development results in great places.

In terms of the additional survey questions which were attached to this round of consultation, in the responses to Q.13 (which relates to the aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge) there was a strong aspiration to preserve Greater Cambridge's historic buildings and wider heritage and a critical comment of GCSP's approach to urban design of new settlements.

Table of representations: Great Places

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for the Greater Places chapter.

Comments highlighting this issue

- Individuals
    - 57683 (J Conroy)
- Public Bodies
    - 56751 (Croydon PC), 58447 (Linton PC), 59246 (Cambourne TC), 59698 (Central Bedfordshire Council)
- Third Sector Organisations
- Other Organisations
    - 58824 (University of Cambridge)
- Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
    - 57909 (Martin Grant Homes), 58019 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58317 (Hallam Land Management Ltd), 58547

(Marshall Group Properties), 58853 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58947 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strongly advocate the Councils' aim of sustaining the unique character of Greater Cambridge and complementing it with beautiful and distinctive development, creating a place where people want to live, work and play.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58718 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Agree that Great Places intersect with other themes within the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58818 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Notes the description in the Plan that a great place is one that locates jobs near to homes, not the other way round.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56985 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Plan does not meet its objectives of delivering high quality and well-designed places across both the rural and urban area as the focus for new development is not in the rural areas.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57180 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57255 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Central Cambridge is a beautiful area and new development must not be permitted that detracts and destroys it. Modern developments do not mix well with historic buildings.
Extensions to existing and new homes and businesses must be high quality and reflect local architecture.
It is essential the landscape character is maintained and not enhanced beyond its natural beauty.
The Green Belt should be protected.
Heritage conservation and enhancement should be prioritised over growth and new development. This includes, wherever possible, preserving heritage assets from

damage from climate change.
Only protect public houses with genuine historic value.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57290 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57412 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The proposed allocation in Stapleford will destroy the landscape character of the village, conserve high quality landscape or the public realm and will not protect and enhance the Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57532 (Stapleford Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The fulfilment of Policy S/NEC through relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant will be at odds with a number of the policies in this Great Places chapter such as Green Belt, protection of conservation areas and heritage assets and Public Rights of Way.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57683 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Local Plan should seek to rebalance community infrastructure in identified underserved areas to benefit new and existing communities.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57836 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land North of Cambourne (HELAA Site 40114):

- Endorse the approach in national policy that development will be led through local design codes involving residents and stakeholders in a transparent way, including key sites like North Cambourne.
- Improved connectivity and permeability to existing and new communities required.

- Consolidation of development at Cambourne to create a settlement of scale with facilities and infrastructure can assist making great places.
- Cambridgeshire has a good track record in well-designed new neighbourhoods; GCSP needs to be well resourced for well-considered proposals.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57909 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The semi-rural and distinctive characteristics of parts of Cambridge, such as West Cambridge Conservation Area, should be formally recognised and protected.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57964 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land east of M11, West of Duxford, Duxford and Land at Duxford (HELAA site 40095):

- Relocate commercial and operational activity to East and West ends to improve setting of historically important site.
- Proposals to expand Duxford Village with homes, facilities, and country park support work-life balance for proposed Avtech employment site.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58019 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the principle of Historic buildings being updated to extend their life, provided it does not alter their appearance.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58048 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Nine Wells Development was meant to provide a soft edge to Cambridge; developing this area would mean the southern edge will no longer be a great place.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58169 (S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land at Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40306 and OS270):

- Cambridge East will be a place integrated within Cambridge with great places embedded in the vision.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58547 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land north and south of Cambridge Rd, Eltisley (HELAA site 51668):

- Vision will create a place where people and nature can co-inhabit the landscape sustainably.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58718 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A great place is somewhere which sits well within its landscape.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58818 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Great Places paper refers to heritage assets but does not recognise Cambridge's global significance and UNESCO World Heritage criteria. The draft Plan should recognise built and natural heritage's vital role.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58818 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
- 60202 (J Preston)
- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Consultation structure risks inadequate consideration and valuation of historic city in its historic landscape setting. Historic landscapes and open spaces are part of the historic environment, not just green infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58818 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
- 60202 (J Preston)
- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge's special character under pressure from proposed growth scale,

impacting medieval town fabric and spaces. Fundamental conflicts between growth, environmental capacity, and character.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58818 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
- 60202 (J Preston)
- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerns that evidence base lacks assessment of cumulative impacts on historic centre. Strategic HIA baseline optimistic but lacks supporting evidence. Historic Environment Baseline Study should have informed First Proposals.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58818 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
- 60202 (J Preston)
- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge South (CBC) – growth will create exemplary neighbourhood and extension aligned with CBC Vision 2050.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58853 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land west/east of Station Road, Meldreth:

- Support landscape character enhancement policy but request allowance for site-specific visual impact considerations.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58947 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land north of Barton Road and Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge:

- Masterplan considers significance and setting of heritage assets and landscape character.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58969 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Little reference to Modern Methods of Construction and off-site manufacture, which should be considered due to scale of house building.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58993 (bpha)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge South (CBC) policies can enable great places with comprehensive planning, facilities, and strong landscape framework.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59005 (Jesus College & partners)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Great places should be designed for people and food with spaces for start-up food businesses to enhance local choice, jobs, cohesion, wellbeing, equality, and resilience.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59087 (Cambridge Sustainable Food CIC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support high quality design promoting health and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59193 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern about heritage sites and conservation areas needing review to protect great places in district.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59233 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Preservation of rural character and identity of villages essential for quality of life; object to disproportionate development damaging such character.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59484 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development must protect rich architectural and cultural heritage with robust historic environment policies covering site allocations and criteria.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59689 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Initial historic environment assessment undertaken but further work and Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) needed before draft Local Plan, proportional and following HEAN 3 methodology; concern on weighting of key Cambridge characteristics and views in Strategic HIA Baseline.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59689 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerns over high densities and tall buildings in North East Cambridge and East Cambridge; impacts on historic city setting need careful HIA consideration.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59689 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policies for Historic Environment covering designated and non-designated assets, Heritage at Risk, historic shopfronts, tall buildings (preferably a separate policy), and skyline with evidence informed by HEAN 4 and historic environment impact.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59689 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Recommend commissioning Historic Landscape Characterisation work to inform this and future plans; Ox Cam research will be shared to help inform plan preparation; encourage use of local conservation officers, archaeologists, and heritage groups' knowledge.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59689 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth themes ("Community, Connectivity, Climate and Character") consistent with National Model Design Code.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59698 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposal for GB1 and GB2 should be reviewed against proposed high quality landscape and public realm policy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59782 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Draft Plan fails to recognise historic relationships between Cambridge as a market town, its market, and productive hinterland.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60202 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Evidence base for Great Places is inadequate; proposals premature pending thorough review of existing policies' success or failure.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60202 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Great places blend community, nature, and beauty, but Cambridge is destroying these and creating poor quality spaces rapidly.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
New neighbourhoods need community spaces to encourage cohesion and local friendships, including independent shops rather than supermarkets.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
New developments should provide spaces for interaction with nature and areas solely for nature, with high quality open spaces supporting wellbeing.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Beauty is part of Cambridge’s heritage in natural and architectural forms; new developments do not meet standards to maintain unique characteristics;

development should be paused until planning system can support appropriate healing measures.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60779 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Table of representations: Policy GP (Site-specific comments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to GP/GP, commented no parking on Silver Street Bridge and Silver Street should also be a priority for public realm improvement.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57143 (North Newnham Resident Association 2nd comment)

GP/PP: People and place responsive design

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 40

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many individuals, public bodies and developers expressed general support for policy GP/PP.

Some respondents argued that policies need to avoid creating repetitive buildings such by as requiring varied height and massing, and that a policy that is applicable to Greater Cambridge shouldn’t dilute the details relating to the special character of Cambridge. A few landowners suggested that developments which demonstrated a high standard of design should be fast-tracked through the planning application process.

There were different perceptions about what the scope of the policy should be; a few of landowners argued that design codes should not be imposed on smaller developments where other mechanisms could achieve similar outcomes. Similarly, a few developers argued that the phrasing of the policy should be altered so that new development only needed to respond to local design contexts rather than the architecture of the Greater Cambridge area. On the other hand, the Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group argued that the policy was too narrowly focussed upon aesthetics, when actually a more holistic approach was required to promote things such as connected, participatory collective spaces.

Historic England questioned whether one policy relating to design would be sufficient, whereas a few respondents queried whether having two policies was necessary. Developers such as Abrdn argued that the policy needed to include sufficient flexibility for well-designed and high-quality buildings even if they are taller than the surrounding townscape. Contrastingly, Historic England and others argued that great care needs to be taken to protect Cambridge’s skyline, views, and approaches and that the Local Plan should be informed by a Tall Building and Skyline study.

Many commentators noted the need to engage with local communities to improve the design of developments and when creating design codes. The British Horse Society argued that greater attention needs to be paid to designing for non-

motorised forms of transport and developments should maximise opportunities to link and enhance with existing Public Rights of Way. Some developers commented that their sites could fulfil the policy and one respondent argued that the relocation of the waste water treatment plant to Honey Hill would contravene this policy.

In terms of the additional survey questions which were attached to this round of consultation, in response to Q.7 (southern rural cluster) and Q.9 (villages) respondents suggested including more public benches and picnic tables, a changing art space, and creative features to make new development attractive places. There was also an expressed desire for new development to designed for children and for new development to reflect village character. For Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), many comments emphasised the need for North-East Cambridge to have a good centre with amenities, for it to be a 'micro-city' within the city, or to incorporate a 'new' architectural style. Similar comments were expressed for Q.3 (Cambridge East) with some respondents requesting that the design uses a precedent of 'Garden City' design or include architecture which celebrates its aviation heritage.

Table of representations: Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for the principle of the policy, and intention to set a strategic vision for achieving high quality design.

Comments highlighting this issue

- Individuals
    - 60134 (C Blakeley), 60390 (D Wright)
- Public Bodies
    - 56633 (Gamlingay PC), 58449 (Linton PC), 59249 (Cambourne TC), 60011 (Steeple Morden PC), 60088 (Guilden Morden PC)
- Other Organisations
    - 58858 (University of Cambridge), 59675 (Historic England), 59981 (Natural England)
- Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
    - 57211 (Abrdn), 57273 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – Commercial), 58211 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – Commercial), 58228 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 59022 (Metro

Property Unit Trust), 60290 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60371 (The Critchley Family), 60525 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Community engagement through Parish Councils is required to take full account of resident's views, local character, referring to village design guides and Neighbourhood Plan policies.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56633 (Gamlingay PC), 60134 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy on quality design is contradicted by proposed relocation of WWTP to Honey Hill. It will impact local communities' health with pollution from traffic and sewage.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56513 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Non-motorised user access is essential in design concept for:

- Walkers
- Cyclists
- Equestrian

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56704 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Developments should maximise opportunities to link and enhance existing Public Rights of Way (PROW).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56704 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy needs to comply with Cambridge Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) strategies.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56704 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Measures should be taken to avoid creating repetitive/ monotonous/ homogenisation building styles (encourage variation in heights, types, scale and massing).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57101 (C King), 57306 (C Sawyer Nutt), 59172 (Endurance Estate), 60341 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60380 (S & J Graves), 60390 (D Wright)

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for Design codes/guides but these should not be imposed on smaller scale developments where other mechanisms can achieve similar outcomes (e.g., parameter plans).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57101 (C King), 57306 (C Sawyer Nutt), 59172 (Endurance Estate), 60341 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60371 (The Critchley Family), 60380 (S & J Graves), 60390 (D Wright), 60466 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Other alternative frameworks for developers to be directed to could include the National Design Guide (10 characteristics of well-designed place).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59172 (Endurance Estate), 60290 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60341 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60371 (The Critchley Family), 60380 (S & J Graves), 60390 (D Wright), 60466 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Developments which can demonstrate a high standard of design should be fast tracked through the application process.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59172 (Endurance Estate), 60290 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60380 (S & J Graves), 60341 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60390 (D Wright), 60466 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Local community should be consulted throughout the process of developing design codes/guides.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57101 (C King), 57306 (C Sawyer Nutt), 59172 (Endurance Estate), 60290 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60380 (S & J Graves)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Conservation Area Appraisals must be updated.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57138 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Conservation Areas must be better referenced in the LP as a primary source for context on built and natural Heritage.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57138 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Impacts from new developments must be accurately portrayed with:

- Heights of trees accurately shown in drawings

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57138 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Where possible site visits should be undertaken by planners and decision makers when deciding new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57138 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A critical analysis is needed with visuals of unsuccessful tall building skylines and eroded long views.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57138 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Consideration should be given to ensuring sufficient flexibility for well-designed and high quality buildings even if they are taller than the surrounding townscape. High quality taller landmark buildings can have a positive impact on their setting by adding to the townscape and should be allowed for in the policy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57211 (Abrdn), 57273 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – Commercial), 58211 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – Commercial), 58228 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 58786 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC) – joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland (GBI) and Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS))

Summary of issues raised in comments
Design needs to reflect existing character of the built environment especially in villages.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57721 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60290 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Design should seek to prevent and mitigate crime and anti-social behaviour.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57721 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy focus is on features and characteristics of developments that respond to local context or specific functional needs of minority groups. These are aesthetic or function-specific interpretations of 'people-responsive' and place. To stop narrow focus, policy needs to consider:

- More holistic approach
- Community needs/life needs
- Activities
- Promotion of connected, coherent, participatory collective spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58011 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Needs public consultation to gain an insight into what people want.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58033 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 60290 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
High quality design is essential:

- including design in affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58049 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Design of access to new developments is poor (e.g., pedestrian links between GB1/GB2 and amenities in Queen Edith's).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58076 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the inclusion of design criteria across the themes of community, connectivity, climate and character (reflecting the Quality Charter for Growth).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58228 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 59675 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land West of London Road, Fowlmere – delivery of scheme will enhance the character of Greater Cambridge by using sustainable construction methods to support the climate emergency.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58807 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
To be consistent with national policy, Policy GP/PP should include wording such as “taking a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development including respecting existing site constraints including utilities situated within sites”.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59596 (National Grid)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome reference to National Design Guide and National Model Design Code.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59675 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Historic environment is a key aspect of Great Places. Encourage provision for the historic environment throughout the plan not just in heritage focused policy e.g., draw on opportunities offered by the historic environment and reflect local character and distinctiveness to create high standards of design.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59675 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Building Better Building Beautiful Commission report may help shape policy in this area.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59675 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Is work on tall buildings to inform policy still happening? Support current Policy 60 and Appendix F of the 2018 Local Plan, however, could be further supplemented to indicate areas which may or not be suited to taller buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59675 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The skyline of Cambridge is an important characteristic of the city with long distance views from the elevated land to the south and west, as well as from the flatter fenland to the north and east. Care should be taken over building heights with policy informed by a Tall Building and Skyline study. Guidance to refer to 'Tall Buildings Advice Note 4': Tall Buildings | Historic England.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59675 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Using one policy to cover all aspects of design and tall buildings may be too ambitious. May be more useful to have a separate policy for tall(er) buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59675 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the establishment of a Place and Design Quality Panel to conduct a site typologies study to understand, protect, utilise and enhance the valued characteristics of different areas in the plan, with the intention of using this information to raise design standards.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59981 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Seek for the provision of existing Policy 60 (tall buildings) to be retained and strengthened.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60213 (J. V Neal)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Unusual to have two separate policies on design – is this necessary?

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60341 (F.C. Butler Trust), 60380 (S & J Graves)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The opening of the policy wording states ‘the policy will require all applicants to demonstrate how their proposals sustain and enhance the unique qualities of the Greater Cambridge area and the subtleties in the different landscape and settlement forms’. This suggests that all developments will need to address the qualities of Greater Cambridge through development, which is unachievable and unreasonable. Suggestion that this wording is amended to ‘as appropriate to the local context of the development site’.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60525 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60582 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Important that developments respond to local context rather than Greater Cambridge character by stating ‘as appropriate to the local context of the development site’.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60582 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerned that combining the local plans will dilute the detail relating to special character of the city.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60780 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to maintain and increase clarity on local characterisation.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60780 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Discussion needed on giving protection to views and approaches.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60780 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Construction quality is not good with homes having poor insulation and soundproofing. Should use Local Plan 2018 to allow for improvements to policy on poor building forms.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60780 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57413 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 45

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many respondents generally supported the policy direction.

Some suggestions were made to the policy wording including requests for more clarity to identify what makes green gaps 'important'. Some respondents identified areas of particular landscape value that should be protected such as the green corridors around the River Cam, River Great Ouse, Hobson's Brook and West Cambridge and the landscape south of Cambridge Biomedical Centre around White Hill. A few developers and landowners wanted the policy to allow for the consideration of development on its own merits and asked that the policy recognised the positive impact that development can have upon the character of landscapes. There were also requests for new developments to retain and enhance landscape features that have particular value, rather than retain all landscape features.

Cambridge Past, Present and Future argued that similar Local Plan policies had not been effective at protecting the setting of Cambridge from the cumulative impact of development and that the policy should require the planting of trees early to improve the screening of the city. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) also

expressed a wish that the policy would prevent visually intrusive developments occurring. Contrastingly, Metro Property Unit Trust argued that the policy needed to ensure that the protection of trees is measured against other elements of the proposal. North Newnham Residents Association provided a number of comments relating to how the policy should protect and enhance hedges.

Historic England (HE) commented that views from the south and east of the city are being underplayed as a characteristic of the city and suggested that Heritage Impact Assessment should look at this issue. HE also argued that the policy should ensure that new development positively responds to Cambridge's historic landscape. Natural England stated that locally designated landscapes should be identified within the plan and given policy protection.

Some respondents argued that specific site proposals in the First Proposals would not be in line with this policy, in particular sites at Babraham, Sawston, and there was reference to Anglian Water's proposal at Honey Hill. Developers such as TOWN, argued that the policy will need to recognise the strategic objectives of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and avoid imposing conditions that could unreasonably restrict development.

Some respondents including some Parish Councils argued that Important Countryside Frontages (ICFs) are an important policy tool for protecting villages, whereas other respondents saying they were an unnecessary additional layer of constraint to development. Some respondents asked for additional ICFs , whereas other respondents asked for ICFs to be removed.

In terms of the additional survey questions, there were a high number of representations in response to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East) which supported the protection of existing natural and landscapes, or provision of new green spaces. In response to Q.7 (southern rural cluster), Q.8 (villages), Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge), there were some representations which expressed support for protecting Greater Cambridge's landscape and there were concerns that new development could harm existing landscapes.

Table of representations: Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support
Comments highlighting this issue

- Individuals

    - 57966 (E Davies), 58137 (M Asplin), 58163 (H Thomas), 60135 (C Blakeley)
- Public Bodies
    - 56634 (Gamlingay PC), 56914 (Cllr. David Sargeant/ West Wickham PC), 57414 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57722 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57941 (Ickleton PC), 58455 (Linton PC), 59926 (Fen Ditton PC), 60012 (Steeple Morden PC), 60089 (Guilden Morden PC), 60409 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
- Third Sector Organisations
    - 56677 (The Ickleton Society), 56986 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57556 (Save Honey Hill Group), 58831 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60781 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
- Other Organisations
    - 59581 (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 59676 (Historic England), 59982 (Natural England)
- Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
    - 58791 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme), 59026 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 60526 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60584 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy, but with caveats, including:

- Policy mentions protecting ‘important green gaps’ but only Longstanton and Northstowe are defined. Council should clarify what makes a green gap ‘important’, considering scope for landscape enhancements with new development.
- River Great Ouse corridor should be included in the policy.
- Use ‘non-designated’ rather than ‘undesignated’ heritage assets.
- Amend policy to require retention/enhancement of landscape features ‘wherever possible’ rather than blanket retention, allowing removal of limited value features or for access.
- Policy references protecting ‘important green gaps’, but only one gap is noted; update to singular.

- Policy does not consider overdevelopment effects on landscape, e.g., park saturation, litter.

  Comments highlighting this issue

- 56901 (RWS Ltd), 57414 (Huntingdonshire DC), 59676 (Historic England), 60526 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60584 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site), 60781 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy should allow consideration of development on its own merits, recognizing development can bring landscape benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58508 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners Mr Currington, Mr Todd, Ms Douglas, Ms Jarvis, Mr Badcock & Ms Hartwell)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Suitability of sites must consider changes in landscape character from infrastructure or committed developments.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60584 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support protection of special and valued landscapes but:

- Proposed policy could overly restrict sustainable countryside development.
- Evidence required for Important Countryside Frontages inclusion; policy needs flexibility at village edges.

  Comments highlighting this issue

- 60315 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Trees are essential to screen developments and maintain green edges, but take ~30 years to mature. Policy should require planting large trees to reduce screening time.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58831 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Development should consider historic landscape character to inform better decisions.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59676 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern that views from south and east of Cambridge are underplayed; Strategic HIA should carefully assess these views.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59676 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
World Heritage Sites, natural interest sites, local landscape designations, and Inheritance Tax Exempt land should be identified and included on maps showing locally designated landscapes and Protected Views.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59982 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Locally designated landscapes (e.g., Areas of Greater Landscape Value) should be identified and protected with development reflecting their distinctive character.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59982 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Existing policies NH/1, NH/2, NH/13 (South Cambs Local Plan) and Policy 8 (Cambridge Local Plan) should be reviewed and updated based on latest landscape character assessment.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59982 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy will require protection of valuable trees unless planning balance outweighs protection.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59026 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 59136 (Metro Property Unit Trust 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Council should clarify what makes a green gap ‘important’ considering landscape enhancements.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59177 (Silverley Properties Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerns that some past developments around Cambridge are visually intrusive and

unattractive; such mistakes should not be repeated.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59581 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

CPRE believes the draft Local Plan does not adhere to principles especially regarding Green Belt site removals.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59581 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Home End does not meet Important Countryside Frontage (ICF) criteria; designation should be deleted.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57124 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Multiple designations limit development opportunities in Fulbourn; ICF adds another restrictive layer.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57124 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cumulative effect of development and incremental change is important; Important Countryside Frontages are vital to village settings and should continue as currently designated.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56677 (The Ickleton Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambourne Town Council requests protection for Cambourne Country parks as key open spaces defining character and landscape setting.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59255 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Protection of landscape setting and countryside gaps is vital for villages, especially those with linear form.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60012 (Steeple Morden PC), 60089 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Transition from agriculture to housing settlements complicates landscape preservation.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56752 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green corridors in West Cambridge are important for visual amenity, character, and city setting; policy should ensure protection.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57966 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments
South-facing parts of The Causeway, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, overlooking Therfield Heath SSSI, should be considered for Important Countryside Frontage designation.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57722 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Remaining green gaps around Oakington should be protected due to Northstowe impact.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56893 (J Price)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments on hedges:

- Protect and enhance existing hedges as boundary treatments.
- Replacement with wooden fencing/wire unacceptable in Conservation Areas.
- Hedges vital for green wildlife matrix; pressure to remove them (e.g., for bins, parking) should be resisted.
- New developments should aspire to living hedges at least 2m high as boundary markers.
- Plastic hedging is unacceptable.
  Comments highlighting this issue
- 57139 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Importance of River Cam and Hobson's Brook green corridors and landscape south

of CBC around White Hill is stressed.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56986 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Multiple designations (Green Belt, Conservation Area, Listed Buildings, Local Green Space) limit development in Fen Ditton; ICF adds further restrictions.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57107 (J Francis)

Summary of issues raised in comments

North-East Cambridge Core Site will require taller buildings; masterplan must carefully manage edges to landscape and ‘bad neighbour’ uses. Policy must recognise NEC AAP objectives and avoid unreasonable restrictions.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60156 (U&I PLC and TOWN)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Over-intensification threatens landscape character.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60203 (J Preston)

Table of representations: Policy GP/LC Protection and enhancement of landscape character (Site-specific comments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

In relation to GP/LC, it is requested that the Important Countryside Frontage designation on Ditton Lane and High Ditch Road in Fen Ditton is reviewed because it does not meet the definition for this designation. It is considered that the Important Countryside Frontage should be deleted in this location.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57107 (J Francis)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is considered that a suitably designed development located at the southern part of the land off Ditton Lane in Fen Ditton would protect and retain the character of the site frontage, protect the setting of heritage assets, and provide additional landscaping at the site boundary. This approach would allow for some small-scale growth at Fen Ditton to meet housing and identified affordable housing needs.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57107 (J Francis)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is requested that the Important Countryside Frontage designation at land off Home End in Fulbourn is deleted because the characteristics of the site means it does not meet the definition for such a designation.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57124 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Fulfilment of S/NEC policy through location of CWWTPR contravenes policy- GP/LC as development at this site has been identified as being of 'very high harm' (First Proposals Green Belt Study, 2021). Damages the setting of important conservation areas. Industrial scale development absolutely out of place in the local landscape which is open and flat. No amount of planting will hide the industrial plant.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57501 (C Martin)
- 57686 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
GP/LC supported in general but its aims are not reflected throughout the Local Plan due to failure to consider the consequential impact of the NECAAP on Green Belt and corresponding Landscape Character Areas as a result of relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant. If the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan is to retain an appropriate level of credibility, the consequential effects of the proposed NECAAP and corresponding CWWTPR should be considered within the Local Plan to assess the impacts under policy GP/LC and included in the Greater Cambridge Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment (2021) Policy GP/HA.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57556 (Save Honey Hill Group)
- 57622 (J Pratt)

- 58137 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposed WWTP relocation would result in a major industrial plant located in Landscape Character Area 6A, including towers planned to 20m-26m high surrounded by circular bund and fencing on top with a combined height of circa 11m. Clearly in breach of Policy NH/2 of 2018 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and presumably its proposed successor, Policy GP/LC.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57556 (Save Honey Hill Group)
- 57622 (J Pratt)
- 58137 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to policy GP/LC, it is currently incompatible with some other policies in the Local Plan notably the development of housing H1/b (148 houses built using unsuitable materials that have created an eyesore for South Cambridgeshire villages of Sawston and Babraham) and H1/c (planned additional 418 houses, which is far too high a density and will create a greater negative visual impact). This needs to be made consistent, otherwise there will be a conflict of policies.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58163 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Land West of London Road responds positively to Important Countryside Frontage designated along London Road. Site provides an opportunity to create a gateway into settlement, providing transition between wider settlement and village. Delivery of a village park will reinstate the countryside frontage and aligns with the principle of designation. Land to the West of London Road is bound by a mature hedgerow belt which dissects the Site from the wider countryside. The Site does not have long distant views to the countryside.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58820 (Wates Development)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to policy GP/LC, three site submissions within the parish of Babraham would contravene the policy. These sites include a “small“ one of 70 further houses as an extension of the next phase build adjacent to Sawston on the opposite side of the road to the current build; a submission to remove all of Babraham Institute land from the Green Belt, and the submission from Cheveley Farms for 3,500 houses.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58821 (Amanda Ogilvy-Stuart)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to policy GP/LC, whilst Land South of Newington, Willingham may form a gap in an otherwise developed frontage, it is considered to be within the confines of the village and as discussed earlier in this representation, could not be considered an important gap or of any significant value in landscape terms.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59177 (Silverley Properties Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to GP/LC, the Core Site at North-East Cambridge will need to be planned to a high density in order to fully achieve the strategic objectives of the NEC AAP, as well as to hit the quantum of development required under Homes England's Housing & Infrastructure Fund. This will require a number of buildings that are taller than may otherwise be commonly found in the north of Cambridge. The masterplan for the Core Site will take great care in how its development edges interface with the landscape and setting of nearby settlements, as well as adjoining 'bad neighbour' uses currently in existence. The policy will need to recognise the strategic objectives of NEC AAP and avoid imposing conditions that could unreasonably restrict development.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60156 (U&I PLC and TOWN)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is considered that a suitably designed development could be delivered at land off Home End in Fulbourn to retain the character of the site frontage, protect the setting of heritage assets, and provide additional landscaping at the site boundary. This approach would allow for some small-scale growth at Fulbourn to meet housing and identified affordable housing needs.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57124 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)

GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 65

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

General support was expressed for the policy direction from a wide range of respondents.

Some respondents, including the Wildlife Trust and National Trust, supported protecting the Green Belt, but want it to play a more positive role for recreation, biodiversity and tackling climate change. A member of the public questioned whether Green Belt policies were still relevant and suggested that development should be considered in the Green Belt in locations that have good public transport connections. Some comments criticised the possibility of Green Belt land being released for busways and East-West Rail. The Campaign for the Protection of Rural England argued that some of the proposals in the Local Plan did not fulfil the historic purpose of Cambridge's Green Belt. Some respondents objected to any development in the Green Belt, even for developments of national significance.

There were a number of comments relating to the Green Belt Assessment. Some respondents asserted that any sites which were designated a 'very high', 'high' or 'moderate high' harm rating in the Green Belt Assessment should also receive a 'red' harm rating in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. A number of developers critiqued the results of the Green Belt Assessment and asked for clearer justification of its results.

Many developers argued that their site in the Green Belt should be considered for development. Some developers asked for land to be identified in the rural area for Green Belt land release to ensure that the viability of the rural areas is enhanced. Croydon Parish Council commented that there is danger of having urban area, then Green Belt and then urban sprawl outside of the Green Belt. Some individuals and

campaign groups considered that the plan's proposals could have negative impacts on the Green Belt, and considered that the plan had not properly consider these impacts. This included the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill. Some comments questioned the effectiveness of existing Green Belt polices and pointed to examples of recent development occurring in Green Belt land.

The Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group (CDEA) asked for the Plan to clearly demand alternative sites of at least equal size and environmental benefit if land is taken out of the Green Belt. Jesus College and CDEA asked for the Plan to more clearly explain the forms of development that would and would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Gladman Developments suggested that the policy should not simply duplicate national policy as set out in the NPPF.

In terms of the additional survey questions, there were a high number of representations which emphasised the importance of protecting the Green Belt. The representations appeared in response to Q.3 (Cambridge East), Q.4 (Cambridge North East), Q.5 (Addenbrookes), Q.8 (villages with public transport links and services), Q.9 (kinds of housing, jobs, facilities, opens spaces in these villages), Q.10 (sites which should be included), Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). In the answers to these survey questions, some respondents objected to the proposed developments on the grounds that they would harm the Green Belt. There were also few representations which expressed a desire to build on the Green Belt and these representations appeared in response to Q.3 (Cambridge East), Q.4 (Cambridge North East), and Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge).

Table of representations: Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for the policy
Comments highlighting this issue

- Individuals
    - 56472 (M Starkie), 56814 (M Colville), 57689 (J Conroy), 57718 (C Harding), 57968 (E Davies), 58138 (M Asplin), 58898 (R Mervart), 60204 (J Preston)
- Public Bodies

    - 56635 (Gamlingay PC), 57723 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57795 (Coton PC)
- Third Sector Organisations
    - 56834 (Save Honey Hill Group), 56987 (Trumpington RA), 58839 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)
- Other Organisations
    - 59181 (National Trust), 59582 (CPRE), 59983 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The Plan does not take into account the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to Honey Hill which is in the Green Belt in order to allow development at North East Cambridge on a brownfield site. There is no reference to this in Policy S/NEC. The existing works is fully functioning and could be upgraded. The relocation to Honey Hill will have a detrimental impact on:

- open space (contrary to policy BG/PO, BG/EO)
- recreation
- amenity for residents
- views of Cambridge
- good quality agricultural land
- rich mix of fauna
- close to SSSI at Quy Fen
- within National Trust's Wicken Fen Vision

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56472 (M Starkie)
- 56509 (C Martin)
- 56834 (Save Honey Hill Group)
- 57422 (C Martin)
- 57606 (J Pratt)
- 57689 (J Conroy)
- 58072 (Horningsea Parish Council)
- 58138 (M Asplin)
- 58341 (C Lindley)
- 60237 (FeCRA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is danger of having urban area, then Green Belt and then urban sprawl outside of the Green Belt.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56752 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Any development of land in the Green Belt will diminish achievement of its primary purpose to prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge merging into one another and the city.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56814 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The ‘harm rating’ from the Green Belt assessment must be recorded in the HELAA assessment as red, amber or green or else the Green Belt is ignored in comparison to other areas which do attract flag ratings. Any site receiving ‘Very High’, ‘High’ or ‘Moderate High’ harm rating should receive a red flag.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56814 (M Colville)
- 57718 (C Harding)
- 58898 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Stress the importance of the Green Belt to the south of the city including land to the south of Addenbrooke’s Road and CBC, plus the river corridor and Hobson’s Brook corridor. Concerned about the threat of the CBC proposals and if Site 056 had been approved.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56987 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support positive role of the Green Belt for recreation and biodiversity. Green Belt also has an important role in tackling climate change and reduce risk of flooding in urban areas. For Cambridge to grow sustainably more positive use of the GB must be made, such as:

- including proposals within the Cambridge Nature Network.
- Planting trees to develop areas of deciduous woodland, orchards and scrubland
  Comments highlighting this issue

- 57028 (The Wildlife Trust)
- 58507 (J Pavey)
- 59181 (National Trust)
- 60136 (C Blakeley)
- 60465 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The evidence base documents – Green Belt Assessment, Landscape Character Assessment and Green Infrastructure Opportunity Mapping recommendations identify opportunities for Green Belt enhancement where Green Belt is released for development. These same opportunities should be realised where development is (of necessity) progressed in the Green Belt through schemes advance through planning applications and other consenting procedures.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60465 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
East West Rail's proposal is a 10m embankment that will damage the Green Belt and shouldn't be supported. The GCP public transport improvements to Cambourne would have much less GB damage.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57044 (W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Consider that additional land should be identified in the rural area for moderate levels of Green Belt release to ensure that the viability of the rural areas is protected and enhanced.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57181 (Southern and Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57257 (European Property Ventures (Cambridgeshire))

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57415 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development in the Green Belt is only ever appropriate for uses other than housing eg re-wilding or supplying access to green spaces
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57718 (C Harding)
- 58898 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Oppose the GCPs preferred off-road busway route through the Green Belt on one of the most visible high points overlooking the City when existing infrastructure exists.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57795 (Coton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support maintenance of existing Green Belt boundary on west of Cambridge between city and M11.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57968 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Current policies seem to have little protective effect. The plan should list specific exceptional circumstances that might allow further destruction of the Green Belt and should more clearly demand alternatives of at least equal size and environmental benefit in the area if more land is taken out of the Green Belt.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58012 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Building on the Green Belt should always be a last resort. Green Belt is often an easy option but not the best.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58050 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Green Belt should be protected and not released for large developments like the expansion of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus when demand could be met through investment within the current campus boundary.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58086 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy should be clear on the forms of development that would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt like current policy NH/9 in South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF confirms that exceptions to inappropriate development can include limited infilling of villages.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58100 (Jesus College)
- 60258 (Jesus College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Make the policy stronger as the proposed GCP CSET scheme is planned in the Green Belt, despite there being an option outside the GB. This reveals the GB status to be meaningless.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58160 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Maintain high quality agricultural land around Cambridge to feed Greater Cambridge from local sources and provide opportunities for farmers markets, local sustainable food initiatives and community forest gardens.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58160 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerned that some historic buildings were omitted during the assessment, despite the fact they could potentially contribute towards the historic setting of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58839 (Cambridge Past, Present and Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern that recent developments and those in the First Proposals do not protect valuable green space. Two areas of concern around Great Shelford:

1. The green finger between Great Shelford and the A1307 that extends from Gog Magog Hills into Cambridge to Botanical Gardens
2. The area of Stone Hill between Cambridge Road, Great Shelford and the River Cam.
   These sites are threatened if not directly by a slow creep of developments towards these areas.
   Comments highlighting this issue

- 59157 (Great Shelford Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The review of the Green Belt is welcomed as there is a compelling need to release Green Belt land to provide the opportunity for sustainable development. However, the results of the 2021 Green Belt Assessment provide significantly different assessments for a number of parcels (CHI 1-4, FU1, FU19, TE6-9) compared to previous evidence in 2012 Inner Green Belt Boundary Study. A much clearer and

more robust justification for the change in classification is needed. It is also noted that the vast majority of inner Green Belt parcels around Cambridge have been identified as ‘High Harm’ and such a blanket conclusion does not appear to reflect the differences in context around the city.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59292 (Endurance Estates)
- 59543 (Cheffins)
- 60269 (The White Family and Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The First Proposals Local Plan is not adhering to the established local purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, particularly in the case of proposals to remove several sites from the Green Belt. Concerned that some of the developments that have occurred around Cambridge are visually intrusive and in some cases aesthetically unappealing and don’t want to see these mistakes repeated.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59582 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Welcome the proposal to include the 3 established local purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These 3 purposes combined with the NPPF policy on Green Belts, are still important today and should influence key decisions regarding development in the Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59677 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

How does this fit in with the settlement boundaries?

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59827 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Oppose development intrusion into the Green Belt. Development ‘creep’ even for ‘nationally significant’ development should be resisted.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59854 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

This is critically important. Green Belt should be rigorously protected.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59927 (Fen Ditton PC)

- 60410 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is time to question if this national policy is still relevant to Greater Cambridge. Where locations have good public transport especially rail or future rail access there is a good case to consider special circumstances judgment. Further Green Belt assessments should consider sustainable development and the extension of Green Belt beyond current boundary to prevent coalescence of villages there.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60136 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Green Belt is not fit for purpose because it ignores historic environment designations and landscape character constraints. The Green Belt was set up to protect the setting of the historic University city.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60204 (J Preston)
- 60237 (FeCRA)
- 60782 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The proposed Local Plan is ripping chunks out of the Green Belt, so it's impossible to take this policy seriously. The Green Belt assessments are inadequate because they don't include historic environment, such as conservation area designations.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60782 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Cambridge Biomedical Campus expansion will have serious landscape impacts on open countryside towards the Gogs and will damage the setting of the city with its beautiful chalk downland views. It will hugely impact the character and boskiness of the nature reserve at Ninewells and farmland birds.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60237 (FeCRA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Green Belt policy must not simply duplicate national policy as set out in the NPPF. The release of Green Belt should not be the primary source of developable land when other suitable and sustainable sites are available outside the Green Belt. Growth should be dispersed across the settlement hierarchy and along sustainable transport corridors such as Melbourn to Cambridge. Sites submitted at Section 10 of

the report which would not require loss of Green Belt and are well served by public transport.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60316 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Anglian Water welcomes the inclusion of wording in Policy GP/GB which aims to support and secure enhancement of the Green Belt, such as for recreation and biodiversity. The evidence base documents identify opportunities for Green Belt enhancement where Green Belt land is released for development. Anglian Water would support recognition that these same opportunities should be realised in instances where development is (of necessity) progressed within the Green Belt under schemes advanced through planning applications and other consenting procedures.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60475 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Table of representations: Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt (Site-specific comments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land adjacent Spring House, Church Lane, Sawston

This land should be allowed to come forward as an infill residential plot for a self-build opportunity. The site does not fulfil any of the five purposes of the Green Belt and the GB boundary should be amended. Supporting evidence and plan submitted.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57022 (H Kent)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land to the north and east of Barrington Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40412) and land to the south-east of Cambridge Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40408)

These are deliverable and sustainable sites that do not contribute to the five

purposes of the Green Belt and should be released and allocated for development as they will assist in delivering varied and balanced housing supply to meet the rising housing needs.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57518 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Station Road, Harston

This is considered appropriate infill development in the context of para 149 of the NPPF. The proposed development for residential would respect immediate character and retain openness of the Green Belt and would be a moderate extension to the village and suitable infill development.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58100 (Jesus College)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land parcel CH10 (South of Cottenham) in the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment. HELAA reference 40296.

This parcel scores low harm against the purposes of the Green Belt in the Green Belt Assessment and a further assessment is provided as an attachment. Request that the site is released from the Green Belt and designated as open countryside outside the village's Development Framework to provide a more logical and defensible GB boundary and to respond to the new development along Oakington Road.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58229 (Christ's College)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Fulbourn Hospital site

Seek a change to the Green Belt boundary to exclude land in the northern part of the Fulbourn Hospital site (northern part of CH15), having regard to the existing built up character of the site and its relationship to Tescos and Capital Park. Plan shows suggested revision to boundary.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58243 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land West of Beach Road, Cottenham (HELAA site 59409)

A Green Belt review is provided to show that this parcel of land should be removed from the Green Belt for residential development as it would not prejudice the purposes of Cambridge's Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58510 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire and The Landowners)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land at Ambrose Way, Impington (HELAA site 40392)

A Green Belt appraisal is provided to support the case for release of land at this site for residential development.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58539 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land to the East of the Airport, Cambridge

If land is to be released from the Green Belt to accommodate future needs, land to the east of the Airport is a primary candidate due to the accessibility of the site and the excellent sustainability benefits that could be generated. The rating of 'very high' level of harm in the Green Belt Assessment is not wholly accurate or consistent with previous GB reviews and should be re-considered.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58553 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land east of Cambridge Road, Hardwick (HELAA site 40414)

A Green Belt Review is provided in support of releasing the site from the outer edge of the Green Belt. This looks at the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment where the site falls within parcel HA4 and considers that the site is a lower level of harm than that in the Assessment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58589 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land north of M11 and west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington (HELAA site 40048)

TMLC considers the site has been incorrectly scored in the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment and consider that it is suitable for development. Also see full response to Policy S/EOC.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58794 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company, a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain and Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Support the recognition that land may be taken out of the Green Belt adjacent to the Campus to meet local, regional and national healthcare, biomedical and research and development needs. The expansion of the campus satisfies national policy tests

for removal of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances. Development is to be landscape-led with investment in landscaping, biodiversity and green infrastructure which can enhance the setting of Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58857 (CBC Ltd, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land west of Oakington Road, Girton (HELAA site 40329)

The Council's Green Belt Assessment should be reviewed. Parcel GI8 should be re-assessed as 2 individual parcels with a split across the Beck Brook. The land between Beck Brook and Oakington Road will create considerably less harm than the overall parcel given the containment in visual terms.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58885 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land West of Impington

The Green Belt status of land west of Impington should be protected so that it remains a separate village surrounded by fields and not swallowed up by Cambridge. Proposals for a large development are out of character and will increase traffic through a quiet residential area. Land is prone to flooding and will increase flood risk to existing homes and put strain on GP practice.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58935 (R Donald)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Greenhedge Farm, Stapleford

The site should be removed from the Green Belt. Supporting evidence is provided which considers the site's contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment also shows that the release of Parcel GS10 would have a low level of harm.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58996 (Peterhouse)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Sites at Great Shelford

The categorisation of sites in the Green Belt Assessment at Great Shelford is supported, particularly the acknowledgement that the release of HELAA site 40413 at Cambridge Road, Great Shelford would have a negligible/low impact on the function of the Green Belt. Sites of medium or high harm should not be released and protected from development. Exceptional circumstances to release a specific site should not exist in situations where an alternative site at the same settlement has a

lower level of harm and is suitable and available for development.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59035 (Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land at Whittlesford

The proposals at Whittlesford will protect and enhance the Green Belt as described in Section 6 of the main representation and shown in the Design Vision and Environmental Appraisal appendices.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59132 (Grosvenor Britain and Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land west of Station Road, Fulbourn (HELAA site 40293)

Largely agree with Greater Places policies but believe Land west of Station Road, Fulbourn represents an excellent location for sustainable development. Benefits of this location are: frequent public transport and proximity to bus stop, proximity to proposed Fulbourn Greenway, would help to enable a sustainable large village to grow, well-contained site on three sides which has limited contribution to Green Belt purposes.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59312 (Countryside Properties)

GP/QD: Achieving high quality development

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 45

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many respondents expressed support for the policy.

A few developers specifically welcomed the policy's encouragement of mixed-use proposals. Croydon Parish Council expressed their desire to keep the landscape rural and the Trumpington Residents Association stressed the importance of delivering high quality buildings and enforcing planning conditions.

Some comments highlighted the need for planning to avoid creating bland developments. There were many suggestions to improve the policy, some included introducing additional architectural design standards, on-street parking provision, Passivhaus standards, crime prevention measures. Some respondents stated that design codes should reflect local building typologies, topography and that the policy should ensure that the use of previously developed or underutilised sites in the urban area can be maximised. Some comments stated that design guides shouldn't be imposed on small developments where other mechanisms could achieve similar outcomes. One developer stated that if a development meets the policy's objectives, the policy should ensure that this carries significant weight in the determination of the proposal.

Some respondents questioned whether it is unusual to have two design policies in the Local Plan and whether it could be covered in one policy. The Wildlife Trust also asked that the Building with Nature standards referred to in policy BG/GI are formally incorporated as a requirement into this policy or GP/QP. Historic England asked for a separate policy relating to tall buildings. Other respondents noticed that parking is referenced twice in the policy under 'climate-positive' and 'local character' and it does not need to be repeated. Some respondents asked for clarification to be provided within the policy as to what is regarded as 'significantly taller' to understand when additional assessment will be required.

Some developers supported the policy and asserted that their sites could deliver the policy's objectives. Other comments highlighted specific sites or proposals that they considered would not meet the policy objectives.

In terms of the additional survey questions, there were a high number of representations which emphasised the importance delivering high quality development. Such representations can be found in response to Q.3 (Cambridge East), Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), Q.5 (Addenbrookes), Q.6 (Cambourne), Q.7 (southern rural cluster), Q.9 (kinds of housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces in villages) and Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). In answer to Q.12 (what should we prioritise when planning homes for the future?), 64% of respondents expressed a desire for safe streets where children can play outside, 30% expressed a desire for accessibility and adaptability for wheelchair users and 51% expressed a desire for secure cycle parking.

Table of representations: Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for the policy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- Public Bodies
  56636 (Gamlingay PC)
  60013 (Steeple Morden PC)
  60090 (Guilden Morden PC)
  59928 (Fen Ditton PC)
- Third Sector Organisations
  58842 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
- Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
  58514 (BDW Cambridgeshire & The Landowners)
  58859 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
  60157 (U & I PLC and TOWN)
  60527 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
  60586 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the policy, but hard to achieve if houses are to be affordable, especially when climate factors are added in.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 56754 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support, but many would prefer the landscape to remain rural as it is and not urban.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 56755 (Croydon PC 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support, but stress importance of build quality and inability of council's to intervene and enforce planning conditions when developers build sub-standard homes. This is based on experience of Southern Fringe where quality has been poor.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 56988 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Draft policy seems focussed on external appearance and not on 'live-ability'.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 56988 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Building with Nature standards referred to in policy BG/GI are formally incorporated as a requirement into this or another appropriate policy such as GP/QP.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57030 (The Wildlife Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Good design is subjective, yet the planning system has allowed the dominance of bland housing estates. Therefore, additional guidance should be introduced to instruct development beyond vague advice about being 'in-keeping' with the existing local aesthetic to avoid monotony. Possible measures to address this include:

- Design guides are acceptable on large schemes to address this. However, it can take time to adopt design guides, in the interim developers could be signposted to alternative frameworks.
- Schemes which demonstrate a high standard of design should be fast-tracked.
- Robust community engagement should also be required.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57013 (C King)
• 60291 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)
• 60342 (F.C. Butler Trust)
• 60353 (F.C Butler Trust duplicate comment)
• 60372 (The Critchley Family)

• 60381 (Stephen & Jane Graves)
• 60391 (David Wright)
• 60467 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Additional measures to avoid monotony could include introducing a minimum number of individual house types appropriate to the scale of development.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57013 (C King)
• 60342 (F.C. Butler Trust)
• 60353 (F.C Butler Trust duplicate comment)
• 60381 (Stephen & Jane Graves)
• 60391 (David Wright)
• 60467 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is unusual to have two design policies in the Local Plan, is it necessary?

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60342 (F.C. Butler Trust)
• 60353 (F.C Butler Trust duplicate comment)
• 59678 (Historic England)
• 60381 (Stephen & Jane Graves)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Design guides shouldn’t be imposed on small developments where other mechanisms can achieve similar outcomes.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57013 (C King)
• 60342 (F.C. Butler Trust)
• 60353 (F.C Butler Trust duplicate comment)
• 60381 (Stephen & Jane Graves)
• 60467 (Peter, Jean & Michael Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The design guide is misleading, there needs to be a photographic, accurate record of poor development to provide guidance for future planning on what to avoid. The chosen visual examples in design guides were worryingly bland examples with too many houses crammed with unrealistic expectations that everyone can walk/cycle to education/schools etc. within five miles.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57141 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is important to include a policy on design with the GCLP that accords with paragraph the NPPF.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57182 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
• 57259 (European Property Ventures- Cambridgeshire)
• 58799 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The ambition to introduce mixed-use proposals is welcome. Most uses can be sensitively co-located and therefore it is requested that co-location of uses is supported in policy GP/QD.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57215 (Abrdn)
• 57274 (Universities Superannuation Scheme- Commercial)
• 58212 (Universities Superannuation Scheme- Commercial 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57416 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the policy, but consider that on-street parking should be taken into consideration so residents can park near homes without obstruction the roadway or having to rely on remote garage blocks.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57724 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is a need to assess the impact of new developments and build to the standards of Passivhaus homes.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58458 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There should be a requirement that steps to enhance biodiversity are required in development plans. This would complement and enhance policies relating to achieving biodiversity gain. There is no explanation why the reported comment that "The potential for planting and biodiversity should be maximised" has been disregarded.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58486 (J Pavey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Where these objectives can be demonstrated, the policy should make clear that this will carry significant weight in the consideration of the proposal.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58514 (BDW Cambridgeshire & The Landowners)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy direction, but it should link to Policy CC/NZ and buildings should be designed with climate mitigation in mind.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58842 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Use of design codes specific to a local area is critical and should reflect local building typologies and topography. The design codes should be flexible to reflect the fact that building construction methods are changing towards the objective of carbon neutrality. A Greater Cambridge design code would be welcome.

Comments highlighting this issue
• (59008) bpha

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy direction should make reference to existing built form on site/s, especially in respect to impact on neighbouring buildings and space to ensure that the use of previously developed or underutilised sites in the urban area can be maximised.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59074 (Metro Property Unit Trust)
• 59139 (Metro Property Unit Trust duplicate comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of the aspiration to achieve high quality design through development which accords with its own ethos and approach to development. Clarifications are needed:

- the need to successfully integrate waste, recycling and parking is referenced twice in the policy under ‘climate-positive’ and ‘local character’ which does not need to be repeated under the same policy.
- Clarification should be provided within the policy as to what is regarded as ‘significantly taller’ to understand when additional assessment will be required.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59529 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome the bullet points on local character, but there should be greater reference to the historic environment. It is confusing having two design policies separated in the Plan – GP/PP and GP/QD. It is also confusing as they address similar issues, i.e. tall buildings. It would be helpful if they were together.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59678 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Consider having a separate tall building policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59678 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy GP/QD could benefit by also referring to building orientation to maximise the opportunities for renewables.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59696 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy should link to section 12 Paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF (2021).

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59941 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Security and Crime prevention measures should be considered at the earliest opportunity as an integral part of any initial design for a proposed development. Developers should, at an early stage, seek consultation and advice from the Police Designing out Crime Officers at Cambridgeshire Police Headquarters on designing out crime.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59941 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy should link to the ‘Secured by Design’ principles and ensure that development proposals improve safety. The full list of principles is listed in the comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59941 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Can you promise to do this?

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60411 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Anglian Water supports the policy and is promoting integrated water management such as the reuse of rainwater on developments (Policy GP/QD). Anglian Water supports the requirements for SuDS on developments. The role of SuDS in improving water quality through intercepting points of pollution should also be referenced to in support of the policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60455 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A couple of clarifications are needed on the wording of the policy:

- The need to successfully integrate waste, recycling and parking is referenced twice in the policy under ‘climate-positive’ and ‘local character’ which does not need to be repeated under the same policy.
- In relation to the policy’s mention of ‘significantly taller’ buildings, clarification should be provided about what would count within this categorisation as ‘taller’.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60527 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
• 60586 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Clarification needed in relation to what ‘’major schemes should share a native 3-D file for assessment’’ actually means. Ideally computer model images should viewed on planning portal by consultees prior to approval. However the issue is that the Planning Portal is a big obstacle to community engagement.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60783 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The frontages policy is important but needs to go further. Neighbours often have views onto the backs of development, the design has to be great quality from all viewpoints.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60783 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Quality seems to have been compromised on many new developments, with the S106 money or a new park not making up for poor-quality design. There needs to be a detailed higher standard of design.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60783 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Table of representations: Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development (sites)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the policy GP/QD but notes that the fulfilment of Policy S/NEC through relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill is contrary to this policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57690 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the policy GP/QD; the Masterplan proposals accompanying these representations demonstrate the potential to deliver these objectives through the development of Land of Beach Road.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58514 (BDW Cambridgeshire & The Landowners)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to GP/QD, Marshall has a strong interest in creating a high quality development in Cambridge East (S/CE) and wishes to work with the GCSP to develop design principles and a design process that can inform a positive Local Plan policy for the site.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58558 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Shares the key design aims of the policy and includes information about how the CBC Vision 2050 (Policy S/CBC) accords with this vision.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58859 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 28

Notes:

- Parts of 57142 (North Newnham Resident Association) comment do not make sense.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many respondents expressed general support for the policy.

There were various suggestions to improve the policy. Many comments focussed upon improving the quality and experience of public spaces through the introduction of Home Zones, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and the principles of the 15-Minute City. Trumpington Residents Association (TRA) and others commented on the quality of the existing streetscape, the capacity of the streets and spaces within the city and their overall maintenance. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that footways need to be more porous for pedestrians but also protect them from motorised vehicles. The same respondent asked how the Local Plan will treat anti-terror architecture.

Metro Property Unit Trust suggested narrowing the policy's scope to ensure that developments should just be landscape-led, but also respond to other design, land-use and landscape considerations. Contrastingly, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Cambridgeshire/ Bedfordshire/ Hertfordshire Area suggested expanding the scope of the policy to include local landscape and habitats and the need to prevent the introduction of new, or expansion of existing invasive species. The Wildlife Trust considered that the Building with Nature standards referred to in Policy BG/GI should be formally incorporated as a requirement into this policy or another appropriate policy such as GP/QD. A few developers questioned how the last bullet point of the policy, 'appropriate types of open space' will be tested, measured, and applied.

In terms of the additional survey questions, in relation to Q.7 (southern rural cluster) and Q.9 (kinds of housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces to include in villages) there

were a number of suggestions, including an expressed desire for new development to be designed for children and a wish to make new development reflect village character. In relation to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), a high number of respondents expressed a desire for green spaces, tree, etc. to be included in the design of the site. Similar aspirations were expressed in response to Q.5 (Addenbrookes), Q.6 (Cambourne), Q.7 (southern rural cluster), Q.9 (kinds of housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces to include in villages) and Q.13 (the broad aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). In terms of enhancing connectivity, respondents expressed support in relation to Q.3 (Cambridge East), Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), Q.6 (Cambourne), Q.7 (the southern rural cluster), Q.9 (the villages) and Q.13 (the broad aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). There were particularly detailed representations expressing a desire to improve connectivity in Addenbrookes which was linked to Q.5 (Addenbrookes).

Table of representations: Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy

Comments highlighting this issue
• Individuals
o 57691 (J Conroy)
• Public Bodies
o 56637 (Gamlingay PC)
o 56756 (Croydon PC)
o 57725 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
o 59929 (Fen Ditton PC)
o 60014 (Steeple Morden PC)
• Third Sector Organisations
o 56989 (Trumpington Residents Association)
• Other Organisations
o 59077 (RSPB Cambs/ Beds/ Herts Area)
o 59679 (Historic England)
• Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
o 57216 (Abrdn)
o 58213 (Universities Superannuation Scheme Retail)
o 58826 (Wates Developments Ltd)
o 58865 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

o 59530 (Countryside Properties - Bourn Airfield)
o 60158 (U&I PLC and Town)
o 60528 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
o 60588 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Developers need to fulfil their planning obligations in relation to paths, infrastructure, and public realm facilities, which have not been delivered in Cambridge's southern fringe. Questioned whether financial penalties should be levied on developers if they do not meet their obligations.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 56989 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need for proper 'home zones' with a 20 mph speed limit from the outset of a development due to concerns that it can take years before 20 mph policy is implemented.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 56989 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Building with Nature standards referred to in Policy BG/GI should be formally incorporated as a requirement into this policy or another appropriate policy such as GP/QD.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57029 (The Wildlife Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57417 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Commented 'Inappropriate and controversial degradation of historical character' - unclear what this is referring to.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57142 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Commented in relation to bus lanes and bus shelters, review the good and bad ones, and improve cleaning maintenance.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57142 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cycle ways, markers and floor-scape must look attractive, fit in with context and be safe and appealing to use.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57142 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No cobbles or sets should be removed in historic core floor-spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57142 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Bike racks should be visually assessed in historic core and not over dominate historic areas.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57142 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Licensed stall holders who operate on listed bridges should have their contracts reviewed.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57143 (North Newnham Resident Association 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Questioned whether there should be a policy on removing or reducing plastics, such as flags, notices, art schemes, from the city centre.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57143 (North Newnham Resident Association 2nd comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Further release of green belt land, in addition to the land already committed in the Local Plan, would be detrimental to the biodiversity of the area.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 58170 (Dr. S Kennedy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Under the first bullet point of the ‘Enhanced connectivity’ policy, it is suggested that the policy could be expanded to include local landscape and habitats as well as public realm.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59077 (RSPB Cambs/ Beds/ Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Under the second bullet point of the policy ‘Response to climate’, they suggest including the need to prevent the introduction of new, or expansion of existing invasive species.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59077 (RSPB Cambs/ Beds/ Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Developments should not only be landscape led, but should respond to design, land-use and landscape considerations which links to the aim to deliver balanced planning decisions.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59078 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to the last bullet point of the policy, it was questioned how ‘appropriate types of open space’ will be tested, measured and applied.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59530 (Countryside Properties - Bourn Airfield)
• 60528 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
• 60588 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
For streetscape improvements, it was recommended to refer to Historic England’s ‘Streets for All’ publications.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59679 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It would be helpful for proposals for GB1/2 to be reviewed against the GP/QP policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 59783 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Commented that there are serious issues of street capacity.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60205 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Questioned whether the policies can be promised and maintained.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60412 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to Policy BG/EO, it was questioned whether certain thresholds and types of open space provision will be required dependent upon the scale of development.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60528 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
More thought needs to be given to making footways porous for pedestrians but protecting them from motorised vehicles. This could be achieved through provision of inset bays. Linked to this, the Party want to see implementation of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, progressing the Making Space for People SPD and 15 minute neighbourhoods.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60784 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cited problem in Cambridge of drivers going to one main shopping centre and cited example of Oxford Local Plan which had sought to decentralise traffic by offering multiple shopping centres.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60784 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Asked how the Local Plan will treat anti-terror architecture, such as the barrier on King's Parade. If it is a permanent fixture it should form part of consultations within the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
• 60784 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Table of representations: Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm (Site-specific comments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to GP/QP, commented that there is a require to review damaging light schemes, such as Burrells Walk

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57142 (North Newnham Resident Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The fulfilment of S/NEC Policy through the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill would be contrary to this policy (GP/QP)

Comments highlighting this issue
• 57691(J Conroy)

GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/greater-cambridge-local-plan-first-proposals/explore-theme/great-places/policy-gpqp-establishing> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 36

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Broad support for the policy was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, public bodies, third sector organisations and developers.

Respondents comments include that the policy should include buildings recorded in Cambridgeshire's Historic Environment Record, it is too focused on City without reference to Conservation areas in villages, and should recognise that new development can enhance heritage assets and that protecting access to heritage assets would help to improve well-being.

Historic England (HE) provided a substantial comment to this policy which included various suggestions. Key elements include that the Councils should provide a

positive strategy for the historic environment, that there should be additional policies for: designated and non-designated heritage assets, heritage at risk, and historic shopfronts, that the Councils should create and manage a local heritage at risk register, and that Heritage Impact Assessments are prepared for site allocations. Other parties considered more could be done to recognise the value of heritage beyond designated heritage assets.

In relation to the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment (SHIA), HE had concerns regarding how Cambridge's setting has been defined and measured, and suggest revisiting parts of this assessment. Some respondents including CPPF expressed a number of concerns, such as perceiving it to omit discussion of Conservation Areas Appraisals and the potential impact of growth on these Areas, omitting assessment of the cumulative impacts of growth on the historic centre, and ignoring previous research. These respondents recommended a third-party, holistic overview is needed and suggest using HE's Historic Places Panel.

Some respondents argued that the Conservation Areas policy should be reviewed to give greater control over significant changes within a coherent area, and some respondents wanted a full set of up to date Conservation Area Appraisals, including for villages and approach roads from all directions into Cambridge, major towns and villages in the area.

Other comments included the importance of the policy aligning with the NPPF, and a view that current policy wording is ambiguous in relation to archaeology, that Local Geological Sites and Geological Special Sites of Scientific Interest often have a historic and heritage aspects, and these should be included in the assessment. A few respondents raised questions in relation to the effectiveness of existing policies. A few respondents raised site specific comments expressing concern about the heritage impacts of new development including the relocation of the WWTP, and development in Little Linton.

In the additional survey questions, some respondents expressed a desire to protect heritage assets in relation to Q.13 (the broad aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). In response to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), a few respondents expressed concerns about the potential impact upon the historic setting of the site. Preservationist sentiments were also expressed in response to Q.7 (southern rural cluster). Similar concerns were expressed in relation to Q.8 (level of development in the villages), Q.9 (kinds of houses, jobs, facilities, or open spaces to be included in

the villages), and Q.13 (the broad aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge) and the need to preserve the beauty and character of villages.

Table of representations: Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy

Comments highlighting this issue

- Individuals
    - 57693 (J Conroy)
    - 57969 (E Davies)
    - 58140 (M Asplin)
- Public Bodies
    - 56638 (Gamlingay PC)
    - 56915 (West Wickham PC/ Cllr. David Sargeant)
    - 60091 (Guilden Morden PC)
- Third Sector Organisations
    - 60785 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
- Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
    - 57219 (Abrdn)
    - 58215 (Universities Superannuation Scheme)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy, but:
• The scope is not wide enough. It appears to concentrate on heritage sites in the city without reference to some of the protected conservation areas in villages
• The policy should not only include listed buildings but also those recorded on Cambridgeshire's Historic Environment Record. Conservation areas should be respected and maintained per SCDC policy NH/14.
• Need to complete Conservation Area Assessments for villages
• In some cases, new development or redevelopment can enhance heritage assets and this should be recognised in the policy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- Individuals
    - 56475 (M Starkie)
- Public Bodies
    - 57726 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
    - 59930 (Fen Ditton PC)
    - 60015 (Steeple Morden PC)
- Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
    - 58215 (Universities Superannuation Scheme)
    - 57219 (Abrdn)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Fails to consider anything other than designated heritage assets. No consideration of heritage significance of Cambridge as a whole, or of the heritage significance of undesignated buildings, spaces, and intangible heritage.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60206 (J Preston)
- 60785 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
- 58860 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Heritage Impact Assessment is not fit for purpose. There is no mention of any Conservation Area appraisal apart from the Historic Core, and no cumulative assessment of significance and issues identified in these Appraisals.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60206 (J Preston)
- 60785 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Ensure positive strategy for historic environment throughout the plan. A good strategy will offer a positive, holistic approach throughout the whole plan whereby the historic environment is considered as an integral part of every aspect of the plan, being interwoven within the entire document.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59680 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy recommendations include

• Strategic policy for the historic environment setting out an overall strategy for the pattern scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.
• Create policies for heritage assets designated and non-designated heritage assets which align with national policy legislation. HE also encourages policy for assets which might potentially be designated during the plan period.
• Include policy for Heritage at Risk, as there is currently no policy in the plan for such heritage.
• HE also recommend the creation and management of a local Heritage at Risk register for Grade II listed buildings.
• Include policy for Historic Shopfronts
• Prepare HIAs for site allocations.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59680 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Detailed heritage impact assessments for the site allocations should follow the 5 step methodology set out in our HE Advice Note 3.
• The appraisal approach should not just focus on distance or intervisibility of a site, but also go into detail about opportunities for enhancement and cumulative effects of the site on the historic environment.
• If the HIA concludes that development in the area could be acceptable, the findings of the HIA should inform the Local Plan policy.
• HE welcome the opportunity to discuss the scope of this next stage of HIA to ensure that the right sites are covered and in a proportionate way.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59680 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
HE have concerns regarding some aspects of the baseline of the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment, including:
• The weighting given to some of the key characteristics and aspects of setting of Cambridge including views.
• HE have some concerns about the way in which some aspects have been defined as important/critical and others contributory of minor.
• HE suggest re-visiting the different setting elements of the SHIA

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59680 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Coton Parish Council is concerned that the heritage aspects of the setting of the American Cemetery are being ignored by the GCP. They are especially concerned that proposals to build a tarmac bus road across the south side of the hill would irreparably damage the landscape around the cemetery.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57797 (Coton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Local Plan policy should ensure that it establishes the highest possible safeguards for the protection of all heritage assets, historic places and important landscapes.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59304 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Gog Magog and the chalk hills are heritage assets.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59280 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Protecting public access to heritage assets encourages better well-being and the more assets encourages public rights of way including permissive footpaths.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59280 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A third-party, holistic overview is recommended, to try to resolve some of these key strategic issues. In relation to heritage, growth is seriously threatening what makes Cambridge Special. It is recommended that Historic England's Historic Places Panel are invited to visit Cambridge and provide strategic recommendations which can inform the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58860 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
- 60206 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Current policy wording is ambiguous in relation to archaeology. It is suggested that the policy wording is amended to state that 'the policy will also require the appropriate treatment of archaeology, where development proposals have the potential to impact archaeological remains or deposits.'

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60529 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60589 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Councils need to ensure the policy reflects the national policy (NPPF 2021, paragraphs 199-204) and aligns with these varying tests.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60317 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
By not developing villages we would protect our heritage. Conservation should be a key and important priority.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60413 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments include:
• Considers that the historic environment has been considered too narrowly and should be widened to include wellbeing and culture.
• The conflict between growth and environmental capacity of the historic built environment and special character must be recognised as a key challenge for the draft Local Plan. It should have been considered at the start of the Great Places chapter.
• The Local Plan should clarify the role and the heritage of the market square as a historic centre of the city.
• Concerned that the evidence base does not include an assessment of the cumulative impacts on the historic centre and what the likely impacts of this might be – without this it is impossible to reach a judgement.
• Paragraph 3.2.4 of the Strategic HIA states that growth will support Cambridge's characteristics, but we cannot find evidence to support this statement.
• The "Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment" references a "Vu-City" model for assessing the impacts of tall buildings. This modelling should made available for the public to see and assess.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58860 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
- 60206 (J Preston)
- 60785 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

There are serious questions in relation to the effectiveness of existing policies. Example of Mill Road Library is cited, it was excluded from redevelopment of depot. It was an excellent opportunity to protect and enhance a heritage asset, which would not have been missed had the City complied with its own Local Plan policy regarding heritage assets. It has been refurbished, but not incorporated into the development, and is now a public building being offered for private sale.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58860 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
- 60206 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concerns are raised as to the validity of the Heritage Impact Assessment (2021). Perceived flaws include:

• The Baseline Study does not assess and record the SIGNIFICANCE, as opposed to weighting, of the City as a whole or of any undesignated areas within and around it. This is because the study only considers the setting of designated heritage assets, rather than taking a holistic strategic view.

• Needs to show more knowledge of city's history + policies

• It confines itself to measuring impact on historic assets, rather than considering the dynamic of the city as a whole + potential impact of growth.

• It seems to ignore the approach of the 2006 Historic Core Appraisal

• Doesn't mention Conservation Area Appraisal apart from the Historic Core Appraisal + no cumulative assessment of significance and issues identified in these appraisals.

• The HIA identifies Conservation Area Appraisals as data to inform the assessment. However, not all the conservation areas have a CAA and therefore there is a gap in the available data.

• The Baseline study does not mention the Suburbs and Approaches Studies.

• The Baseline study does not consider the strategic extent, designations, i.e. the extent to which Cambridge's historic or cultural landscape is protected.

• Study fails to assess the significance of Cambridge as a whole.

• The "view" photos don't show the "eye-catching" impact on a viewer's perception of a contrasting feature such as a tall building in a landscape.

• For the options involving development in and adjacent to Cambridge, it assumes that most problems can be resolved by Design, completely ignoring environmental capacity issues. What if any detailed assessment has been made of the wider visual impacts of tall buildings on the North-East Cambridge site?

• No consideration of impact of transport and traffic upon historic environment, which will be needed to support growth.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58860 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
- 60206 (J Preston)
- 60785 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Local Geological Sites and Geological SSSI often have a historic and heritage aspects. These should be included in the assessment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57791 (Dr R Nicholls)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57418 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The major existing University developments at Eddington and West Cambridge, which are proposed for acceleration, have significantly changed the character of North Newnham, with consequent effects on water management and dense urban development on the edge of the West Cambridge Conservation Area. Maintaining and strengthening Conservation Area policy protection is even more important to preserve the West Cambridge Conservation Area from inappropriate development. Policy 67 does not afford sufficient protection.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57889 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Figure 6.2 Cultural heritage, page 48 – map shows conservation areas are listed the buildings in circling the proposed site of the CWWTP on greenbelt which appears to negate the policy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56904 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to Conservation Area policies,
• That the Policy should be reviewed to give greater control over significant changes within a coherent area.
• A priority is to update Conservation Area Appraisals, using planning experts and community forums.

• A priority is to have a full set of Conservation reports on approach roads from all directions into Cambridge and major towns and villages in County.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56990 (Trumpington Residents Association)
- 57144 (North Newnham Resident's Association)
- 57969 (E Davies)

Table of representations: Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets (Site-specific comments)

Summary of site related issues raised in comments
The objective of Policy GP/HA will be contravened by the requirement of Policy S/NEC North East Cambridge to relocate the Waste-Water Treatment plant to an area of Green Belt. Conservation areas and heritage sites will be compromised by the juxtaposition of a large industrial plant.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56904 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of site related issues raised in comments
In relation to GP/HA, CWWTPR to Green Belt compromises this policy. Significant impact to heritage assets exist in this area. The development would represent totally inappropriate industrial development at this location, blighting views from network of PRoWs and views to the villages and into Cambridge. The impact would be intensified by open landscape.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57497 (C Martin)
- 57617 (J Pratt)
- 57693 (J Conroy)

Summary of site related issues raised in comments
In relation to GP/ HA, the proposals are supported which exclude any development in the area of Little Linton. New development in the area would disrupt the historic open landscape, destroying the separation and damaging the individual character of each settlement as well as cause harm to a valuable environmental resource. The direction of future development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate and will ensure that Little Linton and Linton retain their identity.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57842 (S Nickalls)
- 57873 (A Nickalls)
- 57917 (S Foulds)
- 57930 (H Lawrence-Foulds)
- C Mackay (57960)

Summary of site related issues raised in comments
In relation to GP/HA, there appears no reference to the corresponding Green Belt dependency for Policy S/NEC, which therefore appears selective and should be considered more fully in the study for the options relating to S/NEC.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58140 (M Asplin)

GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/greater-cambridge-local-plan-first-proposals/explore-theme/great-places/policy-gpqp-establishing> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 14

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Broad support for the policy was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, public bodies, organisations and developers. Histon and Impington PC supported the policy on the condition that retrofitting improvements don't harm heritage assets. Linton PC questioned the need for old buildings to adapt and argued that modern changes could harm the buildings. Comments included the need for clarity regarding what interventions are necessary to end heritage assets reliance on fossil fuels, that the policy should relate to all buildings of traditional construction and should relate to policy CC/NZ.

Cambridge Past, Present & Future stated that it would be useful to provide clear guidance on the appropriate location of solar panels on heritage assets and buildings

within conservation areas. Gamlingay Parish Council stated that more support is needed to help residents with listed buildings retrofit temporary fittings to roof structures.

Historic England (HE) broadly support the policy but provided comments including that it should articulate the significant carbon output that is produced when demolishing old buildings and policies should recognise the benefits of sympathetic restoration and retrofitting historic buildings. HE noted that listed buildings, buildings in Conservation Areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. HE noted that traditional buildings can be impacted by climate change to a greater degree than modern buildings and linked a number of publications to help guide the draft policy.

In terms of the additional survey questions, in relation to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East) and Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge) some respondents expressed a preference for retrofitting properties over creating new development.

Table of representations: Policy GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy

Comments highlighting this issue

- Public Bodies
    - 56757 (Croydon PC)
    - 56916 (Cllr. David Sargeant)
    - 57727 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
    - 59932 (Fen Ditton PC)
- Other Organisations
    - 59681 (Historic England)
- Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners
    - 58020 (Imperial War Museum/ Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
More support and work needed to provide a positive framework for residents with listed buildings, enabling them to retrofit temporary fits to roof structures.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56639 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support considering measures that improve the energy efficiency of listed buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56916 (Cllr Sargeant)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57419 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
State that enabling growth on their site will provide direct support for protection, adaptation and preservation of their heritage assets by mitigating climate change impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58020 (Imperial War Museum/ Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support, as long as heritage is not damaged by retrofitting improvements.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58051 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
If the buildings have lasted this long, why do they need to adapt? Insulation and modern materials can lead to decay and dampness in listed buildings.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58460 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It would be useful for the policy and/or the supporting text to provide clear policy on the appropriate location of solar panels on heritage assets/on buildings within conservation areas.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58866 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the acknowledgement in emerging policy of the need for heritage assets to be adapted for climate change, however it would be helpful to have greater definition regarding what interventions are necessary to end heritage assets reliance on fossil fuel. Bath and Oxford provide good examples.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58873 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broadly support the policy direction. Historic England also offers the following advice:

- By caring for and reusing our heritage assets, energy and carbon dioxide can be saved through better maintenance, management, and energy efficiency measures.
- It is important to articulate an evidence-based case for the importance of the historic environment in respect of the embodied carbon value of historic buildings. It is important to emphasise the positive contribution that retaining and reusing old buildings can make, along with the sustainability of old materials and design.
- A sustainable approach to climate change mitigation measures should secure a balance between benefits such development delivers and the environmental costs it incurs.
- Policies should seek to limit and mitigate any cost the historic environment. When considering energy efficiency measures, the benefits of alternative options should be weighed against impact on heritage assets.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59681 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Historic England recommends incorporating their suggestions into policy wording:

- Policies should recognise sustainability over the long-term; historic buildings represent a significant investment of expended energy.
- Demolishing represents a significant reinvestment of embodied energy.
- Planning policies should encourage & recognise the benefits of sympathetic restoration/retention/refurbishment/retrofit of historic buildings, rather than demolition and replacement.
  In their comment, Historic England attached a document outlining several publications that might be helpful when drafting the policy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59681 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Historic England note Listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency

requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59681 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Special considerations under Part L of the Building Regulations are given to locally listed buildings, buildings of architectural and historic interest within Registered Parks and Gardens and within the curtilages of Scheduled Monuments. Buildings of traditional construction more readily absorb moisture and allow for its evaporation. Therefore, these buildings can be impacted by climate change to a greater degree than modern buildings. In relation to this point Historic England recommends some of its publications when writing the policy and these are included in the attached document.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59681 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

This policy is good and supported, but should relate to all buildings of traditional construction and needs some updating. It needs direct read-across to CC/NZ.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60207 (J Preston)
- 60786 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
- 58866 (Cambridge Past & Present & Future)

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Wellbeing and social inclusion > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

42

Notes

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on the Wellbeing and Social Inclusion policies, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific housing and open space policies. These comments have been moved to the specific policy: H/AH Affordable Housing, H/HM Housing mix and BG/EO Providing and enhancing open spaces.
- Some comments attached to this section relate to transport, water efficiency, urban and specific sites. In many cases the representors that made these comments have also made similar comments on the relevant sections within the plan. Where appropriate we will review placement of these comments in the final version of these representation summaries which will accompany the draft plan.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There was good general support for the overarching aims of the proposed wellbeing and inclusion policies from site promoters, the University of Cambridge, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group, Cambourne TC and Central Bedfordshire Council. Huntingdonshire District Council had no comment on this policy area. Two site promoters expressed the need for a more balanced provision of affordable housing and sustainable travel across Greater Cambridge, in order to achieve the Local Plan's identified wellbeing and social inclusion aspirations. Fen Ditton PC was broadly supportive of aspiration but concerned with the ambiguity in some of the detail.

One member of the public expressed a need for new residential development to be no more than 4 storeys high, inclusive and provide open spaces with a balanced approach to cycling. Existing sporting facilities must be maintained and improved to safe, modern requirements. One member of the public suggested the Local Plan should include policies to protect cultural significance, specifically to support cultural activities and to provide for, and safeguard public and private spaces for arts and other activities.

In terms of social & transport infrastructure provision, comments from two members of the public and three PCs: Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Great Shelford; and Teversham were received. They cited concerns over the need: to consider the impact of high growth strategy on existing residents; for access to GPs and other primary care services and the retention of those services in villages; for active travel to be a feasible choice; and to invest in sports and leisure facilities, swimming pools, across the city and especially near large new developments. There was little evidence of detailed plans regarding infrastructure to support well-being and inclusion, communities need green community spaces, public parks, policing, schools, shops. They noted transport to any services and social support are essential to achieving wellbeing along with lower housing densities, increased dwelling space standards and access to private amenity space. Histon & Impington PC stated water efficiency must be compulsory.

DB Group Holdings raised the matter of the Local Plan ensuring a variety of employment opportunities are available across the District for all members of the community. Cambridge Past, Present & Future noted the protection and enhancement of the Historic Environment is not just key to creating and providing Great Places but also a vital part of Wellbeing.

One member of the public cited the North East Cambridge proposal, with the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP).will have a negative impact on residents and users of the surrounding area. Another member of the public suggested policies should acknowledge both the health and amenity benefits of visible green open space even if not publicly accessible. A different member of the public noted the need to balance climate change mitigation and adaptations with provision of a good standard of amenity. There was also no mention of people with disabilities. Linton PC highlighted the need to consider needs of elderly people.

The Environment Agency, while supportive of the opportunity to level-up communities, tackling this green inequality at scale and improving the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the GC area, caveated that for this to be achieved this needs to be balanced with the need to protect the environment, by providing appropriate wildlife refuges from human disruption and interference.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties considered the Local Plan will only worsen environmental damage and fail to serve Cambridge citizens who are disadvantaged, and the planned growth will only serve our significantly privileged citizens.

Many comments were submitted by site promoters indicating that their sites, if allocated for development would support the Local Plan's aspiration for creating healthy developments. Stapleford PC advised against 100-dwelling add-on developments rather the provision of infill brownfield sites with affordable housing would support inclusivity and develop wellbeing.

Several groups and individual members of the public highlighted the negative impact the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill would have on local amenity in terms of noise, odour and vibration pollution.

Table of Representations: Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed wellbeing and inclusion policies.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57207 (Abrdn)
- 57272 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)
- 58207 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail)
- 58526 (Marshall Group Properties)
- 58643 (University of Cambridge) & 58315 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
- 58782 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)
- 59174 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG))
- 59222 (Cambourne Town Council)
- 59697 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
If the Plan is going to meet the wellbeing and social inclusion aspirations identified, then there needs to be a better balance to ensure that affordable housing and sustainable travel is provided across the urban and rural areas of Greater Cambridge, not just Cambridge, the edge of Cambridge and new settlements.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57176 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57250 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to ensure new residential development is no more than 4 storeys high, inclusive and provide open spaces.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57276 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need balanced approach towards cycling.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57276 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No Comment.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57406 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Existing many sporting facilities must be maintained/improved to safe/modern requirements.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57276 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Social & Transport Infrastructure Provision:

- Impact of high growth strategy on existing residents needs to be evaluated including water
- Policy should address the need for access to GPs and other primary care services and the retention of those services in villages
- Active travel should be a feasible choice
- Need to invest in sports and leisure facilities, swimming pools, across the city and especially near large new developments
- Little evidence of detailed plans regarding infrastructure to support well-being and inclusion, communities need green community spaces, public parks, policing, schools, shops
- Transport to any services and social support is a huge part of wellbeing
- Lower housing density, increased dwelling space standards and access to private amenity space are also essential to achieving wellbeing
  Comments highlighting this issue
- 57537 (C Martin)
- Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC
- D Lister
- 59127 (Great Shelford PC)

- 59232 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Fulfilment of S/NEC Policy through relocation of CWWTP will have a negative impact on residents and users of the surrounding area.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57680 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Water efficiency must be compulsory.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57874 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policies should acknowledge specifically the health benefits and amenity benefits of visible green open space such as college or other playing fields even if not publicly accessible.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57962 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Local Plan should ensure that a variety of employment opportunities are available across the District for all members of the community. This includes protecting and enabling the growth of established and successful businesses in the District such as DB Group (Holdings) LTD.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58277 (DB Group Holdings LTD)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to consider needs of elderly people.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58435 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Protecting and enhancing the Historic Environment is not only key to creating and providing Great Places but a vital part of Wellbeing.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58784 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The GC Local Plan presents an opportunity to level-up communities, tackling this green inequality at scale and improving the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the GC area, by creating and contributing to healthier, greener, and more accessible environments. This must, however, be achieved in balance with the need to protect the environment, by providing appropriate wildlife refuges from human disruption and interference.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59728 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to balance the climate change mitigation/adaptations with providing a good standard of amenity. No mention of disabled people.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59779 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broadly supportive of aspiration but concerned at ambiguity in some of the detail.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59925 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Local Plan should include policies to protect cultural significance, and specifically to support cultural activities, and to provide for, and safeguard, public and private spaces for arts and other activities.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60201 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support protection of valuable open spaces although planned development in the north part of the city threatens these spaces. Local Plan's will only worsen environmental damage and fail to serve Cambridge citizens who are disadvantaged and the planned growth will only serve our significantly privileged citizens. A good standard of living, affording to get onto the property ladder, is not accessible to many local residents who grow up here and additionally deterring those living in other places from coming to live here.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60772 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Table of representations: Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments
The land at Fen Ditton site would include the aspiration for creating a healthy new development, providing the opportunity to create a healthy community with infrastructure supporting community activity, health, education and quality of life. Achieved through a combination of a compact mixed-use urban structure and providing integrated green space which creates the conditions for people to lead healthy lives by encouraging 'active travel', reducing vehicular traffic, improving the public realm and enhancing social interaction. Include 'equigenesis': an equalising environment that uplifts everyone's health and well-being.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60575 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The provision of new sports pitches and a village hall /sports pavilion on Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham will wholly support the ambitions of Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments and Policy WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56900 (RWS Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The redevelopment of the Clifton Road Industrial Estate will have opportunities to improve the wellbeing and inclusion of local residents.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57272 (Universities Superannuation Scheme -Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Avoid 100-dwelling add-on developments; provide infill brownfield sites with affordable housing which support inclusive and develop wellbeing.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57530 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The creation of truly mixed-use communities, maximising access to jobs and facilities for all residents, as proposed at North Cambourne, is a key measure in assessing which sites should come forward for development. Larger sites are preferred in

achieving overall gains for inclusion and balanced place making, as they can better provide: homes for all parts of the community; a wider range of accessible jobs; support the delivery of low carbon transport infrastructure; ensure that infrastructure, services and facilities are provided alongside new employment and homes; and support arts and culture.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57908 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

IWM is supportive of aims for supporting wellbeing and inclusion and can make a significant contribution to local health and wellbeing, including placemaking and identity, community engagement and social inclusion.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58018 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambridge East has the scale to achieve transformational change in the east of the City that will significantly improve the lives of local residents through the provision of job opportunities, affordable homes and a range of cultural, leisure and retail options.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58526 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land at Meldreth provides an opportunity to provide for sustainable growth in the southern part of the rural area where there are not necessarily other suitable locations.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58933 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Comprehensively planned development at Cambridge South would bring opportunities for local living, particularly for those in housing need and those working at the Biomedical Campus for whom housing is unaffordable or inaccessible. A fully integrated community is proposed with supporting recreation, health and social infrastructure – with tangible benefits for health and wellbeing.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59000 (Jesus College (working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings), a private landowner and St John’s College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The proposals at Whittlesford would help to build a healthy and sustainable community.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59119 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The scale of development at Cambridge East provides a significant opportunity to meet, not only the needs of the future Cambridge East residents, but also a wider demand for community, sports and leisure facilities close to the city centre that might not be capable of being accommodated on other more constrained sites.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58535 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
If the site at Comberton were to be allocated this would provide a key opportunity to provide much needed specialist housing for older people in a sustainable location which would benefit the wider community. The characteristics of Extra Care development (such as the provision of on-site services and facilities) should enable consideration of where this can contribute towards mixed and balanced communities and sustainable growth in rural areas.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59773 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the development of new facilities in appropriate locations where there is local need. At CBC there is an identified need for the social infrastructure, community and leisure facilities that can help a community thrive, and which foster great placemaking. Social infrastructure and community uses will provide a key part of the supportive environment for clusters and innovation districts, and different users onsite.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58843 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The fulfilment of S/NEC policy through the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill is contrary to this policy and would lead to adverse effects in terms of noise, odour and

vibration pollution and contravenes WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56512 (Catherine Martin)
- 57578 (Save Honey Hill Group)
- 57627 (J Pratt)
- 57681 (Jennifer Conroy)

WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

43

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the WS/HD Creating healthy new developments policy. Those indicating their support included Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Groups, Cambourne TC, Great and Little Chishill PC, Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties, two members of the public and three developers; one of which suggested the policy should go further with other measures which maximise wellbeing benefits. There were also many comments from individuals and site promoters stating the application of Health Impact Assessments should only relate to major developments with one site promoter requesting the threshold being outlined.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign cited the need for new developments to integrate transport and cycling infrastructure which supports all types of uses and users. One member of the public noted adequate allotment provision will contribute to healthy developments. Natural England suggested the policy include links to the importance of adequate levels and qualities of accessible green infrastructure. One developer and another site promoter, while supportive of the application of health principles to new development, stated the ten Healthy New Towns principles were onerous and development should apply these where possible.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties supported the idea of “high quality people-focused spaces” but requested more details on these. They suggested the Local Plan should support interventions like those set out in the ‘Encouraging Healthier Takeaways in Low Income Communities’. They would also like to see council involvement to see local businesses who already produce healthy food for the residents of Cambridge having a presence in local shops in Chesterton, Arbury, Abbey and Kings Hedges. The Council should approach these local businesses and provide incentives for them to trade in areas where all local people can access them; not just those who live in Market or Petersfield or Trumpington.

Table of Representations: Policy WS/HD - Creating healthy new developments

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed creating healthy new developments policy
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58837 (CBC Limited)
- 59179 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG)
- 59224 (Cambourne TC)
- 59773 (Endurance Estates)
- 59780 (B Hunt)
- 60133 (Christopher Blakeley)
- 60153 (U&I PLC and TOWN)
- 60422 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
- 60224 & 60553 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)
- 60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policies could go further to set out requirements on not only creating healthy new developments, but other measures which maximise wellbeing benefits that developments can offer those who build them, those who live in them and the communities around them now and into the future.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60224 & 60553 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Health Impact Assessments: The requirement should only relate to major developments.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57098 (C King)
- 57298 (C Sawyer Nutt)
- 58868 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Ltd)
- 59158 (Endurance Estates)
- 60289 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)
- 60340 & 60351 (F.C. Butler Trust)
- 60360 (H.J. Molton Settlement)
- 60379 (S & J Graves)
- 60389 (D Wright)
- 60469 (P,J&M Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to outline threshold where a Health Impact Assessment is required.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59015 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
New developments must integrate transport and cycling infrastructure which supports all types of uses and users.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59025 (Cambridge Cycling Campaign)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Adequate allotment provision will contribute to healthy developments.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59293 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy should include strong links to the importance of adequate level and quality of accessible green infrastructure.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59980 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of application of health principles to new development, however the ten Healthy New Towns principles are onerous. Rather, development should apply these

where possible. Clarification on when Health Impact Assessments are needed and not needed.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60521 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60575 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support the idea of “high quality people-focused spaces” but want more detail on these.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy which restricts the development and locations of hot food takeaways seems sound. How can we encourage and enable local families to eat a balanced and sufficient diet? The Local Plan should support interventions that help to reverse this trend like those set out in the ‘Encouraging Healthier Takeaways in Low Income Communities’.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Want council involvement to see local businesses who already produce healthy food for the residents of Cambridge having a presence in local shops in Chesterton, Arbury, Abbey and Kings Hedges. The Council should approach these local businesses and provide incentives for them to trade in areas where all local people can access them; not just those who live in Market or Petersfield or Trumpington.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60774 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy WS/CF: Community, sports and leisure facilities > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

32

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council RA = Residents' Association

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the Policy WS/CF Community, sports and leisure facilities policy. Those indicating their support included Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, Steeple Morden PC, Guilden Morden PC, Great and Little Chishill PC and Marshall Group Properties.

Cambourne TC supported the policy but stated it should not rely on community hubs providing facilities as they do not meet all the diverse age and cultural needs. Croydon PC and Trumpington RA, while both supportive of the policy, noted the need for transport for outlying villages to access facilities and for long-term support for community, sports and leisure facilities beyond the early stages in a development, respectively. Huntingdonshire District Council had no comment on this policy area. Barrington PC requested a much stronger policy definition for Community Healthcare facilities which should be prioritised given their poor provision under the current Plan.

One member of the public requested the prioritisation of a new swimming pool for public access in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, especially in the latter due to lack of provision and new development, and existing capacity especially in Cambridge being over capacity. This should not just consider future demand but existing demand especially from students and South Cambridgeshire population into Cambridge. Histon and Impington PC stated the need to aim for a swimming pool within cycling distance of every community. Subscription based sports facilities should be discouraged to enable their use by all.

Sport England requested their 'Active Design' be referenced in the policy for the development of new facilities that encourage people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Cambridge Futsal Club, with the support of Cambridge Handball Club indicated the lack of a venue in the whole of Cambridgeshire large enough to host national level indoor sports events watched by seated spectators. One member of the public highlighted that Cambridge skateparks are not suitable for year-round use; to be suitable in winter these require lighting and rain covers. One developer cited the lack of evidence on existing levels of open space and whether these are sufficient.

Two site promoters noted the need for the policy to set out how new community, sports and leisure facilities will be provided and sustained through new development. The type and scale of facilities should be commensurate to the size of the

development proposed. One member of the public requested further information about preventing landlords from evicting Clubs operating on their land or charging a rent so high the Club is forced to leave. Two site promoters supported the policy but requested further clarification about what is deemed ‘appropriate’ and thresholds for contributions and whether these are provided on/off-site. Two city centre site promoters confirmed the proposed policy clearly stated community, sports and leisure facilities are appropriate in mixed-use developments, such as Lion Yard, Grand Arcade & Guildhall Chambers. They noted these are vital to ensuring continued vitality in this type of development.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Education) raised associated safeguarding concerns where facilities are used by the school and the wider community. Separate access arrangements are needed and expected to be fully funded by the developer to mitigate the level of risk. Early engagement is needed to mutually agree the basis on which access to the facilities will be managed. One developer supported the policy but went on to state the capacity of existing facilities and capacity offered by educational establishments needs consideration to ensure that provision is not sought, where capacity exists elsewhere.

The Education and Skills Funding Agency (Department for Education) requested the policy makes clear that education facilities serving a wider catchment area will not be considered a town centre use requiring sequential approach to be applied, but that any such facilities must be in sustainable, accessible locations.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group requested planning policies actively support the strategic plans of local health commissioners, and new health facilities to meet the needs of the population should be supported. These should enable flexibility within the NHS estate. Where it can be demonstrated that health facilities will be changed as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation programmes, it should be accepted that a facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use and planning policies within the Local Plan must support the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlighted the social impact of access to a good standard of education. Growing inaccessibility to social care and services mean many families miss out on help, entrenching patterns of inequality throughout lives. A space to study at home and parents who provide books making a bigger difference than school attendance. They requested better accessibility to community, sports and leisure facilities, and recreational green open spaces. They also objected to the built open space alongside the Meadows Community Centre in Arbury and would like to see existing open spaces in Arbury turned into spaces for recreational use.

Table of Representations: WS/CF- Community, sports and leisure facilities

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed Community, sports and leisure facilities policy.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57715 & 57716 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
- 58535 (Marshall Group Properties)
- 60009 (Steeple Morden PC)
- 60087 (Guilden Morden PC)
- 60423 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Prioritise the build of new swimming pool for public access in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, especially in the latter due to lack of provision and new development, and existing capacity especially in Cambridge being over capacity. More appropriate provision will also reduce traffic in Newmarket Road and East Road, two existing choke points. Build should be looked at not just on future demand but existing demand especially from students and South Cambridgeshire population into Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56507 & 58812 (M Tansini)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to aim for a swimming pool within cycling distance of every community.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57866 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Subscription based sports facilities should be discouraged to enable their use by all. This will then include the society at large.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57880 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy however transport is also needed for outlying villages to access facilities.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56748 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is no venue in the whole of Cambridgeshire large enough to host national level indoor sports events watched by seated spectators.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56787 (C Horton, Chairman of Cambridge Futsal Club & with the support of Cambridge Handball Club)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Sport England would like to see their 'Active Design' referenced in the policy for the development of new facilities that encourage people to take part in sport and physical activity.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56856 (Sport England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Where facilities are used by the school and the wider community, there are associated safeguarding concerns. Separate access arrangements are needed and expected to be fully funded by the developer to mitigate the level of risk. Early engagement is needed to mutually agree the basis on which access to the facilities will be managed.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56950 (Cambridgeshire County Council - Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supports for the policy however there is a need to provide long-term support for community, sports and leisure facilities, continuing beyond the early stages in a development. Based on our experience in the Southern Fringe, it would have been very beneficial to have greater support for the community development process over a longer period than has been possible through the s106 funding and Council budget. This might have helped mitigate the level of anti-social behaviour that has become a problem in the Southern Fringe developments.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56982 (Trumpington RA)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Important to provide a policy setting out how new community, sports and leisure facilities will be provided and sustained through new development. The type and scale of facilities should be commensurate to the size of the development proposed.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57178 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57253 (European Property Ventures -Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The proposed policy WS/CF makes clear that community, sports and leisure facilities are appropriate in mixed-use developments, such as Lion Yard, Grand Arcade & Guildhall Chambers. This is vital to ensuring continued vitality in this type of development.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57209 (Abrdn)
- 58208 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No Comment
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57408 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Request policy makes clear that education facilities serving a wider catchment area will not be considered a town centre use requiring sequential approach to be applied, but that any such facilities must be in sustainable, accessible locations. Plan states that new and replacement facilities should facilitate the growth of the area by providing sufficient capacity to accommodate community need and demand. Request an addition, explaining that in some cases this will include wider sub-regional community demand, and for educational facilities there is a national policy requirement to provide a sufficient choice of school places, which is not necessarily same as meeting a capacity need within a specific pupil place planning area.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57485 (ESFA - Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge skateparks are not suitable for year-round use. To be suitable in winter, our local skateparks need lights (which could be extinguished late at night to discourage anti-social use), and rain cover. Simple adjustments to provide more space could also be implemented, such as smooth access paths (e.g. Jesus Green).
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58000 (J Humphrey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No updated evidence on existing levels of open space and whether these are sufficient. In area where there is a lack of existing open space or facilities then enabling development may be required to ensure delivery.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58872 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy direction. The capacity of existing facilities and capacity offered by educational establishments needs consideration to ensure that provision is not sought, where capacity exists elsewhere.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59017 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Planning policies should actively support the strategic plans of local health commissioners, and new health facilities to meet the needs of the population should be supported. It is essential that all planning policies enable flexibility within the NHS estate. Where it can be demonstrated that health facilities will be changed as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation programmes, it should be accepted that a facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use and Planning policies within the Local Plan must support the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59183 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the policy; should not rely on community hubs providing facilities as this will not meet all the diverse age and cultural needs.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59228 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Is it possible to guard against landlords who wish, at the end of a lease, to give notice to a Club on their land, or charge a rent so high that the Club is forced to leave? I note that The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify what facilities are needed. Is the Planning Department aware of the “Place Standard” Survey carried out by Cllr Sam Davies for Queen Edith’s and published in Feb 2020?
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59781 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Community Healthcare facilities should be prioritised as they have been poorly provided for under the current Plan. Much stronger policy definition is required.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59856 (Barrington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the policy however, clarification is needed:

- what is deemed ‘appropriate’ and thresholds for whether this will be on-site contributions or off-site?
- what is considered to be a ‘large scale development’ i.e. is this major development as defined by the NPPF, or is this a locally set measure?
  Comments highlighting this issue
- 60522 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60576 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A good standard of education should be offered to all citizens and good schools can strengthen and stabilise local communities giving children and young people a steady foundation for their future. Growing inaccessibility to social care and services mean many families miss out on help, entrenching patterns of inequality throughout lives. A space to study at home and parents who provide books making a bigger difference than school attendance.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60775 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need ways of giving ownership of the arts to young people. Better accessibility to community, sports and leisure facilities, and recreational green open spaces. Object to the built open space alongside the Meadows Community Centre in Arbury and want to see existing open spaces in Arbury turned into spaces for recreational use.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60775 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

17

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

A wide variety of organisations, citizens, landowners, and developers expressed support for this policy. Persimmon Homes East Midlands were supportive of the policy but asked that it was not mandatory. A few respondents asked for the policy’s scope to be amended to include different uses: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG for example asked for developers to provide short-term solutions for the NHS to deliver services for new residents whilst development was taking place, Cam-Skate asked for skateboard facilities to be included in the policy and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties recommended that temporary spaces be used to assist with unaffordable housing via property guardianship. Several respondents objected to ‘meanwhile uses’ being implemented in the Green Belt.

Table of Representations: WS/MU - Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments policy.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56631 (Gamlingay PC)
- 56983 (Trumpington Residents Association)
- 57409 (Huntingdonshire District Council)
- 57717 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
- 57881 (Histon & Impington PC)
- 58005 (J Humphrey)
- 58725 (University of Cambridge)

- 58847 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
- 59231 (Cambourne Town Council)
- 60154 (U&I PLC and TOWN)
- 60765 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Meanwhile use on sites proposed in Green Belt while waiting for consents should not be permitted.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56903 (Save Honey Hill Group)
- 57616 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of requirement but this should not be mandatory.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57388 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support: Cambridge has a real lack of indoor skateboarding facilities.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58117 (G Gardner - Cam-Skate)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support including NHS services. Developers need to provide (at their own cost) flexible short term solutions for the NHS to deliver services for new residents whilst wider development is taking place.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59186 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Recommend temporary spaces and buildings are used to assist with unaffordable housing via property guardianship.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60776 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new development > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

20

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There was some support for the aims of policy from a mix for parish councils, private developers and other agencies. A number of developers discussed how the development of their site would support the policy. Several suggestions were made for the detailed policy wording including:

- its application only to strategic development over a certain scale;
- flexibility where it is not possible meet the policy due to local circumstances or the availability of labour;
- the inclusion of text that supports employment related development that would generate high skilled jobs locally;
- requiring developers to offer apprenticeship scheme linked to Further Education opportunities.

There were also a number of objections to the proposed policy direction with the Home Builders Federation suggesting that it is not justified against the tests set out in the NPPF and the CIL regulations with work already taking place to improve skills and opportunities through the CITB.

Questions were asked around how expansive the definition of "inclusive" would be and how it would address socio-economic exclusion. There was also a request for support for more opportunities for young people to develop in the science and tech sectors and within Cambridge University.

Table of Representations: WS/IO - Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed creating inclusive employment and

business opportunities through new developments policy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56632 (Gamlingay PC)
- 57719 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
- 59234 (Cambourne TC)
- 60225 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)
- 60279 (Commercial Estates Group)
- 60554 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)
- 60577 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The creation of more jobs creates need for more homes.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56749 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy is best suited to large strategic sized developments of over 500 dwellings and New Town proposals.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57179 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57254 (European Property Ventures Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Object

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57389 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments

No comment

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57410 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

To achieve an increase in high skilled jobs, text should be included within Policy WS/IO that supports employment related development that would generate high skilled jobs within the local area.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57420 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
How will the Plan ensure that employment opportunities in new developments are ones which meet descriptions of being “inclusive” beyond the statutory requirements on protected characteristics?
How can the Plan prevent the type of socio-economic exclusion in the current Cambridge job market?
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58009 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to support local community engagement with the construction industry. Investment should give residents the opportunity to gain employment and skills on development sites. Developers need to offer apprenticeship scheme linked to Further Education opportunities.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58957 (bpha)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Unclear how this Policy is justified against the tests set out in NPPF paragraph 57 and regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.
The construction industry already contribute to improving skills and opportunities through CITB, who are leading a variety of programmes to develop skills.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60155 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for Policy, however some flexibility in the policy is needed as it may not always be possible or realistic to meet the policy requirements due to local circumstances or labour availability at the time of works.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60523 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for Policy, however there are no routes into the science & tech business and Cambridge University careers for local citizens. There needs to be more opportunities for young people to grow and develop their skills, knowledge and

passions with interesting careers.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60777 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Marshall has a strong interest in creating inclusive employment and business opportunities, in accordance with the policy objectives of Policy WS/IO.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58541 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need for spaces for small and medium companies and incubation spaces across Cambridge. The Campus expansion will allow for such spaces alongside other flexible business uses and is an opportunity to create inclusive employment and business opportunities.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58850 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

21

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

A wide variety of respondents expressed support for this policy. The Environmental Agency supported the policy but argued that its scope needed to be widened to protect Cambridge's aquifer. The Environmental Agency also noted that hazardous facilities have the potential to pollute the environment, but strategic planning of waste and resources can address this issue. The University of Cambridge also asked for the policy's scope to be widened so that it will protect Cambridge's research environment; specific requests included adding mitigation against electromagnetic interference into the policy and protecting research undertaken by the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory. Croydon PC asked for the policy to be reviewed in the context of major transport infrastructure and Linton PC asked for exclusion zones around key infrastructure cables and sites.

Some parish councils argued that pollution levels were unacceptable, so the monitoring of existing high-density areas is required, and mitigation measures should be implemented in areas of new development. Similarly, the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties included numerous recommendations to address pollution in existing city-centres and new settlements. Trumpington Resident Association argued that reducing light pollution should not be used to justify not lighting pedestrian desire lines. Several developers objected to the policy, arguing that it fails to recognise that potential negative impacts from development can be mitigated against.

Table of Representations: WS/HS - Pollution, health and safety

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed pollution, health and safety policy.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57027 (The Wildlife Trust)
- 57578 (Save Honey Hill Group)
- 57720 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
- 58813 (University of Cambridge)
- 59189 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group CGC)
- 59240 (Cambourne TC)
- 60010 (Steeple Morden PC)
- 60478 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
- 60424 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57411 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy needs to be considered in the context of major road and rail infrastructure which will cause pollution.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56750 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The need to minimise light pollution should not be used as a reason to not light pedestrian desire lines as this would contradict the aim of reducing car use.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56984 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Pollution in some areas is perceived to be at unacceptable levels in certain areas, so monitoring of existing high-density areas is required, and mitigation measures should be implemented in areas of new development.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57883 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should include reduction of noise, light pollution and improvement of air quality along with exclusion zones around gas, electric cables and water treatment plants.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58444 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Electromagnetic interference (EMI) should also be included in the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58813 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy should help to protect the research environment including equipment,

which is sensitive to noise, vibration and not just human receptors.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58813 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy to protect research undertaken by the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge should be rolled forward into the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58813 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Would welcome a policy that details how land contamination should be considered, which would ensure land is suitable for end-use, but also ensures that the quality of underlying aquifers is protected.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59729 (Environmental Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Welcome the fact that the policy will provide protection to and from hazardous installations, however these facilities also have the potential to pollute the environment. Strategic planning of waste and resource use provides the opportunity to address this issue.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59729 (Environmental Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments

As part of Anglian Water's Statement of Common Ground with the two Councils, they would welcome support in the Price Review 2024 submissions for their case for greater investment in river health in AMP8 (2025 - 2030).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60478 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Anglian Water want to work with the two Councils to develop a low-energy intensity approach to the design and operation of assets. In relation to the policy, the new wastewater recycling facility will seek to reduce emissions compared to the existing facility.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60478 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Argue that the policy fails to recognise that impacts could be mitigated against it. It is suggested that the wording of the policy is changed to: ‘we propose that this policy will require that development does not lead to, or is subject to significant adverse effects as a result of noise, vibration, odour, and/or light pollution unless these effects can be satisfactorily mitigated against’.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60524 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60579 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Welcomes initiatives to reduce movements within settlements and to enhance active or electric transport. In addition to this, the Party lists aspirations that it wants to deliver including: an emissions-free zone in the centre of Cambridge, major investment into active transport and bus networks, low traffic neighbourhoods, strict rules against vehicle idling, and accelerating the shift to electric vehicles. Furthermore, the Party supports the embedding of certain elements into new settlements including: cycle greenways, parking permits to ensure parking is a deterrent, ensure advance green phases for bicycles and the implementation of ‘European-style’ provision for cycles, pedestrians and disabled people.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60778 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

WS/PH: Protection of public houses

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy WS/PH: Protection of public houses > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

15

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

The majority of respondents expressed support for the policy and the approach to protecting public houses. Support mainly came from Parish Councils. Some comments supporting the policy approach raised that although public houses should be protected, in some circumstances it may not be viable so the policy should allow for their loss. Similarly, one PC suggested the policy should be realistic in its approach if the local community cannot support a public house. However, Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggested the policy could safeguard public houses by nominating them as assets of community value. This was also reflected in other PCs comments regarding the importance of public houses in providing positive impacts and employment opportunities for communities. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties thought that the policy focus on public houses doesn't reflect the other types of community assets that need safeguarding.

Table of Representations: WS/PH - Protection of public houses

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for the overarching aims of the proposed protection of public houses policy.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56640 (Gamlingay PC)
- 57227 (Abrdn)
- 57595 (R Pargeter)
- 57728 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
- 58217 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)
- 58463 (Linton PC)
- 59933 (Fen Ditton PC)
- 60016 (Steeple Morden PC)
- 60092 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should be realistic as some communities cannot support a public house.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 56758 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
To help safeguard public houses in the villages, the supporting text to the policy could encourage nominations as assets of community value.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 58871 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for policy that allows for the loss in some circumstances where public houses are no longer viable.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57227 (Abrdn)
- 58217 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Condition could be included that if part of the pub is agreed for another use, the marketing policy remains.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60016 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Denying permission for change of use will not work unless they can remain financially viable.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57595 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Sustainable public houses are important as they provide positive impact on village communities.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60414 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Pubs are important as they offer employment opportunities.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60414 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The focus on public houses doesn't reflect the diversity of the city, as there are other types of community asset in danger.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 60787 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
"Talk the talk, but will they walk the walk?"
Comments highlighting this issue

- 59828 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue

- 57421 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Jobs

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Jobs > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

27

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Some developers, private-sector organisations and councils expressed support for the aims of the policies in this section. A few parish councils argued the statistics forecasting jobs growth need to be reconsidered after Covid-19 and three respondents argued that the figures were too high.

A few landowners argued that the policies do not promote the needs of Cambridge's high technology clusters or life sciences sectors. Some landowners also emphasised the need for the Local Plan to be flexible in its approach to commercial, retail and leisure uses. Contrastingly Histon and Impington Parish Council argued that new jobs should not be limited to high-tech jobs but cover a range of employment types. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that the Local Plan must effectively tackle poverty and inequality in Greater Cambridgeshire and that growth in high-tech clusters will not address these problems. Great Shelford Parish Council argued that the policies in the Jobs Chapter needed to place a greater emphasis upon protecting the rural economy. There were a few comments relating to sites, with developers arguing that their site could deliver the aims of the policies.

Representations for Jobs

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support the aim to encourage a mixed economy in Greater Cambridge, which includes a wide range of jobs while maintaining the area's global reputation for innovation.

Comments highlighting this issue

59699 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 58021 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58802 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company, Grosvenor Britain & Ireland, and Universities Superannuation Scheme), 58910 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policies are positive and forward-thinking, recognising changing work environments through support for remote working and improved employment facilities.

Comments highlighting this issue

59699 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policies need reconsideration in light of Covid, evolving work/life patterns, and demographic changes in the workforce.

Comments highlighting this issue

56759 (Croydon Parish Council), 58465 (Linton Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Lack of consideration for types of jobs in a post-Covid context. Community work hubs similar to WeWork should be considered as alternatives to working from home.

Comments highlighting this issue
59237 (Teversham Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policies do not clearly support or promote the needs of Greater Cambridge's high-technology clusters.

Comments highlighting this issue
58021 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concern that limited land supply to 2041 may constrain sustainable economic growth.

Comments highlighting this issue
58347 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support the need to plan for future job growth, but concern that proposed figures are too low compared to historic trends, particularly for Life Sciences.

Comments highlighting this issue
58870 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Jobs are a key priority.

Comments highlighting this issue
58034 (Great and Little Chishill Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Continuing economic growth is vital regionally and nationally.

Comments highlighting this issue
57911 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The Cambridge economy supports a diverse range of businesses; policies should ensure this diversity continues to reduce inequality. Economic growth in Greater

Cambridge is exceeding expectations; policies should harness this for community-wide benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue
57911 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

New jobs must reflect varied education and employment backgrounds, not just high-tech; creative and hands-on work opportunities should be considered.

Comments highlighting this issue
58258 and 58263 (Histon and Impington Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policies must address poverty and inequality. Relying on high-tech growth risks deepening social divides.

Comments highlighting this issue
60788 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

More should be done to train the local population to meet the area's professional employment needs.

Comments highlighting this issue
58465 (Linton Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support for small, low-rent spaces for start-ups is essential.

Comments highlighting this issue
58258 (Histon & Impington Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

A flexible approach to planning for commercial, retail, and leisure use is needed to support job creation.

Comments highlighting this issue
57320 (Abrdn), 57275 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 58018 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policies must ensure development avoids harm to the natural environment and delivers net gains for biodiversity in accordance with the requirements of BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

Comments highlighting this issue
59986 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policies lack focus on protecting the rural economy. There appears to be no other vision rather than commercialising, meaning no maintenance or protection of existing businesses.

Comments highlighting this issue
59165 (Great Shelford Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concern about economic growth being used to justify high levels of housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
60137 (Christopher Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Broadband and mobile infrastructure requires improvement to support remote and home working.

Comments highlighting this issue
59165 (Great Shelford Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

New employment areas must be supported by strong transport infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue
58261 (Histon & Impington Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Developing prime agricultural land in the green belt contradicts claims to protect rural economy or best agricultural land.

Comments highlighting this issue
57547 (Stapleford Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The target of 58,500 new jobs by 2041 is unrealistic and outrageous.

Comments highlighting this issue
57580 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policies underestimate employment floorspace needs, especially for logistics. The restriction on large-scale regional and national warehousing and distribution is contrary to economic trends and market evidence.

Comments highlighting this issue
59302 (Avison Young)

Summary of issues raised in comments

No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
57424 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Site related Representations for Jobs

Summary of issues raised in comments:

One employment area we find significant and interesting is the expansion of Cambridge Science Park to the land East of Impington. This was put forward in the call for sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58261 (Histon & Impington Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Marshall's vision for Cambridge East strongly aligns with the Local Plan's aim to encourage a flourishing and mixed economy in Greater Cambridge, which provides for a wide range of jobs whilst maintaining the area's global reputation for innovation. As a successful business that has been rooted within Cambridge for over 110 years, Marshall is keen to deliver a scheme at Cambridge East that is truly mixed-use and provides employment opportunities at all levels across a range of uses.
Marshall has a long legacy of investing in skills. Cambridge East will build on the established and respected Marshall Apprenticeships by providing a wealth of skills, education and lifelong learning opportunities for people of all socio-economic backgrounds and academic abilities, equipping them for a life of self-sufficiency and ensuring that everyone is able to fulfil their true potential.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58566 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The proposals to promote mixed use development, including residential uses on land towards the east of Melbourn would potentially reduce the prospect of further growth or expansion of the successful employment areas where high-technology, research and development and related facilities are now well-established.
Unlike more conventional employment premises, the research and development sector is one where there is significant potential for growth and one where growth would support and fund additional development.
The proposed allocation of the land adjacent to the existing Science Park for mixed use development (with only 2.5 hectares of the total site area of 6.5 hectares identified for employment use), would potentially restrict the future growth and expansion of this key sector. The proposed allocation represents a unique source of land for the expansion of the Science Park while it is not necessarily the most suitable site for residential development in Melbourn or Meldreth.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58798 (Phase 2 Planning)

Policy J/NE: New employment and development proposals

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/NE: New employment and development proposals> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

45

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

This policy attracted a substantial number of detailed representations. Some parish councils, district councils, landowners and developers expressed support for the policy. Reasons included that it would support delivery of a mix of types of employment, ensure developments were appropriate in scale to their location, and could support providing jobs where there are good transport links.

Babraham Research Campus Ltd broadly supported the policy but asked that policy wording is clearly written to confirm that employment development will be supported

in policy areas in the countryside. Other respondents sought amendments to policy areas, such as at Granta Park. Gamlingay Parish Council asked that proposals are proportional in scale and retain the character of the rural area so that they correspond with Gamlingay's Neighbourhood Plan.

Some individuals perceived there to be enough employment in the area and thought that facilitating more jobs would create a need for more homes. Contrastingly, other respondents, mainly developers and landowners, perceived the policy to be too restrictive, and that greater flexibility was required. Some argued that the policy should do more to support clusters, and allow more employment development in various locations. Endurance Estates argued that the emerging policies for industrial development would suppress demand. The same respondent argued that the employment land evidence base underestimates the actual need for Class B2 and B8 uses. Similarly, Newlands Developments argued that the Plan needs to account for increasing growth in the research and innovation, logistics and advanced manufacturing sectors especially in the context of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. Tritax Symmetry stated that the failure to address logistics floorspace will lead to increased vehicle miles as businesses and households are supplied from facilities further away. A few developers, including Lolworth Developments Limited, stated that the Plan does not meet NPPF's requirement for planning policies to accommodate the bespoke locational requirements for storage and distribution operations of all scales.

The Education and Skills Agency asked for the policy to recognise the direct and indirect skills and employment benefits of education facilities. BioMed Realty asked for the policy to support the needs of clusters and proactively recognise opportunities for some densification to make best use of established R&D Parks, and that policies within the emerging local plan should explicitly support employment development. Hallam Land Management Limited argued that here should also be consideration of data centres. There were a few site-specific comments where developers promoted their land as a suitable place to deliver the policies. There were also objectors such as Trumpington Resident Association who argued that certain sites were not appropriate for development.

Representations for Policy J/NE: New employment and development proposals

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support

Comments highlighting this issue:

57730 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60261 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the ambitions for the Local Plan to encourage a flourishing and mixed economy in Greater Cambridge which includes a wide range of jobs.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58220 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail), 57232 (Abrdn), 57277 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Agree with the policy direction that employment development under E(g), B2 and B8 use classes will be supported in the plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57423 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the direction that employment development will be supported in towns and villages where it is of an appropriate scale and character to their location and scale of settlement.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57423 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the consideration of employment proposals on their merits, where they are of an appropriate scale, character and in an accessible location.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58874 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the policy principles of prioritising new employment development in Cambridge within the mixed use Areas of Major Change such as Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58874 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the approach towards new and additional employment premises in villages and specified locations within the countryside as this will offer scope for increasing and diversifying local employment opportunities across the wider Greater Cambridge area potentially reducing the need to commute and supporting the viability of smaller communities

Comments highlighting this issue:

57425 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the intended purpose of this policy, which is to identify suitable locations for employment proposals and potential uses that might be acceptable in these locations. There are clear sustainability benefits to focusing employment

development at appropriate and accessible locations that are well-linked with existing and committed transport links.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58570 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Broadly supported but future policy wording should be clearly written to confirm that employment development will be supported in defined 'Policy Areas in the countryside'

Comments highlighting this issue:

58088 (Babraham Research Campus Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It is entirely appropriate that the proposed policy direction within the Greater Cambridge Local Plan is one that simply assesses the appropriate scale and character having regard to its location and the scale of settlement.
For developments within town and village settlement boundaries, it is the scale and character that are key to ensuring that the overall character of the settlement is maintained.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60642 (Bruntwood SciTech)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Proposals and criteria need to be proportional in scale and character in a rural area as with Mill Hill GAM5 policy, Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan

Comments highlighting this issue:

56641 (Gamlingay Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The proposed policy should make clear that small to medium sized warehousing and distribution will be supported to meet the identified need.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57277 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is strong demand for B2/B8 floorspace in Greater Cambridge and along the A428 corridor, but that demand is not being met.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58602 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site), 59045 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59301 (Avison Young), 58376 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 60359 (H. J. Molton Settlement), 60399 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The current and emerging policies for industrial development are restrictive, and suppress demand.

Greater Cambridge is relying on other parts of the region to provide industrial and logistics premises.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58602 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The employment land evidence base (the 2020 ELEDES) underestimates the actual need for Class B2 and B8 uses. Key issues include:

- It does not properly take into account existing supply or market signals
- It ignores the wider region/functional property market area relevant to Greater Cambridge
- There is insufficient consideration of the economic development needs of industrial occupiers in Greater Cambridge
- The failure to cover large/strategic premises which is contrary to economic trends, market evidence and the scale of economic ambition for the Region
- The requirements for storage and distribution floorspace are at least 50% to 115% lower than the level of need within Greater Cambridge when considering the latest data
- Recent market and economic trends, particularly in terms of e-commerce, have had an impact on demand for logistics floorspace
- Covid and the growth in online sales
- Brexit has resulted in increased needs in the food, 3PL, pharmaceutical and healthcare sectors
- Demand from new employers seeking UK hubs
- Growing consumer demand and shorter delivery timeframes reshaping the traditional distribution network

Alternative estimates include:

- Savills estimate that more than 270,000 sqm of industrial floorspace is required over the plan period
- Additional land of between 55.0 ha and 71.5 ha needs to be allocated to avoid compromising the economy and increasing emissions

Greater Cambridge must assess strategic distribution needs and appraise all available supply options.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58602 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site), 59045 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59301 (Avison Young), 60688 (Newlands Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

At the regional level there are ambitious plans for significant economic growth across the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and UK Innovation Corridor. This includes growth in research, innovation, logistics and advanced manufacturing sectors. These trends must be considered in future planning, especially given strong market demand for logistics space and limited supply.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60688 (Newlands Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is no evidential basis for the proposed restriction on large-scale regional and national warehousing and distribution within the area in draft Policy J/NE which is also contrary to economic trends, market demand, and national planning policy guidance.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59301 (Avison Young), 60688 (Newlands Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Plan does not meet NPPF's requirement for planning policies to accommodate the bespoke locational requirements for storage and distribution operations of all scales, and the PPG's guidance in 'How can local authorities assess need and allocate space for logistics?' (Paragraph 31).

The lack of the evidential basis to robustly justify the emerging Policy J/NE stating that large scale national and regional warehousing and distribution centres will not be supported in Greater Cambridge clearly undermines the soundness of the Plan as currently proposed.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59045 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

While the plan 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. A range of employment sites must be able to cater for the needs of the logistics sector and provide sites of at least 10ha close to the SRN. A single warehouse of 25,000 sqm (which is below the current market average) requires a site of around 10ha.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60399 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Not meeting the needs for industrial and strategic logistics within Greater Cambridge is contrary to national guidance.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58602 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy restriction on large scale regional and national warehousing and distribution within the area in Policy J/NE should be removed to align with national planning policy guidance

Comments highlighting this issue:

59301 (Avison Young), 60688 (Newlands Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

To not plan appropriately for large scale B8 warehousing risks placing increased and unintended pressure on existing / planned employment floorspace.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58376 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Failure to address the logistics floorspace needs of Greater Cambridge will lead to increased vehicle miles as businesses and households are supplied from facilities further away. There will also be greater stress on businesses seeking to fulfil orders from greater distances.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60399 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The locations supported for E(g), B2 and B8 uses under J/NE (i.e. in Cambridge, within towns and villages, close to but outside settlement boundaries of villages, in defined ‘established employment areas in the countryside’, and in the countryside for the expansion of existing businesses) are not appropriate for either general industrial uses or for logistics development. The plan is looking to impose a blanket prohibition on large scale national and regional warehousing and distribution centres in Greater Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60399 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Greater Cambridge will need to consider whether regional distribution centres are being provided in sustainable locations in adjoining authority areas to meet any regional need before unilaterally abdicating responsibility to meet regional needs.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60399 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Plan needs to reflect the current and future needs of the logistics industry as that need is now manifesting itself, post Covid and post Brexit. Large sustainable sites close to the SRN need to be identified in a planned way.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60399 (Tritax Symmetry)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There should be consideration of data centres for which demand is growing and which tend to compete for B8 floorspace.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58376 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Due to widening gap between the supply of and demand for industrial space the policy direction which encourages employment development at appropriate scales on village boundaries is supported.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59301 (Avison Young)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

New areas of substantial employment must have a good transport infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58262 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

To provide flexibility to take into account the long-term connectivity and travel projects or other such contextual development that may better enable long term sustainable transport opportunities recommend that the text below is included:
"A degree of flexibility will be provided when considering the accessibility and transport options available to a proposal for employment development, to consider nearby short, medium and long term sustainable transport projects that may influence the sustainability of a proposal beyond the nearby infrastructure currently available."

Comments highlighting this issue:

57423 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It should be made clear that co-location is an acceptable way to help meet both the warehousing and distribution and housing needs in the area.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57277 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Recognise preference for brownfield land but such land can have high biodiversity value which needs to be mitigated.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58877 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In order to encourage a flourishing and mixed economy in Greater Cambridge which includes a wide range of jobs it is important that proposed policy allows flexibility for

employment uses. This would be in accordance with Paragraph 82 of the NPPF.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58220 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail), 57232 (Abrdn), 57277 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In order to support economic growth, innovation and to strengthen the strategic role and reputation of Greater Cambridge it is vital that the policies are drafted with sufficient flexibility including:

• To allow the benefits of a proposal to provide a world-class bio-medical facility (and employment opportunities) outside a settlement boundary/development framework to be balanced against any conflict with policy in this regard, particularly where it meets high standards of sustainability.

• To afford great weight in the determination of a planning application to the economic and wider needs case for bringing forward a bio-medical facility (and employment opportunities)

• To give great weight to the ability to bring forward an innovative and comprehensive manifesto of sustainable travel measures to support a proposal in the rural area

• To support proposals for employment uses which also provide associated land uses such as shops, creche and cafés should, where these uses are open to the wider community. And deliver significant community benefit and improve the sustainability credentials of the local area.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57528 (Mr Henry d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Whilst recognising the intense demand for employment space in Greater Cambridge, recommend the councils take a pragmatic approach to new employment development which recognises the longer-term ability for E(g) uses to change to education, and the benefits education brings to the local labour market.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57487 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Some flexibility in the policies and site allocations is requested, recognising the direct and indirect skills and employment benefits of education facilities such as Cambridge Maths School.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57487 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Government recently introduced the new Use Class E to promote flexibility in town centres. It is crucial that the Local Plan does not seek to restrict sub-uses within the wider Use Class E. This would be in direct conflict with the aims of Use Class E

and would therefore be unlikely to be considered sound by a Planning Inspector during examination.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58220 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail), 57232 (Abrdn), 57277 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It is essential that a more ambitious approach is taken in seeking to capture and accommodate the substantial demand in office, R&D, lab and associated manufacturing space in the Greater Cambridge area. There is a need to provide sufficient supply in order to meet the balanced homes/jobs requirements and to reflect the high employment density and employment skills these uses engender. The Higher Growth option should be pursued to reflect the Combined Authority's commitment to doubling GVA by 2040 and capitalise on the significant appetite for research/knowledge-based, commercial development in the City.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60160 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60767 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The focus on local employment opportunities outside defined areas greatly limits the opportunity to bring forward a major new innovation cluster as there is little support or flexibility for this.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58022 (Imperial War Museum / Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

GCLP should continue with South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy E/9 which provides a clearer and stronger strategic policy which permits employment clusters in suitable locations which draw on specialisms of Cambridge area in identified sectors and in…"other locally driven clusters as they emerge". This would more closely accord with NPPF (Para 81 and 83). It would enable new innovation clusters in appropriate locations, and enable the area to continue as an engine for economic growth particularly in innovation sectors, also reflecting emerging OxCam ARC strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58022 (Imperial War Museum / Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support of continuation of the designation of established areas in the countryside including incorporation of Granta Park.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58720 (TWI)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The boundary to the Granta Park established employment area should be extended to include the area covered by the extant consent S/1110/15/OL which is subject to a reserved matters submission.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58721 and 58772 (TWI)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policies in the Local Plan need to be flexible enough to support the needs of clusters and proactively recognise opportunities for some densification to make best use of established R&D Parks, including Granta Park.

They need to recognise the growth opportunities on established Parks as they continue to evolve and be supportive of these, recognising the need to be able to respond to changing market below and re-invest in the existing built form. Policies within the emerging local plan should explicitly support employment development, and Granta Park should be given similar weight to other campus developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58712 (TWI), 59298 (BioMed Realty)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policies should be put in place which are supportive of adaptation over time and a new policy be included such as an “opportunity area” that recognises opportunities afforded through the redevelopment of Granta Park, through both a rationalisation and upgrading of the existing building stock and the opportunities afforded to attract new occupiers through sensitive new development.

The sustainability credentials of the site are changing through the significant infrastructure improvements that are being delivered improving connectivity to Cambridge, but also nearby settlements. This will open new opportunities for the Park to continue to evolve and make better use of the site.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58710 and 58756 (TWI), 59298 (BioMed Realty)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Given the need to plan for higher employment growth, the spatial approach and proposed allocations are somewhat limited and do not fully explore the potential of South East Cambridge to support other existing clusters.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60277 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Is it still appropriate for Cambourne Business Park to be an Established Employment Area in the Countryside given South Cambridgeshire District Council’s aim to develop a large proportion of the site as residential?

Comments highlighting this issue:

59261 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Councils should not arbitrarily limit themselves at this key stage in the local plan process by not countenancing Green Belt release, particularly in those locations such as South East Cambridge where there is already an established employment cluster that could suitably accommodate further development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60277 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There should be an explicit reference against development in the Green Belt, for example at CBC.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56991 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Large capacity for employment development in more suitable locations already exists and there is no need for CBC to expand into the Green Belt

Comments highlighting this issue:

56991 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There seems to be no mechanism for the Councils to control the extent of growth and the risks that high growth brings to the local society and the pressure it places for more homes. There is a risk that if the number of jobs grows at a faster rate than projected, there will be a demand for even more homes than currently planned.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56991 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Object. The policy should include provision for new other rural based enterprises such as equestrianism which have to be located in the rural area and which have significant economic and social benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57043 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Does not take the post pandemic ways of working into account. Office demand is becoming less with flexible working and hot-desking; shops are closing because of greater online purchasing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59463 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is already full employment in the area and facilitating more jobs just creates a need for more homes. True affordable homes are what is needed.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59463 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It is disingenuous to expect that the people moving into these new homes will be the same people as those taking the new jobs. Currently there are many residents who commute to jobs outside Cambridge and many others who work in Cambridge but choose to live outside and commute in.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59463 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The jobs that are desperately needed are green jobs: those that will enable existing homes to be retrofitted, and the training that accompanies them; and care jobs.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59463 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is evidence that high-tech employment growth is actually damaging to low-skilled workers.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59463 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There seems to be too much emphasis on growing research and development jobs. There should be more zones for "ordinary" jobs for those who have not benefited from a university education.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58073 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The concept of “Providing jobs near to residents“ will only work where the pool of local residents is suitable for the employment. Businesses will not accept a requirement to recruit in a small geographical area.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57597 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The plan does not support the employment growth to the south of the City with housing allocations within the RSC. This is a major failing of the Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59146 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

This has to be continuously worked on as a living document

Comments highlighting this issue:

60415 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Any proposed development along or close to A505 will impact on North Hertfordshire, positively in terms of increased employment opportunities or negatively in terms of additional traffic using the A505.
A10 is most direct route for North Herts residents to Cambridge and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. With the Campus set to expand, residents in North Herts will be well placed to take jobs or use facilities at Campus. Additional trips by car on A10 would significantly negatively impact on Royston.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58685 (North Hertfordshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

There is not enough information to comment

Comments highlighting this issue:

56760 (Croydon PC)

Site related Representations for Policy J/NE: New employment and development proposals

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Development at Hazlewell Court will allow for new employment opportunities in a variety of sectors, creating jobs for local people and helping to boost the Greater Cambridge economy. The site is also an established rural business park, and there is an opportunity for this provision to be expanded. This small scale employment provision can also act as incubator units to help new businesses grow and we see this as a complementary role to the proposed larger scale commercial proposals at Slate Hall Farm, Bar Hill (Site URN 236).

Comments highlighting this issue:

57200 (R Cowell)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Clifton Road Industrial Estate site allocation should be flexible enough to allow for some small to medium sized warehousing and distribution uses on the redeveloped site.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57277 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The focus on local employment opportunities greatly limits the opportunity to bring forward a major new innovation cluster as there is little support or flexibility for this.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58022 (Imperial War Museum / Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

One employment area we find significant and interesting is the expansion of Cambridge Science Park to the land East of Impington. This was put forward in the call for sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58262 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Plan should allocate circa 50ha of land at Scotland Farm for employment uses. The HELAA Assessment finds the site suitable for employment, save in respect of archaeology and access. HLM would request this assessment be revisited in light of the evidence now available and submitted with these representations. Its allocation would be entirely consistent with national planning policy, particularly paragraphs 11a and 104. Aligning new jobs with C2C and the Scotland Farm Travel Hub, in an accessible location close to East West Rail, is entirely consistent with Government policy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58376 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Cambridge East has a number of characteristics that make it a unique opportunity for the area. The potential exists for a combination of a research hub, space for all levels of education and the commercial space to accommodate both large scale global occupiers and the flexible, affordable space for the small, high growth businesses. It can include maker spaces, space for growing sectors that require mid-level skills, and the leisure and retail offer will provide opportunity for entry level jobs. This will create a mix of employment and training opportunities suitable for residents of different skill levels as Marshall can expand the offering of the Marshall Apprenticeship programme.

It offers economic and sustainability benefits that cannot be delivered elsewhere. It will make a significant contribution to the target of doubling GVA by delivering both more jobs and more productive jobs. It will attract and grow jobs in higher productivity sectors, transport investment will increase agglomeration effects across the city and investment in training will help existing residents boost their skills and productivity. The mix of jobs and types of employment floorspace to support these jobs at Cambridge East will be the subject of further discussion and testing with the GCSP.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58570 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

TWI, as an organisation, needs to adapt and evolve to changing market conditions and the research requirements of its member organisations, and reflect changing operational requirements and respond to poor environmental performance of some of their older building stock. There is likely to be requirements to repurpose or replace some of the existing buildings on the site during the next 10–15 years.
TWI is undertaking a review of its business strategy and related space requirements, which are likely to flex and adapt over the life of this next Local Plan.
Would therefore encourage the Council to put in place policies which are supportive of this adaptation over time and a new policy be included such as an “opportunity area” that recognises opportunities afforded through the redevelopment of the site, through both a rationalisation and upgrading of the existing building stock and the opportunities afforded to attract new occupiers through sensitive new development.
The sustainability credentials of the site are changing through the significant infrastructure improvements that are being delivered improving connectivity to Cambridge, but also nearby settlements. This will open new opportunities for the Park to continue to evolve and make better use of the site.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58710 and 58756 (TWI), 59298 (BioMed Realty)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The provisions in the development plan need to give greater weight to the significance of Granta Park, but also recognise the need to provide flexibility to allow for the continued evolution of the park, and in doing so recognise the requirements of the Welding Institute.
Policies within the emerging local plan should explicitly support employment development, and Granta Park should be given similar weight to other campus developments.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58712 (TWI)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Future employment growth at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus is a nationally and internationally-significant opportunity for the Life Sciences sector and the future prosperity of Cambridge.
Enabling the expansion of the Campus into the identified Major Area of Change is nationally important. The Campus is part of a thriving Life Sciences ecosystem within Cambridgeshire but is the only place where major hospitals are co-located with advanced research institutes, higher education, and the international headquarters of Life Sciences companies, and the only place where the full cycle of discovering, demonstrating and delivering healthcare innovations can be found in one place.
Support the development of detailed criteria to ensure proposals for employment development will be acceptable. The nature of future employment development is anticipated to be agreed with GCSP as part of the Campus’ Local Plan policies.

Comments highlighting this issue:
58874 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The Cambridge Innovation Parks West proposals would directly respond to policy J/NE. It would contribute to the spatial distribution of employment land – providing significant and high-quality floorspace and shared campus-style facilities in a predominantly rural, yet sustainable location.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60261 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Given the need to plan for higher employment growth, the spatial approach and proposed allocations are somewhat limited and do not fully explore the potential of South East Cambridge to support other existing clusters. Land to the South East of Cambridge provides an opportunity to deliver additional employment land in a sustainable location; fundamentally, it can facilitate growth despite its current location within the Green Belt.

As such, the Councils should not arbitrarily limit themselves at this key stage in the local plan process by not countenancing Green Belt release, particularly in those locations such as South East Cambridge where there is already an established employment cluster that could suitably accommodate further development. The expansion of the PTP cluster should be specifically supported by the GCLP, and the Green Belt release of such sites could in fact lead to more sustainable outcomes, for example by facilitating a nature network as discussed in the previous section, and by delivering jobs in close proximity to homes.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60277 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

In relation to Land to the east of Whittlesford Highway Depot in Whittlesford Bridge, commercial development of the site would provide a substantial boost to local job opportunities and would constitute a comprehensive expansion of the existing employment space along the site's western boundary. Furthermore, aligning with the aims of Policy J/NE and various other sustainability initiatives forwarded by the Greater Cambridge Partnership, development of the site would provide new commercial space with direct links to rail networks, therein reducing the need for incoming commuters to rely on their private cars.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60359 (H. J. Molton Settlement)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

It is entirely appropriate given the proposed policy direction to acknowledge that the present use of Melbourn Science Park as an employment park is accepted and that the nature and scale of its existing character provides the opportunity for

redevelopment to develop a much more modern approach to employment parks and to work alongside the authorities and the local community to develop a strong vision that continues the legacy of this part of the village to the village of Melbourn.
Where Melbourn is identified as a Rural Centre within the settlement hierarchy it is entirely appropriate that our client looks positively at the opportunities that exist for redevelopment of the park. Whilst the Local Plan similarly does not list Melbourn Science Park as one of the key employment sites outside the Green Belt as stated in the Local Plan 2018, supporting text to Policy J/NE states that development in locations which provide a range of suitable units, including for start-ups, SMEs and incubatory units will be supported.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60642 (Bruntwood SciTech)

Policy J/RE: Supporting the rural economy

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/RE: Supporting the rural economy > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

13

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There were less representations in response to this policy than other policies in the Jobs Chapter. The University of Cambridge and parish councils supported the policy. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) stated that the policy should be strengthened and properly enforced, and KWA Architects argued the scope of the policy should not be limited to reusing and replacing buildings. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council stated that the policy should protect small rural employment sites, but not permit expansion into the countryside, and development should consider the impact of traffic on the rural road network and on net zero targets. Huntingdonshire District Council expressed concern over the deliverability of the policy in the context of the wide range of uses facilitated through the prior approval and notification process.

There were contrasting views about the role of bridleways, the CPRE argued that opening up of tracks and bridleways at scale will increase security risk to farms, whereas the British Horse Society asserted that a safe, well connected bridleway network should be seen as an important facility for economic, social and well-being.

Representations for Policy J/RE: Supporting the Rural Economy

Summary of issues raised:
Object as the policy should not be limited to reusing and replacing buildings. Some valuable rural enterprises can require new buildings, e.g. equestrianism. These businesses support economic, health and environmental wellbeing.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57047 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised:
A safe, well connected bridleway network should be seen as an important facility for economic, social and well being. It is an important source of diversification for farmers, a significant rural employer and good for health particularly for women. Grazing land is good for carbon sequestration.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56701 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised:
Concern over the deliverability of the policy in the context of the wide range of uses facilitated through the prior approval/ notification process,
Comments highlighting this issue:
57426 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Supports the policy
Comments highlighting this issue:
56761 (Croydon PC), 56917 (Cllr Sargeant/West Wickham PC), 59009 (University of Cambridge), 60017 (Steeple Morden PC), 60093 Guilden Morden PC

Summary of issues raised:
Very important
Comments highlighting this issue:
60416 Great and Little Chishill PC

Summary of issues raised:
The policy should protect small rural employment sites, e.g. Melbourn Science Park and Bassingbourn Wireless Station, but not permit expansion into the countryside. Any development of these sites must consider the impact of traffic on the rural road network and on net zero targets.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57731 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy should be strengthened and properly enforced. The rural economy can be diversified but at its core are farmers and their interests must be protected. Opening up of tracks and bridleways at scale will increase the security risk to farms.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59583 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised:
If proposals relate to solar or windfarms the policy need to relate back to CC/RE and protection of landscape.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58880 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised:
Waste- localised anaerobic digestion plants are needed to deal with local food and farming waste, animal waste, green waste,tree debris and grass cuttings- a strategic plan is needed across the Greater Cambridge area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56642 Gamlingay PC

Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

29

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Some parish councils, government and political organisations expressed support for the policy. However, Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited questioned the need for this policy as they perceived it to already be included in national policy. A few respondents argued that the Plan's housing proposals could exacerbate climate change which would harm agricultural land. Similarly, the Campaign to Protect Rural England argued there should be no building on South Cambridgeshire land due to its potential to harm food production. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties asked for reassurances that this policy would not prevent habitat restoration projects on drained peat soils currently under agricultural use.

There were a few representations relating to specific sites; some argued that the policy would be contravened by the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus proposals. Whereas some developers argued that there were clear instances when it would be necessary to build upon agricultural land and posited specific examples.

Representations for Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land

Summary of issues raised:
Support:
• Strongly, in the light of grade I peat soil requiring remedial action and the need for increased food security.
• Critically important
• As supported in the Sustainability Appraisal.
• Very important and must be a priority
Comments highlighting this issue:
Individuals: 60138 (C Blakeley), 60417 (Great and Little Chishill)
Parish Councils: 57740 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56762 (Croydon PC), 56918 (Cllr. David Sargeant/West Wickham PC), 57948 (Ickleton PC), 59931 (Fen Ditton PC), 60018 (Steeple Morden PC), 60094 (Guilden Morden PC)
Political organisations: 60789 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Welcome the recognition of soil as a valuable resource and key element of the environmental ecosystem which requires protection, in accordance with paragraph 174 of the NPPF.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59985 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised:
The policies is contravened by:
• Allowing development at Honey Hill to facilitate the development of NEC
• Cambridge Biomedical Campus
Comments highlighting this issue:
56508 (C Martin), 56992 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57540 (A Martin), 57560 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57623 (J Pratt), 58233 (J Mead)

Summary of issues raised:
The emerging Local Plan should support the principle of adopted Policy NH/3 by clearly identifying the corresponding agricultural land and Green Belt cost that would require allocation in the Local Plan as a consequence of the proposed North East Cambridge development to allow a comprehensive assessment to be made.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57560 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised:
There are potential conflicts between this policy and CC/CS which need to be explored
Comments highlighting this issue:
60789 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
The NPPF states "Where significant development is demonstrated to be necessary,

areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality"

Comments highlighting this issue:

56992 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised:

Supported in principle however the plan should the emerging Local Plan should support the principle of adopted Policy NH/3 by being clear on the dependency of policy S/NEC North East Cambridge on agricultural land use to ensure objective responses on land use.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57560 (Save Honey Hill Group), 58141 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised:

Support agricultural land protection which is above sea level, and has suitable sustainable drainage (above water table)

Comments highlighting this issue:

56643 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:

The proposed policy captures the importance of restricting development which could lead to the irreversible loss of the best agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)

Comments highlighting this issue:

57560 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57623 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised:

The proposed policy is reinforced by the concerns raised in response to the First Conversation, regarding carbon sequestration, biodiversity, and our ability to meet our food growing needs.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57560 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57623 (J Pratt)

Summary of issues raised:

Agricultural land must be protected. The more land that is lost to development, the more carbon emissions due to importing food and building properties.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58035 (D Blake)

Summary of issues raised:

Sea level rise will cause flooding of the Fens by 2100, the remaining agricultural land south of Cambridge will be damaged by EWR and its associated housing. Why do you implicitly support that?

Comments highlighting this issue:

57045 (W Harrold)

Summary of issues raised:

It is in the national interest to stop building on South Cambridgeshire land. It prevents food imports, will be required when climate change causes the Fens to flood reducing a key source of agricultural products for the UK.

Comments highlighting this issue:
59584 (Campaign to Protect Rural England - CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy needs to take account of alternative reversible uses of agricultural land e.g. equestrianism.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57048 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised:
There will be some instances where the loss of agricultural land will be required to meet development needs. This includes:
• Trumpington South
• The relocation of the Cambridge WRC

Comments highlighting this issue:
57183 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57260 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58804 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company – TMLC - a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland – GBI - and Universities Superannuation Scheme – USS), 60468 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
This policy is unnecessary as the use of best and most versatile land is included under national planning policy

Comments highlighting this issue:
58888 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy should be strengthened and properly enforced

Comments highlighting this issue:
59584 (Campaign to Protect Rural England - CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
To protect the remaining carbon stock in our peatlands and restore them to a net carbon sink, significant land management changes will be necessary including allowing some rewetting of the peat soils. This will entail loss of agricultural yields (which must however be set against the total collapse of food production in the worst climate scenarios). Reassurance is sought that this policy would not prevent habitat restoration projects on drained peat soils currently under agricultural use.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60789 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy does not provide any bespoke reference to renewable or infrastructure developments both of which are likely to require the use of such land given the locations of grid connections

Comments highlighting this issue:
58888 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue:
57428 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Site related comments for Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land

Summary of issues raised:
The proposed allocation ‘Trumpington South’ is classed as being Grade 2 agricultural land across 98% of the site. TMLC considers the need for development is sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value within the land.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58804 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company – TMLC - a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland – GBI - and Universities Superannuation Scheme – USS)

Summary of issues raised:
Agree that the relocation of the Cambridge WRC including its sludge treatment operations from the NE Cambridge allocation would release a sustainable brownfield location for development. This inevitably then requires a justifiable trade-off between harm to Green Belt and the loss of agricultural land (Policy J/AL) and the benefits of releasing the site which if it did not occur would likely require development in Green Belt and on greenfield sites – albeit in less accessible and sustainable location(s).
Comments highlighting this issue:
60468 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

13

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There were not many representations submitted in response to this policy. Some individuals, developers, charities, and parish councils expressed support for the policy. Contrastingly, Croydon parish council argued that protecting business spaces should be considered on a case-by-case basis. A few developers, including Abrdn, argued that the policy should recognise the increasing importance of town centres catering for flexible uses, and that office uses are not always required. The same respondents also stated that re-developing brownfield land and re-providing existing uses alongside co-located residential uses is a better way to utilise land.

DB Group Holdings LTD argued that protection for existing business space needs to extend to ensure that expansion opportunities are supported. The same group asked for measures to be included to ensure that other development that is supported by the plan does not constrain existing successful business sites. There were also some site-specific comments, where developers and landowners explained how their sites could fulfil the aims of the policy.

Representations for Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space

Summary of issues raised:
General support for policy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56644 (Gamlingay PC), 57233 (Abrdn), 57733 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58075 (B Marshall), 59585 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
Should be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56763 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy J/PB will need to justify with evidence where loss is proposed. The policy should recognise that it is increasingly important for town centres to cater for flexible

uses, and that office uses are not always required.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57233 (Abrdn), 58221 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) (Retail))

Summary of issues raised:
An effective way of better utilising land is to redevelop brownfield land and re-provide the existing uses alongside co-located residential uses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57233 (Abrdn), 57278 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – Commercial), 58221 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) (Retail))

Summary of issues raised:
Policy should ensure it does not restrict ongoing operation of existing uses in interim period before redevelopment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57278 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised:
If business is required to relocate, accommodation needs to be available for employees who relocate.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57733 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Protection for existing business space also needs to extend to ensure that expansion opportunities are supported. This includes ensuring that other development that is supported by the plan does not unduly constrain existing successful business sites.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58278 (DB Group (Holdings) LTD)

Summary of issues raised:
This policy is a high priority.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60418 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57430 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Site related comments for J/PB: Protecting existing business space

Summary of issues raised:
Hazlewood Court, Bar Road, Lolworth (Site URN 676) is currently used for commercial purposes, supporting a small but well-occupied rural business park. Proposal will allow for an increase in local employment opportunities and protection of business and employment and will help to develop a more inclusive economy.

Development would have potential to support the sustainability of the existing business park through providing supporting services including hotels, conference and meeting space.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57208 (R Cowell)

Summary of issues raised:

USS intends to bring forward Clifton Road Industrial Estate for re-development within plan period; however, prior to its redevelopment existing tenants should not be restricted in the operation of their business.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57278 (Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) – Commercial)

Summary of issues raised:

Marshall proposed development at Cambridge East will result in relocating existing business at Cambridge Airport. Marshall are considering options for retaining elements of business in Greater Cambridge/Wider Cambridgeshire which would align with the intention of Policy J/PB.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58577 (Marshall Group Properties)

Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

20

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Some parish councils, developers, developers, political organisations and the University of Cambridge expressed support for the policy. A few respondents, including Carbon Neutral Cambridge, emphasised the importance of ensuring the policy Greater Cambridge’s rural communities. Two commenters, including Central Bedfordshire Council, argued that the policy could be strengthened to refer to the provision of home office space in new dwellings as the emphasis is currently on the delivery of external hubs or extensions. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties asked that extensions were rigorously tested for proof of a need for homeworking.

D Lister argued that policies to support work hubs where remote workers from different companies can comingle. The University of Cambridge stated that it supports agile working, including the creation of agile working hubs on the University’s estate. A few developers explained how their sites could support the aims of the policy.

Representations relating to J/RW: Enabling remote working

Summary of issues raised:
General support for the policy
Comments highlighting this issue:
District and parish Councils: 56645 (Gamlingay PC), 56764 (Croydon PC), 56919 (West Wickham PC), 59700 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 60019 (Steeple Morden PC), 60095 (Guilden Morden PC)
Landowners and Developers: 58080 (B Marshall), 59531 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60530 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60590 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
Charities and Think Tanks: 57778 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 59585 (CPRE)
Education Institutions: 59044 (University of Cambridge)

Political Organisations: 60790 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
This is critically important to Greater Cambridge and neighbouring areas.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59934 (Fen Ditton PC), 60419 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Home and remote working are important aspects of keeping rural communities economically sustainable in a manner compatible with reducing carbon emissions.
Comments highlighting this issue:
56919 (West Wickham PC), 57778 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy in the SCDC Local Plan should be considered for wider implementation.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57734 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Policy must be based on rigorous assessment of need.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60790 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Local employment hub demand may be affected by risk posed by COVID and future development not clear.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60790 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Residential extensions should be tested against proof of need.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60790 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Further exploration needed of funding models for employment hubs. Publicly funded hubs should be explored.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60790 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Support investment in communications infrastructure across the city to support the increase in remote working. This is essential as low speed broadband will result in home working not being practical.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57847 (D Lister), 58266 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Consider that the policy could be strengthened to refer to the provision of home office space in new dwellings as the emphasis is currently on the delivery of external hubs or extensions of existing dwellings. Not everyone will be able to live in premises with a spare bedroom hence ensuring new homes have space for a desk is a minimal requirement to support home working.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58266 (Histon & Impington PC), 59700 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised:
Policies to support work hubs where "remote" workers from different companies can comingle also seems like a good idea, especially if close to residential sites.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57847 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised:
The University has embraced remote working as a response to the pandemic restrictions, and will continue to support agile working in the longer term, where appropriate to roles. This will include the creation of agile working hubs on the University's estate, for its operational purposes, but a successful permanent transition will also depend on the ability of staff to work remotely at home and/or at hubs.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59044 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57431 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised:
The Bourn Airfield proposals will make appropriate provision to achieving the objectives of this policy through the provision of co-working space and provision of fibre broadband to all homes.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59531 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst the policy does not place any requirements on new developments to consider this matter, it is highlighted that the development of Land north of Cambridge Road, Linton would benefit from homes that include provision of studies and include the necessary broadband services to easily facilitate home working.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60530 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The Fen Ditton proposals will make appropriate provision to achieving the objectives

of this policy through the provision of co-working space and provision of fibre broadband to all homes.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60590 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Site related comments for Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working

Summary of issues raised:
The Bourn Airfield proposals will make appropriate provision to achieving the objectives of this policy through the provision of co-working space and provision of fibre broadband to all homes.
Comments highlighting this issue:
59531 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)

Summary of issues raised:
Whilst the policy does not place any requirements on new developments to consider this matter, it is highlighted that the development of Land north of Cambridge Road, Linton would benefit from homes that include provision of studies and include the necessary broadband services to easily facilitate home working.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60530 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The Fen Ditton proposals will make appropriate provision to achieving the objectives of this policy through the provision of co-working space and provision of fibre broadband to all homes.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60590 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

16

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There were less y representations in response to this policy compared to other policies in the Jobs Chapter. Some developers, parish councils, charities, and landowners expressed support for this policy. Histon and Impington PC wanted the affordability of the workplaces to be higher and set at 80% rather than 60%. Contrastingly, Mission Street Ltd questioned the requirements of the policy due to a perceived lack of evidence justifying the level of affordable workspace and the scale of development that should provide it. The same respondent asked for clarity relating to key terms in the policy and asked for the policy to have greater flexibility so that the rate of affordable workspace is proportionate to the scale of the development. Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited argued that it was not acceptable for a commercial development to subsidise workspace.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties supported the aims of this policy but wanted the rate which is considered 'affordable' to be set through assessment of the ability of the target market to pay the rates. Contrastingly, the Universities Superannuation Scheme recommend that affordable workspace requirements are subject to viability to ensure marginal schemes are not unnecessarily restricted from coming forward. The same respondent also argued that the provision of affordable workspace on-site is not always appropriate and wanted the policy to allow for financial contributions for equivalent off-site provision. A few developers and landowners put forward site specific comments and explained how their sites would deliver the aims of the policy.

Representations for J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries

Summary of issues raised:
Support
• Very important now and going forward.
Comments highlighting this issue:
Parish Councils: 57740 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
Landowners or developers: 58580 (Marshall Group Properties), 59831 (Dry Drayton PC), 60161 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60278 (Commercial Estates Group), 60420 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 60768 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support affordable workspaces but with greater affordability of 60% rather than the 80% in the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58269 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Support 20% affordable workspace if development is above 1,000m²
Comments highlighting this issue:
56646 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised:
Local affordable workspace can reduce commuting and increase local employment opportunities
Comments highlighting this issue:
59587 (Campaign to Protect Rural England - CPRE)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy would increase access to affordable flexible spaces for start-up businesses and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) across Greater Cambridge. This plays an important role in helping to address social inclusion.
Comments highlighting this issue:
60278 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised:
The requirements of Policy J/AW are questioned based on a lack of evidence justifying the level of affordable workspace and what scale of development should provide it.
Comments highlighting this issue:
57429 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
The policy is unnecessary and unreasonable. If a business cannot afford to occupy a commercial development then it will operate either from home or via an alternative route – perhaps hiring incubator type space on an irregular/as needed basis. It is not acceptable for a commercial development to subsidise workspace.
Comments highlighting this issue:
58895 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised:
Clarity is required on:
• Definition of affordable
• How affordable workspace is to be calculated and applied across the districts
• What constitutes a ‘larger commercial development’
Comments highlighting this issue:
56765 (Croydon PC), 57429 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Flexibility should be included within the policy so that the rate of affordable workspace is proportionate to the scale of the development on a site-by-site basis as:
• The job market and skills found within the London authorities cited will differ from Greater Cambridgeshire and therefore drawing the comparison and providing a blanket percentage requirement for affordable workspace across employment development will not necessarily be as appropriate within the unique circumstances of the area and the need may also vary depending on the surrounding uses and context.
• Employment space rents across the City and South Cambridgeshire differ greatly,

depending on locations; indeed, it is this range of rents across types of product that provides the necessary ecosystem for research and development companies to thrive.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57429 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised:
Support the aims of this policy but concern that it will have the same problem as so-called “affordable” housing, i.e. that 80% of the market rate in Cambridge is still out of the reach of most. Ideally, the rate which is considered ‘affordable’ should be set through assessment of the ability of the target market to pay these rates.

Comments highlighting this issue:
60791 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised:
Recommend that affordable workspace requirements are subject to viability to ensure otherwise marginal schemes are not unnecessarily restricted from coming forward.

Comments highlighting this issue:
57279 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised:
Provision of affordable workspace on-site is not always appropriate therefore the proposal to allow flexibility for financial contributions for equivalent off-site provision is supported

Comments highlighting this issue:
57279 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 60278 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support
• Very important now and going forward.
Comments highlighting this issue: Parish Councils
57740 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC),
Landowners or developers
58580 (Marshall Group Properties), 59831 (Dry Drayton PC), 60161 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60278 (Commercial Estates Group), 60420 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 60768 (U+I Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support affordable workspaces but with greater affordability of 60% rather than the 80% in the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58269 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support 20% affordable workspace if development is above 1,000m2
Comments highlighting this issue: 56646 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Local affordable workspace can reduce commuting and increase local employment opportunities
Comments highlighting this issue: 59587 (Campaign to Protect Rural England - CPRE)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The policy would increase access to affordable flexible spaces for start-up businesses and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) across Greater Cambridge. This plays an important role in helping to address social inclusion.
Comments highlighting this issue: 60278 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The requirements of Policy J/AW are questioned based on a lack of evidence justifying the level of affordable workspace and what scale of development should provide it.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57429 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The policy is unnecessary and unreasonable. If a business cannot afford to occupy a commercial development then it will operate either from home or via an alternative route – perhaps hiring incubator-type space on an irregular/as-needed basis. It is not acceptable for a commercial development to subsidise workspace.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58895 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Clarity is required on:
• Definition of affordable
• How affordable workspace is to be calculated and applied across the districts
• What constitutes a ‘larger commercial development’
Comments highlighting this issue: 56765 (Croydon PC), 57429 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Flexibility should be included within the policy so that the rate of affordable workspace is proportionate to the scale of the development on a site-by-site basis as:
• The job market and skills found within the London authorities cited will differ from Greater Cambridgeshire and therefore drawing the comparison and providing a blanket percentage requirement for affordable workspace across employment development will not necessarily be as appropriate within the unique circumstances

of the area and the need may also vary depending on the surrounding uses and context.
• Employment space rents across the City and South Cambridgeshire differ greatly, depending on locations; indeed, it is this range of rents across types of product that provides the necessary ecosystem for research and development companies to thrive.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57429 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support the aims of this policy but concern that it will have the same problem as so-called “affordable” housing, i.e. that 80% of the market rate in Cambridge is still out of the reach of most. Ideally, the rate which is considered ‘affordable’ should be set through assessment of the ability of the target market to pay these rates.
Comments highlighting this issue: 60791 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Recommend that affordable workspace requirements are subject to viability to ensure otherwise marginal schemes are not unnecessarily restricted from coming forward.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57279 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Provision of affordable workspace on-site is not always appropriate therefore the proposal to allow flexibility for financial contributions for equivalent off-site provision is supported.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57279 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 60278 (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of issues raised:
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue:
57432 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Site related comments for Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries

Summary of issues raised in comments: The proposals at Burlington Park will aim to deliver a diversity of research and development floorspace of different sizes and rental points, providing an alternative to other, high-rental locations, whilst still being

in the Southern Cluster. This would allow Burlington Park to support the local R&D ecosystem and help companies at all stages of their development continue to thrive.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57429 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Marshall is supportive of this policy intent and is committed to providing a scheme that offers a broad range of opportunities. The delivery of a wide range and mix of employment floorspace is an important consideration in the evolution of the design of Cambridge East. Marshall has instructed specialist commercial advisers to provide advice on what mix of uses Cambridge East should be looking to deliver. This advice will also serve to ensure that Cambridge East is both fit for today's requirements, but is also sufficiently flexible to ensure it is future-proofed.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58580 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The important role the policy would have in helping to address social inclusion and it would provide an additional benefit to Green Belt release in the Land to the South East of Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue: 60278 (Commercial Estates Group)

Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

5

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There were fewer representations attached to this policy than other policies in the Jobs Chapter. A few parish councils and landowners expressed support for the policy. Gamlingay Parish Council expressed support for the policy but asked for additions such as ensuring showering facilities and water refilling stations are required in all new employment facilities. The landowner CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust argued that the Cambridge Biomedical Campus has a deficit in existing facilities and they supported the provision of flexible business spaces on the site to enable it to become more successful. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties asked for green spaces to be included in employment parks.

Representations for J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support the principle of the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue: Individuals
Parish Councils: 57740 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
Landowners or developers: 56647 (Gamlingay PC), 58876 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Showering facilities and water refilling stations are required in all new employment facilities.
Comments highlighting this issue: 56647 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Section 106 contributions are required.
Comments highlighting this issue: 56647 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Investment support for active travel is required with development of all new business and employment.
Comments highlighting this issue: 56647 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57433 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The Campus has a deficit in existing facilities due to rapid development over time. Further supporting flexible business spaces will enable it to become more complete, dynamic, and successful.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58876 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments: A range of green spaces should be provided in employment parks to ensure employees have access to nature for wellbeing, space to walk and use. Cambridge Science Park is an example where there is a duck pond and grass.
Comments highlighting this issue: 60792 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Policy J/RC: Retail and centres

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/RC: Retail and centres > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

20

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Several respondents expressed support for the policy. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC argued that the policy needed to have a greater focus on rural shops and services. Abrdn, the Universities Superannuation Scheme and the Education and Skills Funding Agency supported elements of the policy but objected to Article 4 Directions that restrict alternative uses, arguing that alternative uses improve vitality of city centres. Contrastingly, Cambridge Past, Present and Future argued that shops and services should be protected from change of use through removal of permitted development rights. A few developers, including Abrdn, disagreed with bullet point three of the policy, which states that the Council will resist the loss of retail or other town centre uses in existing centres and primary shopping areas, because this was not perceived to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to the contemporary economic climate. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that encouraging small-scale units in Cambridge may not be sufficient to attract the range of users mentioned in the policy.

Representations for J/RC: Retail and centres

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support the principle of the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57435 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support the protection of small high streets.
Comments highlighting this issue: 56648 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: This needs to be carefully assessed in light of the Covid changes that may now become permanent.
Comments highlighting this issue: 56766 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Abrdn supports:

- Ambition to update existing retail policies to reflect new Use Class E.
- City centre approach to retail, recognising this as the most sustainable location for such uses.
- Developing a specific approach to retail policy for Cambridge city centre, including its shopping centres.
  Abrdn notes:

- Use of policy J/RC to support retention of retail and leisure uses with revitalisation of high streets.
- Critical policy allows sufficient flexibility for complementary uses in retail areas. Decline in demand for retail space means there needs to be an element of re-purposing and an increased leisure and residential offering.
- Policy J/RC should support all uses within Use Class E.
- Evidence on key retail trends, including shift to online shopping and resultant lower footfall in retail areas.
- City centres are evolving to becoming experiential destinations, with a plethora of different uses. Recognised by Government in changes introduced, such as the new Class E.
- Welcomes Councils' offer to engage with investors about future ambitions for city centre.
  Abrdn strongly objects to:
- Continued resistance to the loss of retail or other town centre uses in existing centres and primary shopping areas where it would undermine their vitality or ability to serve local communities.
- Article 4 Directions that restrict alternative uses, as these often improve vitality of city centres by diversifying the mix of uses and bringing more people in at different times of day.
  Comments highlighting this issue: 57235 (Abrdn)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Supports the proposed approach to support retail within new mixed-use developments located outside of district centres to ensure new residents have local facilities accessible sustainably.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57280 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support for the diversification of uses on high streets. Education, though not typically a town centre use, can increase footfall and support the vibrancy of town and city centres. Recommends including education as a supported use within the final policy.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57488 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Policy should have a strong focus on supporting village shops and services.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57739 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: No mention of cycle safety. Need to improve cycle storage and cycle safety.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57867 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: USS supports:

- Ambition to update existing retail policies to reflect new Use Class E.

- City centre approach to retail, recognising this as the most sustainable location for such uses.
- Non-Class E uses within the city centre, such as cinemas and leisure facilities, which can complement retail uses and ensure retail areas in Cambridge continue to flourish.
- Developing a specific approach to retail policy for Cambridge city centre, including its shopping centres.
  USS notes:
- Use of policy J/RC to support retention of retail and leisure uses with revitalisation of high streets.
- Critical policy allows sufficient flexibility for complementary uses in retail areas. Decline in demand for retail space means there needs to be an element of re-purposing and an increased leisure and residential offering.
- Consumer demand is pivoting towards experience-led shopping destinations and accessible convenience-oriented retail places.
- Submission of evidence on key retail trends, including shift to online shopping and resultant lower footfall in retail areas.
- Policy J/RC should support all uses within Use Class E.
- City centres are evolving to become experiential destinations, with a plethora of different uses. Recognised by Government in changes it has introduced, such as the new Class E.
- Different retail areas operate in different contexts.
- Welcomes Councils' offer to engage with investors about future ambitions for city centre.
  USS strongly objects to:
- Continued resistance to the loss of retail or other town centre uses in existing centres and primary shopping areas where it would undermine their vitality or ability to serve local communities.
- Article 4 Directions that restrict alternative uses, as these often improve vitality of city centres by diversifying the mix of uses and bringing more people in at different times of day.
  Comments highlighting this issue: 58222 & 58230 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Will the City Centre be able to support leisure activities? Traditionally, these are outside the city centre. If so, a transport plan is essential for out-of-town leisure facilities.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58271 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The hierarchy must include the centres in the new settlements and new communities. Facilities in these locations need to be protected to serve the residents and prevent car journeys. Vital shops and services should be protected from change of use through removal of permitted development rights.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58894 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments: There are empty shops. Public transport is too expensive, which encourages people to travel in cars. Local Authorities are increasing charges for cars to travel into the city centre, meaning there is nothing to encourage people into the town and city centres. There is a risk that the commercial centre of Cambridge will suffer considerably under current plans.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59279 (Great Shelford Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The policy should acknowledge the flexibility of Class E to support the revitalisation of high streets. Local authorities should be open to all manner of uses and a mix of complementary uses. A positive and creative approach to town centres would enable delivery of housing and jobs in highly sustainable locations. The policy must be flexible to accommodate rapidly changing market conditions.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59308 (Brydell Partners)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The repurposing of buildings for residential use should be controlled by Local Planning Authority Building Control.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59588 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Historic shopfronts can positively contribute to an area both aesthetically and economically. The restoration of such shops has provided Derby with bespoke shopping, leading to much larger footfall.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59682 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support for small commercial/retail premises in rural communities.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59711 (Caldecote PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support for updates to policies on retail and leisure, which should take account of changes due to Covid and empty spaces. Welcome the proposal to establish a hierarchy of centres across Greater Cambridge. In Cambridge, ‘encouraging small-scale units’ may not be sufficient to attract the range of users mentioned.
Comments highlighting this issue: 60793 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Site related comments for Policy J/RC: Retail and centres

Summary of issues raised in comments: Marshall is pleased that the GCSP recognises that there is an opportunity at Cambridge East to provide a range of retail and leisure services and facilities to serve the Greater Cambridge population.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58581 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Supportive of the policy. The proposals for the expansion of the Campus will include an element of retail which will reduce journeys, support daily life on the Campus, and meet residents' and employees' needs.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58884 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

14

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

The consultation on the First Proposals indicated that in general there was support for the proposed policy direction. CBC Ltd indicated that a need for visitor accommodation, for both business and visitor use, and a conference centre had been identified at Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Marshall Group Properties stated that there are opportunities at Cambridge East to provide a range of retail and leisure services and facilities. There were requests for recognition in the policy of the potential role of retail centres, and particularly the city centre, in providing space for new visitor accommodation and attractions.

Concern was expressed over the loss of housing to short terms letting accommodation. There were also concerns over the capacity of visitor attractions to

accommodate increased visitor numbers, with the levels likely to grow given growing population in the area and the development of new visitor accommodation. There was a request that the policy should support well-designed, sustainable improvements to existing attractions and a suggestion that new visitor accommodation should be asked for a contribution to mitigate their impact. Greater clarity was requested regarding when new attractions would be acceptable in rural areas and concern that the policy would have the potential to conflict with the Plan's green infrastructure policies.

Representations for Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions, and facilities

Summary of issues raised in comments: General support for the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue: Parish Councils 57740 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), Landowners or developers 58023 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58584 (Marshall Group Properties), 58892 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Our County is an important tourist destination and so we should support all visitors and tourism.
Comments highlighting this issue: 60421 (Great and Little Chishill Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments: No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57436 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments: This policy needs careful consideration as there is a danger of prime housing being made into Airbnb type of accommodation.
Comments highlighting this issue: 56767 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities can complement retail uses. The city centre would be an appropriate location for such uses due to its transport links and proximity to visitor attractions. The proposed policy J/VA should set out that these uses will be appropriate in existing retail uses.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57238 (Abrdn), 57281 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 58223 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Attractions at Duxford including the museum, major air show events, conference and corporate hire facilities supply the market for an on-site hotel, planning consent has been granted. Economic model identified under-supply of business and tourist accommodation and will contribute towards addressing this and supporting the visitor economy.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58023 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Pleased that there is recognition that there are opportunities at Cambridge East to provide a range of retail and leisure services and facilities to serve the Greater Cambridge population.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58584 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments: There is an identified need at the Campus for visitor accommodation, particularly for business activities but also for visitor use. Campus expansion could provide hotel space alongside a conference centre for which there is also an identified deficit. The Campus is in serious need of floorspace to allow for the mixing of different staff from different institutions to enable knowledge spill-over and idea sharing. A diverse development offer allows the Campus to move towards an interconnected and vibrant innovation district promoting collaboration and innovation.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58892 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments: The policy should recognise that some natural and cultural visitor attractions have a carrying capacity beyond which they will be harmed. There appears to be a conflict in approach between 'supporting attractions which can be accessed by sustainable travel' and restricting tourist facilities and attractions which don't need to be in a rural location. We would be concerned if these policies prevented the delivery of green infrastructure.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58930 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Holiday accommodation has impacted on the supply of rented flats in central Cambridge. A number of companies have bought property near Cambridge Station and in South Petersfield and converted them to short-term lets. This policy needs to be stronger and more importantly enforced.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59219 (F Gawthrop)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Policy support should be provided for well-designed, sustainable improvements and enhancements to existing visitor attractions. Many existing services and facilities are operating close to their limits (including visitor facilities at Trust properties) and the impact of additional population pressure on tourist facilities and visitor attractions is likely to be harmful if such facilities are not able to flex or adapt to meet increasing demands.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59230 (National Trust)

Site related comments for Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions, and facilities

Summary of issues raised in comments: Land at Hazelwood Farm, Lolworth (HELAA site 52680): The development of a hotel at Site URN 676 will contribute to

the provision of tourist accommodation within Greater Cambridge, meeting this growing need, helping develop the local economy and delivering employment opportunities for the area, providing high-quality accommodation and remote work space.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57225 (R Cowell)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Proposals will complement the proposed strategic employment development on the adjoining land referred to as Slate Hall Farm, Bar Hill (Site URN 236). The provision of visitor accommodation would provide a support function with ancillary services that can further the sustainability of the proposed employment development.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57225 (R Cowell)

Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist / language schools

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - J/FD: Faculty development and specialist/language schools > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

12

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There were not many representations in response to this policy. A parish council, the University of Cambridge, Anglia Ruskin University, and a developer expressed support for the policy. The Education and Skills Agency supported the policy direction but recommended that the supporting text makes a distinction between privately operated and state-funded education, due to changes of use under permitted development rights. Anglia Ruskin University provided a lengthy representation where they suggested improvements to the policy to better reflect their strategic priorities. B Marshall objected to the policy on the grounds that providing student accommodation for language students worsens the learning experience and leads to more under-utilised facilities and removes a source of income for low-income families. Contrastingly, F Gawthrop asked for the policy to be strengthened to not allow language students to stay in family dwellings.

Representations for Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist / language schools

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support policy.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57741 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59085 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments: No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57439 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Support policy direction. We recommend that the supporting text makes a distinction between privately operated and state-funded education, due to changes of use under permitted development rights.
Comments highlighting this issue: 57489 (ESFA - Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Object to the policy not housing students in family homes (esp. for language students). Family homes provide a source of income for those on low incomes and are beneficial as a learning experience for the student. Providing student accommodation worsens the learning experience and leads to more under-utilised facilities.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58079 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised in comments: Any reduction in car parking must be backed up with a high-quality transport system.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58274 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments: ARU makes the following comments:

- Proposed policy direction should begin "Recognising that they make a significant contribution to society, we propose to support new or enhanced faculty and specialist facilities/development in Greater Cambridge which meet the following requirements:.."
- Supporting text should better reflect ARU's role and plans.
- It should be made clear that ARU “is developing a new masterplan for their Cambridge campus on East Road. This will focus on consolidation and refurbishment and/or redevelopment of campus buildings with further adaption to provide blended learning/teaching with a mix of on-campus and off-site learning and teaching using digital technologies. Opportunities for expansion of the campus through new acquisitions are also being explored."
  Comments highlighting this issue: 58373, 58389 & 58410 (ARU)

Summary of issues raised in comments: We agree that Policy 43 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) has value and should be rolled forward into the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59096 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments: "The use of family dwelling houses to accommodate students of specialist colleges and/or language schools only is not appropriate". The should be changed to 'not allowed'. This policy has previously operated to the detriment of local people.
Comments highlighting this issue: 59294 (Frank Gawthrop)

Site related comments Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist / language schools

Summary of issues raised in comments: Supportive of the policy that supports new teaching hospital facilities and specialist faculty development. These are types of development will come forward as part of the future expansion of the Campus.
Comments highlighting this issue: 58893 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Appendix A: Summaries of Representations – Homes Chapter Contents

Homes 786
H/AH: Affordable housing 794
H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing 804
H/HM: Housing mix 810
H/HD: Housing density 816
H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots 824
H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes 827
H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people 831
H/CB: Self and custom build homes 835
H/BR: Build to rent homes 836
H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) 843
H/SA: Student Accommodation 849
H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside 851
H/RM: Residential moorings 853

H/RC: Residential caravan sites 856
H/GT: Gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites 858
H/CH: Community led housing 860

Homes

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section: 32

Notes

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on the Homes policies, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific housing, biodiversity and green spaces, and infrastructure policies. These comments have been moved to the specific policy: BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity, BG/GI: Green infrastructure, H/AH: Affordable housing, H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing, H/HM: Housing mix, H/HD: Housing density, H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots, H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes, H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people, H/CB: Self and custom build homes, H/BR: Build to rent homes, H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation, H/SA: Student accommodation, H/CH: Community led housing, and I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery.
- Some comments attached to this section relate to the overall number of jobs and homes, the overall development strategy, and specific sites. In many cases the representors that made these comments have also made similar comments on the strategy and sites sections within the plan, with the comments attached to this webpage supplementing them by referring to issues relating to the housing policies. Where appropriate we will review placement of these comments in the final version of these representation summaries which will accompany the draft plan.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There is general support for the proposed housing policies from some Parish Councils, Cambourne TC and some site promoters. General comments on the homes chapter include support for the Local Plan requiring a wide range of housing – type, size and tenure - as this will improve the ability of the market to achieve enhanced levels of delivery and will support the creation of diverse communities. Specific comments suggest the need for family homes with gardens within the city and the need to reuse vacant buildings to minimise whole life carbon emissions. Parish Councils suggest that there is a need to prevent building of new homes while others remain empty, and the need to protect new homes from being lost to buy to let. Metro Property Unit Trust asks for the housing policies to recognise the importance of purpose-built student accommodation, as this reduces the demand on

the existing and proposed housing stock. Great Shelford PC highlight that homes do not make a community, and that they need to be supported by infrastructure.

Table of representations: Homes

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support / general support for proposed housing policies.

Comments highlighting this issue

58456 (Orwell PC), 58468 (Linton PC), 59175 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 59281 (Cambourne TC), 58778 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Homes need to be of good quality and high environmental standard.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56768 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the reuse of vacant buildings, where this is an effective way of minimising whole life carbon emissions.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57779 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Local Plan needs to provide a wide range of housing – rented, retirement living, market housing, affordable housing, and custom and self build homes – as this will improve the ability of the market to achieve enhanced levels of delivery. Such diversity is best achieved on larger sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57912 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Need homes of all sizes in new developments, including family homes with gardens within 2 miles of the City. There is currently an oversupply of flats that are not selling.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57587 (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The mix and affordability of homes is critical.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58279 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support need to plan for sufficient housing to meet economic growth aspirations and to ensure the right mix of housing tenures to meet requirements of diverse communities.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58809 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support the Councils aims in respect of homes, however concerned the approach will constrain sustainable economic growth and not meet the housing requirement to 2041.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58378 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support proposed strategy to plan for and deliver enough homes to meet objectively assessed needs, including significant amounts of affordable housing and a mix of tenures to suit diverse community needs.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59701 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

High standards of housing can be achieved through preparation of development briefs and design codes.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57912 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for action to prevent building of new homes when others lie empty.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59278 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Continuous requirement for new housing – something should be done about empty homes.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59242 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Would be good to see restrictions on buy to let.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59278 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Taxable penalty to deter new homes from being bought by those with no intention to live there. Could require new homes to be lived in by owners. Otherwise the housing shortage will never end, and further land will be needed for new development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59242 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The housing policies should recognise the importance that purpose built student accommodation plays in reducing demand on existing and proposed housing stock.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59090 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Homes do not make a community – need to be supported by infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59278 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57441 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58037 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 59126 (University of Cambridge)

Representations relating to S/JH: New jobs and homes

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Strongly supportive of principle of planning for enough housing to meet the needs of Greater Cambridge, including proposed approach of delivering more homes than the standard method. However, consider there is significant opportunity to consider increasing the target as a positive response to evidence base and scale of employment growth.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58588 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Support for planning for enough homes to meet needs, including affordable housing to rent or buy. But object to needs being driven by future economic assessments as should also consider climate change.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60139 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Note the housing target and is supportive of appropriate brownfield sites being redeveloped to help contribute towards meeting the housing need for Greater Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57240 (Abrdn), 57282 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 58224 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Councils could be more aspirational in relation to the number of homes to be delivered within the plan period. Suggest the aim on page 258 is updated to read "…for enough housing to meet our needs, as a minimum".

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58729 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- The jobs forecast may be higher than the middle forecast included in the Local Plan, and this would potentially mean an increase in the homes target for the plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58025 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Would like to see the direct evidence for housing need in Greater Cambridge – split by sizes and types of homes. Well known that people struggle to afford homes in this area and there is an often unchallenged assumption that this will be solved by building more homes – what research has been carried out into what actually drives high house prices, and what evidence is there that building more homes will address this?

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60794 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Representations relating to S/DS: Development strategy

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Object to failure to provide adequate levels of housing to south of City. Development at Whittlesford can deliver a mix of housing types and tenures to cater for all generations.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59175 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Many proposed developments around Cambridge that is already a congested and expensive area to live. But that there are few proposed developments south west of the City where there are good road and rail links that would support more development than currently proposed.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60822 (T Wood)

Representations relating to S/CE: Cambridge East

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Cambridge East provides a significant opportunity to tackle the affordability crisis within Cambridge, by accommodating a wide range of homes of different sizes and tenures.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58588 (Marshall Group Properties)

Representations relating to S/RSC: Other site allocations in the rural southern cluster

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Proposed development at Mingle Lane, Stapleford would severely impact the Green Belt, Gog Magog Hills, Wandlebury, and the rural landscape with little or no benefit to local people. Landscape and biodiversity cannot be replaced once lost. Will result in coalescence with Cambridge. Infrastructure is insufficient to support more development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57545 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Avtech1, Avtech 2 and the expansions of Duxford village (HELAA Site 40095) – should be allocated for employment uses, housing and community facilities.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58025 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)

Representations relating to S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area

Summary of issues raised in comments:

- Land at Hazelwood Farm, Lolworth (HELAA site 52680) – should be allocated for employment development

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57231 (R Cowell)

H/AH: Affordable housing

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/AH: Affordable housing > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 62

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes and Wellbeing and Social Inclusion headings as the comments were specific to affordable housing. 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

Executive Summary

There is support for the policy direction from many developers whilst parish councils, community groups and individuals want the policy to go further by providing homes that are more affordable, more secure and are run by community groups or local authorities. There also calls for affordable housing to be targeted at local people, older people and key workers and for a broader range of affordable tenures including low cost home ownership. Parish councils, community groups and individuals want to see the 40% requirement strictly enforced whilst developers call for flexibility based on robust viability assessments and review mechanisms which also cater for specific needs of schemes such as Extra Care schemes which cannot compete with market housing. They also highlight exemptions set out in the NPPF. There are disagreements over clustering with parish councils wanting affordable housing spread across developments but developers calling for some flexibility to match Registered Provider preferences. Developers argue that allocating more small sites will deliver more affordable housing more quickly than relying on strategic sites with their significant infrastructure overheads.

Table of representations: H/AH - Affordable Housing

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for the proposed policy direction:

- 40% affordable housing on all schemes of 10+ dwellings
- Support for policy direction and intention to deliver a policy compliant development at Cambridge East that offers wide ranging housing benefits, including to those in greatest housing need
- Increase in provision from current Cambridge Local Plan justified by need
- High level of need exacerbated by rising house prices in Cambridge
- Supports for the expanded provision of affordable housing
- Important that such homes are built with inclusion, health and wellbeing at the forefront

Comments highlighting this issue:

Public Bodies:

- 57442 (Huntingdonshire District Council)
- 57742 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
- 59487 (Shepreth PC)
- 59702 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners:

- 58231 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd)
- 58590 (Marshall Group Properties)
- 58801 (Wates Developments Ltd)
- 58816 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company (‘TMLC’), a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme)
- 58829 (Wates Developments Ltd)
- 58835 (Wates Developments Ltd)
- 58901 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
- 60226 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)
- 60555 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Rate of affordable housing is appropriate in the context of the Greater Cambridge area where affordability is a key issue.

- More affordable housing is needed, including at the Biomedical Campus.
- Need a more refined approach to affordability that recognises the total cost of living in each location including, for example, the need for a car(s) due to lack of public transport or active travel options.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58778* (Phase 2 Planning)
- 57587* (D Lott)
- 58180 (Cllr Gough)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Not enough truly affordable housing – unrealistic definition of affordable housing used in planning, as 80% market value is not affordable for the majority of people.
- As much affordable housing as possible should be truly affordable i.e. social rent, rather than affordable rent or discounted market.
- Provide truly affordable housing for lower paid and starters.
- We need truly affordable housing for young families.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59278* (Great Shelford PC)
- 59242* (Teversham PC)
- 56525 (D Kelleway)
- 56769 (Croydon PC)
- 56746* (Croydon PC)
- 58469 (Linton PC)
- 59185 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- We need a large increase in council owned and managed secure rented property backed up by community ownership cooperatives, housing associations and cohousing projects.
- All affordable housing should be council housing to provide security of tenure, accountability and efficiency.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60795 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
- 56994 (Trumpington Residents Association)
- 59242* (Teversham PC)
- 56526 (D Kelleway)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Concerned about affordability of houses in Cambridge, the loss of affordable housing to Right To Buy and first time buyers being outbid by Buy To Rent landlords.
- Split between houses and flats on a development should be the same for market and affordable units, and not like the Wing development where ratio of houses to flats is almost inverse for affordable homes to that for market homes.
- Affordable housing should be prioritised for local people and protected in perpetuity.
- The Histon & Impington Neighbourhood Plan emphasises the need for affordable housing. This need can be best met by the provision of smaller Rural Exception Sites, delivered by the local Community Land Trust, in preference to market led schemes which will deliver minimal local benefits.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59464 (S Buckingham)
- 59242* (Teversham PC)
- 56525 (D Kelleway)
- 57554 (Stapleford PC)
- 59803 (Histon & Impington Community Land Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- A mix of housing types should be provided across Greater Cambridge. Alongside open market sale housing this should include affordable rent, social rent, starter homes and rent to buy.
- Significant reservations regarding the affordability of the First Homes product and concerns that under the current policy proposals they will replace “traditional” affordable tenures, particularly Shared Ownership.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59121 (bpha)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- We should also be looking at retirement affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60425 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Affordable housing policy should support the principle of homes for NHS Staff (key workers), and support access for NHS staff to affordable housing, as a priority, where there is an evidenced need.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59200 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Support for overarching policy objective but should specifically reference the need to 'significantly increase the number of affordable ownership homes for those who can't afford to buy their own homes'.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59494 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- The policy objective to require the delivery of new affordable home ownership products on all sites is strongly supported. However, it should specifically reference strong support for developments where the large majority (75%+) of homes are proposed as affordable home ownership products regardless of the size of these homes.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59496 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- This policy should include an exemption to First Homes and/or any other specific tenure split requirements where the large majority (75%+) of housing is proposed as affordable housing (as defined by Annex 2 of the NPPF).

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59497 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- The affordable housing target for schemes which provide a mix of Build to Rent and conventional homes should be a blend of both targets (apportioned according to the number of homes proposed). The targets for each housing type should be set with reference to relevant viability evidence.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59499 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Support intermingling of affordable homes throughout developments to increase social inclusion.
- Affordable housing should be placed within market housing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58280 (Histon & Impington PC)
- 57878* (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Affordable housing organisations are causing problems by:

- Not enforcing rental agreements
- Not tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB)
- Selling on housing stock

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56994 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Although affordable housing should be distributed across developments, some clustering should be allowed to assist with delivery and ongoing management.
- Flexibility should be allowed for clusters to exceed the 15 unit restriction where this has been agreed with the relevant Registered Provider. The clustering of affordable housing units is generally a practical requirement for Registered Providers for management and maintenance reasons. As such, the policy should allow a degree of flexibility here.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56994 (Trumpington Residents Association)
- 58231 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd)
- 60531 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60591 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Will this include building the modular pod type homes that could be made available for those who find themselves homeless?

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58543 (Dr Hawkins)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Consideration should be given to a stepped approach. Any expansion of Cambourne should have a threshold of 30% for affordable homes. Older settlements have a much lower percentage of affordable housing and a 40% requirement on new development will take them towards the levels achieved in Cambourne.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59271 (Cambourne TC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- 40% affordable housing requirement should apply to all development, not just schemes of over 10 dwellings.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56649 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- 40% affordable housing requirement should be more rigorously enforced.
- Policy H/AH: Affordable housing, should be strengthened and enforced as far as possible. We would like to see increasing numbers of small sites developed with affordable housing included.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56815 (M Colville)
- 57554 (Stapleford PC)
- 58082 (B Marshall)
- 58280 (Histon & Impington PC)
- 59311 (M Berkson)
- 59589 (Campaign to Protect Rural England - CPRE)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Affordability cannot be allowed to overturn Green Belt legislation, or landscape impact policies, or build on high quality agricultural land.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57554 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Green field sites should be acquired at current use value and either (a) kept as social housing as a price related to the cost of land and construction cost or (b) if sold at market rate then the windfall land value increase should all go to government for use on infrastructure and not to developers/ landowners who did nothing socially valuable to earn it.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57046 (Dr Harrold)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Whether the continuation of a 40% affordable housing requirement is viable will be determined by the viability assessment:

- The need for viability testing may arise in some areas
- Important to ensure that a whole Plan viability assessment, which takes into account infrastructure and emerging policy requirements, is undertaken at the appropriate time to ensure the policy is robust
- Policy should include a review mechanism so viability can be reviewed in light of economic cycles, changing affordable tenures and rising build costs
- The viability assessment should assess the different typologies available for the provision of specialist housing for older people
- It may be necessary to include varied affordable housing requirements based on site type and location

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57391 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)
- 57913 (Martin Grant Homes)
- 58735 (The Church Commissioners for England)
- 59191 (Endurance Estates)
- 59742 (Endurance Estates)
- 60292 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)
- 60318 (Gladman Developments)
- 60346 (FC Butler Trust)

- 60354 (FC Butler Trust)
- 60382 (S & J Graves)
- 60392 (D Wright)
- 60462 (P, J & M Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Concern that the viability assessment has underestimated some of the costs in relation to policies and land values. It may be necessary to reduce the affordable housing requirement on some development typologies in order to ensure the local plan is consistent with paragraph 58 of the NPPF.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60151 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- The provision of affordable housing contributions will need to be assessed taking into consideration those sites providing a mix of C2 and C3 uses and as such the policy approach must support the separate assessment of affordable housing contributions on these types of sites.
- The delivery of Affordable Housing on Extra Care sites is typically challenging. It is considered that practical issues should be addressed within the policy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59742 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Support for proposal that affordable homes should be provided on-site except for in the circumstances set out in paragraph 63 of the NPPF.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57283 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- In line with paragraph 65 (b) of the NPPF, it should be made clear that purpose built accommodation for students is exempt from the requirement to provide a percentage of the total number of units as affordable.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59094 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Small sites are more capable of delivering policy compliant levels of affordable housing than strategic sites due to the latter's already high infrastructure burdens.
- The plan should allocate more greenfield sites away from city where affordable housing will be more viable.
- More small sites will disperse affordable housing and provide more choice.
- Small sites can deliver affordable housing more quickly.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57111 (C King)
- 57184 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57261 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
- 57308 (C Nutt)
- 58231 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd)
- 58801 (Wates Developments Ltd)
- 58829 (Wates Developments Ltd)
- 58835 (Wates Developments Ltd)
- 59191 (Endurance Estates)
- 60346 (FC Butler Trust)
- 60354 (FC Butler Trust)
- 60382 (S & J Graves)
- 60392 (D Wright)
- 60462 (P, J & M Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- The restriction placed on development in 'Group Villages' as defined in the settlement hierarchy (of up to 8 dwellings/15 dwellings in exceptional circumstances) limits the ability of these areas to provide for any additional affordable housing as the threshold for triggering the requirement for affordable housing on schemes will not typically be met.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60327 (Daniels Bros - Shefford Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Support for proposal that where the development is solely for Build to Rent, there could be a proportionate reduction in affordable housing. However, this

should also apply to developments where part of the residential uses are Build to Rent.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57283 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments

- The proposed policy direction wording should be amended to make it clear that on sites of 10 or more private residential dwellings 40% of new homes will be required to be affordable.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59094 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 23

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to exception sites for affordable housing. 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

Executive Summary

General support for the policy with parish councils and individuals seeking stronger controls whilst developers prefer a more flexible approach. The stronger controls suggested include: the requirement for local community support and/or leadership; robust evidence of local need; stricter criteria particularly in the green belt; local connection policies; no market housing; and prioritising the most sustainable communities and community led housing initiatives. Those arguing for more flexibility suggested: prioritising key workers alongside local people; allowing schemes in the green belt and across all types of villages; and a more positive approach to market housing.

There was some concern that rural exception schemes could be used as a trojan horse to enable larger schemes or schemes on unsuitable sites to come forward. However, it was also suggested that rejected larger/unsuitable sites should be considered for rural exception schemes.

There was a preference for rural exception sites to be prioritised over First Homes exceptions sites with green belt controls seen as a key tool for achieving this.

Table of representations: H/ES - Exception sites for affordable housing

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception site policy is supported

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58574 (T Hawkins)
- 58778* (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception sites should only be permitted if they have the full support of the local community/ parish council

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56650 (Gamlingay PC)
- 56770 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Schemes should originate from and be directed by the local community, not a developer

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57598 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception sites should only be created in response to objectively assessed local need

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60796 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Can a cascade be used to ensure unfilled properties are offered to households in neighbouring villages before the rest of the district?

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58574 (T Hawkins)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Local connection criteria should be applied in perpetuity

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60020 (Steeple Morden PC)
- 60096 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception sites should be able to cater for key workers as well as local people. Key workers should be eligible on exception sites in the green belt

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58981 (Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support policy emphasis on “community led housing initiatives such as community land trusts, co-housing and co-operatives”

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60796 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

A range of sites for rural exception schemes should be considered including parts of larger sites rejected through the planning process and other sites that have not come forward because they are unsuitable for larger scale housing

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59801 (Histon & Impington CLT)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception sites should only be permitted where there is appropriate village infrastructure and public transport

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58191 (Cllr Gough)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Stricter criteria should be used in permitting sites in the green belt

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56816 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

“Rural exception sites will be allowed in the Green Belt only when it can be demonstrated that non Green-Belt alternative sites are not available” should be rigorously enforced.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60796 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Agree that First Homes Exceptions Sites should not be allowed in the green belt

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58934 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Should only be allowed outside existing planning boundaries in very exceptional circumstances where there is a very strong and demonstrable need, and there are no sites available within the boundary

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57598 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Market housing should not be allowed in exception schemes

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56650 (Gamlingay PC)
- 58281 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Custom/ self build should be excluded from exception schemes as they will cause maintenance and management issues. If allowed, re-sales should be restricted for at least 5 years after completion

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 56650 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception sites can deliver affordable housing without the need for larger unsustainable market housing schemes

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57743 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

An element of market housing should be allowed to support viability

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57185 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57262 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
- 57529 (H d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Sites in the green belt should be allowed

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57185 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
- 57262 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Further flexibility within the Green Belt should be allowed for traditional rural exception sites where there is a demonstrable local housing need

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59215 (bpha)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy should not be overly restrictive on the scale of schemes permitted in Group Villages

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57470 (Colegrove Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception sites should be allowed in all settlements regardless of category provided they are proportionate

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57529 (H d'Abo)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Should recognise that where there is evidence of need, schemes which meet this need should be supported even where it may be contrary to other policy objectives.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 58778* (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

First Homes exception sites should not replace traditional exception sites as the preferred type of delivery

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59215 (bpha)
- 60796 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Concerned Exception Sites policy becomes a loophole for building on sites where development would not otherwise be permitted.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 60796 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

- 60426 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Exception site policy should not be used to allow large scale market housing led schemes

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59590 (Campaign for Protection of Rural England)
- 60426 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Do not support this policy.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57587* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

No comment

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 57443 (Huntingdonshire DC)

H/HM: Housing mix

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/HM: Housing mix > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 23

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes and Wellbeing and Social Inclusion headings as the comments were specific to housing mix. 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

Executive Summary

Support, from Parish Councils and site promoters, for the approach that new developments should have a mix of housing sizes. However, site promoters are seeking more flexibility in the approach to allow for changing market conditions, changing requirements, and site specific circumstances. Site promoters suggest the policy does not stipulate percentages, includes indicative mix only or the ranges for some housing sizes and tenures are amended, and that each development should determine its own mix. Parish Councils would like policy to address need for provision of bungalows and protection of existing smaller homes. Comments that housing mix should allow for the provision of homes for young single person households. A site promoter objects to the potential to include a planning condition that removes permitted development rights for extensions where that would cause harm to the housing mix. Another site promoter highlights that use class C2 schemes with self-contained dwellings will not always be able to provide the mixes suggested due to their different requirements.

Table of representations: H/HM - Housing mix

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Good mix is essential for all ages / need a mix of dwellings within a development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56771 (Croydon PC)

56746* (Croydon PC)

58283 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Welcome approach to identify broad ranges as recommendations but with encouragement to work with a Registered Provider, the Council's housing team, and Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service to discuss final mix for a new development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58595 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for approach that new developments should have an appropriate mix of housing sizes.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58822 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

58905 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for approach that provides recommendations and that these are set out as a range, as this will allow flexibility to respond to changing market conditions and requirements.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59532 (Countryside Properties - Bourn Airfield)

60532 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

60592 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for policy applying to 10 or more dwellings, but would also suggest a higher threshold of 1 hectare, as housing mix on smaller sites will be dictated by size, location and topography.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60149 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Smaller units (1 & 2 bed) should be designed so they cannot be extended. Historically, smaller units have been extended reducing the pool of smaller homes available.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56651 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Need for bungalows – to address the overall lack of bungalows in the area and for downsizers.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57744 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

58472 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Need a much higher proportion of ‘Homes for Life’.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58283 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy is about right.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60427 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Object to potential for a planning condition to be attached that removes permitted development rights for extensions that would cause harm to the housing mix – this is overly cautious and too restrictive.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57186 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support for flexibility to allow exceptions to the proposed housing mix where justified by specific circumstances.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57284 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial)

59502 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy must recognise that housing offer on some sites is tailored to meet specific needs rather than a broader housing mix. Need to include flexibility to allow for important locations to develop housing mix for their specific needs and site specific policies for these sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58905 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Wording needs to be more flexible and not stipulate set percentages. Should be worded to be flexible to changing needs over time. Will ensure policy does not become out of date, as well as allowing needs to be met over the plan period, schemes can be designed to meet specific needs or character of the area.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57393 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

58555 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Recommend that avoid prescriptive housing mix requirement, and instead allow schemes to determine own appropriate mix based on location. Policy could include an indicative mix to be encouraged if appropriate. Housing provided needs to reflect the needs across the area and the policy should be flexible to recognise that housing needs will change over the plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60319 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy should ensure that regard also had to relevant and up to date evidence, as proposed housing mix is a snapshot in time.

Comments highlighting this issue:

60149 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy should include specific reference to ‘the nature and location of the site and the type of housing proposed’ to ensure the right homes are built in the right locations. Town centres are better suited to smaller households. Also, exact mix may depend on whether the homes are for rent or sale.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59502 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy should include flexibility on unit mix where majority of proposed housing is affordable, to prevent them being unattractive or less viable. Allowing some schemes to focus on particular sizes to encourage delivery will make an important contribution

to meeting local needs, whereas requiring all schemes to meet a specific mix will result in a reduction in housing delivery.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59504 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Policy should include specific reference to the need to “provide affordable ownership housing for young single person households”.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59506 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

The proposed proportion of 4+ bed market housing in the rural area is too high and should be reduced.

Comments highlighting this issue:

56651 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Flats or houses for young, single professionals are needed as there is no post graduate provision by the universities.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59278* (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

If percentages are retained in the policy, 3 bed market dwellings should be amended to 40-60% and 4 bed market dwellings should be amended to 20-35% for both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire - to be in line with housing needs survey which recognises the need for family homes, and increasing 3 bed homes will support downsizing.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57393 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Prescriptive nature of tenure mix for market homes is not robust and should be amended to enable developers to deliver a mix of homes that will respond to local market demand.

Comments highlighting this issue:

58555 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Consideration needed on a site by site basis for Use Class C2 schemes where it is not always appropriate or viable to provide larger properties. Policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to recognise that specialist housing for older people serves a different market with specific requirements.

Comments highlighting this issue:

59743 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Approved developments such as Waterbeach or Bourn Airfield should be made to change their plans if a good housing mix is not provided.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57587* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue:

57444 (Huntingdonshire DC)

H/HD: Housing density

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/HD: Housing density > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 31

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to

housing density. 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

Executive Summary

General support for the policy, with developers supporting that there is no specific density figure being required, seeking to make the most of sustainable sites, and noting that the policy adheres to NPPF. Other comments include that it should be a design-led approach, appropriate to local circumstances, and that the drive for higher density should not override consideration of landscape, townscape and heritage impacts from inappropriately tall buildings. Parish councils were concerned that rural and non-rural areas should not be the same density.

Comments that lockdowns underscored the crucial role of green spaces and corridors for the mental and physical health, especially for those living in high density housing, and that the policy should ensure accessible green space provision and provide opportunities for food growing where private gardens are not provided.

It was suggested that the policy should be amended to require smaller units on higher density sites in town centres and close to transport interchanges and on small, constrained sites, as these are less suited to families. There was a suggestion the policy should allow room for extensions to help families adapt and remain within their homes and communities. Also, to address concerns that at higher densities parking and hard landscaping areas increase the risk of surface water flooding, that the policy should require use of permeable materials.

Wide ranging concerns included that there is a need for proper family homes with gardens, higher densities will create the ‘slums of tomorrow’ leading to anti-social behaviour, crime, anxiety and mental ill-health, that a lack of parking impacts on community cohesion, and that there have been poor schemes in the past, with the Cambridge Station area mentioned. Concern that if densities are increased too much it might decrease the quality of life, and might impact the quality of the city, including its economic prospects as companies will not want to move here.

Table of representations: H/HD - Housing density

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support policy

Comments highlighting this issue:

Public Bodies

- 57745 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Other Organisations

- 59149 (University of Cambridge)
- 60480 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners

- 57285 (Universities Superannuation Scheme)
- 58599 (Marshall Group Properties)
- 58823 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company, joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme)
- 60162 (U&I PLC and Town)
- 60320 (Gladman Developments)
- 60533 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60593 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support policy, but with caveats including:

- Sites in Town Centres or close to transport interchanges suit increased housing densities but less so for families. Policy should emphasize smaller units (e.g., 1-bedroom, 1-person homes).
- Smaller, constrained sites likely suit smaller unit types with less private amenity/play space; roof gardens and community spaces should be encouraged.

Comments highlighting this issue:

- 59508 (Pocket Living)
- 59510 (Pocket Living duplicate comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support policy with caveats that:

- Standards for accessible green space provision must be met.
- Building height is not addressed; housing density should not override landscape impact considerations (tall buildings).

- Where private gardens are absent, opportunities for local food growing (allotments, community farming) should be provided.
- Plenty of public realm green space is necessary.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60797 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
- 57779* (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support policy adhering to the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework).

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60533 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60320 (Gladman Developments)
- 60593 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments:

Support no specific density figure being required.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60533 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- 60593 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57455 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Object to policy on grounds that:

- High densities are inappropriate for families; ‘proper’ family homes with generous gardens are needed.
- High densities may create ‘slums of tomorrow’ with antisocial behavior, crime, anxiety, and mental ill-health.
- Could result in small builds with little outside green space.
- Past mistakes have led to high-rise housing with poor green infrastructure and lack of open space.

- Increasing population in a small city risks quality of life and economic objectives; companies may avoid the area.
- Poor schemes, such as around Cambridge Station, cited as examples.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56531 (D Kelleway)
- 57564 (Save Honey Hill Group)
- 57624 (J Pratt)
- 57695 (J Conroy)
- 59143 (F Gawthrop)
- 59835 (Dry Drayton PC)
- 59242* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Density should be appropriate to local circumstances.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56652 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Don’t underestimate value of Clare Hall Sports Ground and ecological corridor as vital green lung, important especially for mental and physical health of residents in high-density housing, underscored by Covid-19 lockdowns.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56697 (Margery Evans)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Quality of life depends on reasonable space inside and outside homes.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56772 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Competition for parking spaces harms community cohesion; suggest journey budgets be used to determine housing numbers in rural areas to restrain development and reduce parking competition.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57119 (P Bird)

Summary of issues raised in comments

For stable communities, householders need sufficient room for extensions to help young families stay; growth of individual properties should factor into housing density assessments.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57119 (P Bird)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Previous SCDC Local Plan limited rural site density to 30 dwellings per hectare; pleased that strict prescription has been relaxed.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57119 (P Bird)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Rural areas must not have the same density as non-rural areas; Great Shelford Village opposes high density.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58284 (Histon & Impington PC)
- 59277 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Minimum home sizes must be defined and enforced without exception.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58284 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support delivery of appropriate site-specific net densities; higher densities to be encouraged on sites with good accessibility for efficient use of sustainable locations.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58823 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company, joint venture Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme)
- 59149 (University of Cambridge)
- 60533 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support design-led approach to determine optimum capacity and appropriate density reflecting local character, especially in villages.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60140 (C Blakeley)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Council previously failed to secure sufficient open space in developments, leading to poor resident environments; section 106 funds often spent elsewhere.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59143 (F Gawthrop)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambourne Town Council requests careful consideration of densities to ensure sufficient open space and biodiversity in new developments; positive lessons should be learned from Cambourne's green space provision.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59303 (Cambourne Town Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Adequate allotment provision helps make dense developments sustainable by providing garden space near homes for all residents.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59305 (D Fox)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy should specifically reference impacts on historic environment, heritage assets, townscape, and landscape.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59683 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Historic England welcomes site-specific design-led approach with site and area design codes to guide development.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59683 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Commentator questions whether the policy will be properly controlled/enforced.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60428 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

High-density developments face risk from increased car parking and hard landscaping leading to surface water flooding; policy and monitoring should maximize permeable materials and prevent post-development hard landscaping.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60480 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Densely developed areas create ill health and should not be allowed.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57587* (D Lott)

Comments relating to specific sites

Summary of issues raised in comments

Relating to policy H/HD, if the density is increased too much, this might decrease the quality of life and harm the economic objectives of the plan as companies might not want to move here. This is of particular relevance to the size and scale of S/NEC / NECAAP.

Comments highlighting this issue

57564 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57624 (J Pratt), 57695 (J Conroy)

Summary of issues raised in comments

In relation to H/HD, it is important to apply a design-led approach to determine the optimum development capacity of sites in order to make the best use of land. See in particular our response to S/NWC: North West Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue

59149 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments

In relation to H/HD, Marshall is supportive of a design-led approach to density that encourages each site to make the best use of land. Marshall has recently appointed specialist landscape architects who will be advising on the opportunities and constraints across the Cambridge East site and what these mean for densities and heights that can be supported across the development. It is intended that this work will feed into the discussions that Marshall will continue with the GCSP in order to help in demonstrating the capacity of the site and begin to establish design principles.

Comments highlighting this issue

58599 (Marshall Group Properties)

H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 19

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to garden land and subdivision of existing plots. 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

Executive Summary

General support for the policy from a range of public bodies and third sector organisations, although there were some additional comments that gardens can help

mitigate surface water flooding and provide buffer zones to ecological sites, the policy needs to be strongly worded to prevent detrimental impact on neighbours, and there is a need to consider each proposal on a case by case basis. A parish council commented that green space is needed around properties in rural settings and developments in villages should have gardens of reasonable size. One individual was opposed to sub-division of plots unless on very large plots where in keeping with the surroundings.

Concern was raised that there is often little biodiversity mitigation required for in-fill developments and that there has been a gradual loss of green habitat and trees, it was suggested the policy should be strongly worded to require biodiversity mitigation/enhancement. Also, Anglian Water were concerned that parking and hard landscaping areas increase the risk of surface water flooding and suggest the policy should require use of permeable materials.

Table of representations: H/GL - Garden land and subdivision of existing plots

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals:
• 60141 (C Blakeley)
Public Bodies:
• 56653 (Gamlingay PC), 56920 (Cllr. D Sergeant/ West Wickham PC), 57746 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59684 (Historic England), 59836 (Dry Drayton PC), 60021 (Steeple Morden PC), 60097 (Guilden Morden PC)
Third Sector Organisations:
• 56996 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57108 (Fulbourn Swifts Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy, but with caveats including:
• Gardens can help mitigate surface water flooding and support introduction of a condition that permeable surfaces must be used if gardens are converted to driveways.
• Policy should specifically recognise importance of large gardens adjoining sites of biodiversity and ecological importance as buffer zones protected from development by subdivision.
• Needs careful case-by-case consideration, especially regarding access and neighbours.

• Policy should reinforce positive benefits like appropriate development opportunities, windfall housing, and sustainment of communities.
• Policy needs to be strongly worded and rigorously applied to prevent detrimental impacts on neighbours through changes in character, massing, and loss of trees.

Comments highlighting this issue
57972 (E Davies), 56773 (Croydon PC), 58142 (M Asplin), 58937 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60798 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Careful consideration needed for each application.

Comments highlighting this issue
60429 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Planning permission for in-fill developments often lacks biodiversity mitigation, causing reduction in green habitat and reducing green network value. Suggest policy include specific mitigation/enhancement requirements for biodiversity.

Comments highlighting this issue
57108 (Fulbourn Swifts Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue
57446 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge Past, Present & Future has seen developments approved causing significant loss of trees; policy needs to be strongly worded and rigorously applied.

Comments highlighting this issue
58937 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green space needed around properties in rural settings. Developments in and around villages should have reasonably sized gardens.

Comments highlighting this issue
59276 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Higher density developments risk increased car parking and hard landscaping, which can increase surface water flooding risk. Request policies H/HD and H/GL be enforced to maximise permeable materials and prevent hard landscaping post-development.

Comments highlighting this issue
60481 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Garden land must not be developed. Sub-division of existing plots must be prevented except on very large plots in keeping with surroundings.

Comments highlighting this issue
57587* (D Lott)

H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 21

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to residential space standards and accessible homes. 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

Executive Summary

Support for use of nationally described space standards from a mix of respondents. However, site promoters and housebuilders have asked for additional evidence and justification for their use as required by the NPPF. A statement that there are no nationally prescribed standards for use class C2 schemes.

General support for requirements for accessible and adaptable homes – meeting M4(2) and M4(3) standards. However, specific comments seeking higher proportion of homes required to meet M4(3) standards and requesting that this applies to both market and affordable homes. An individual is seeking amendments from these national standards. Site promoters and housebuilders suggest that additional evidence and justification is needed, and that an ageing population alone is not a reason to seek these standards.

Support for requirement that new homes should have their own private amenity space, but with some respondents seeking flexibility as they do not believe that it is always necessary. A request that student accommodation is exempt from this requirement.

Table of representations: H/SS - Residential space standards and accessible homes

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the policy.
Comments highlighting this issue
57447 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57747 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), bpha (59223), 60430 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 60594 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broadly support requirement for nationally described residential space standards, but should be treated as bare minimum.
Comments highlighting this issue
60799 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Okay, provided that developers don’t ask for retrospective changes.
Comments highlighting this issue
59837 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Use of nationally described residential space standards is supported.
Comments highlighting this issue
56530 (D Kelleway), 59512 (Pocket Living), 60534 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 59242* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Essential as people should be able to own a home for life and not need to move for accessibility.
Comments highlighting this issue
56774 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Residential conversions and homes created through change of use should meet nationally described residential space standards.
Comments highlighting this issue
56530 (D Kelleway), 59242* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need evidence and justification per NPPF for inclusion of nationally described residential space standards; viability is key.
Comments highlighting this issue
57395 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 60146 (Home Builders Federation), 60227 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60556 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Councils should lobby for nationally described residential space standards to become part of Building Regulations rather than optional planning policies.
Comments highlighting this issue
56530 (D Kelleway), 59242* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of M4(2) and M4(3) requirements.
Comments highlighting this issue
60534 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support for M4(3) provision, but proportion required should be higher.
Comments highlighting this issue
56654 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
M4(3) standards should not just relate to initial occupier; safeguards needed against making properties less accessible over time.
Comments highlighting this issue
56654 (Gamlingay PC), 57599 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy needs to include a proportion of market housing to meet M4(3) wheelchair adaptable standards per Housing Needs of Specific Groups study.
Comments highlighting this issue
57447 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57599 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Huntingdonshire DC successfully introduced higher standards; consistency across

area may improve viability.

Comments highlighting this issue

57447 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Ageing population alone is not justification for increased M4(2) and M4(3) requirements; otherwise would be in Building Regulations.

Comments highlighting this issue

57395 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need evidence as required by PPG for any M4(2) and/or M4(3) standards.

Comments highlighting this issue

57395 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 60227 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60556 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

If all homes are required to meet M4(2), some flexibility is needed for schemes where this is not achievable.

Comments highlighting this issue

57395 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Specific requirements sought to amend M4(2) standards related to toilet layouts and step-free access.

Comments highlighting this issue

57599 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concerns that homes for disabled occupants could have smaller floor area than those for able-bodied occupants.

Comments highlighting this issue

58286 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Consider accessibility of existing housing stock and how those with mobility difficulties can adapt their homes.

Comments highlighting this issue

60146 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support requirement that new homes should have private amenity space.

Comments highlighting this issue

58827 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Policy should recognise that not every home can or needs to have direct access to private amenity space.

Comments highlighting this issue
59512 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Generous minimum private amenity space standards are needed.
Comments highlighting this issue
56530 (D Kelleway), 59242* (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Expect definition of amenity space standards in future drafts of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan, subject to consultation.
Comments highlighting this issue
57395 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should confirm that student accommodation is exempt.
Comments highlighting this issue
59098 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should allow flexibility on constrained or unfeasible sites so they are not discouraged from delivery.
Comments highlighting this issue
59512 (Pocket Living), 60146 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Requirements should be factored into site capacity and viability considerations to ensure deliverability.
Comments highlighting this issue
60594 (Countryside Properties - Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No nationally prescribed space standards for Use Class C2 schemes, but operators will provide a range of units to meet housing mix.
Comments highlighting this issue
59744 (Endurance Estates)

H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 18

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to specialist housing and homes for older people. 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

Executive Summary

General support for a policy focus on specialist housing and homes for older people from parish councils and developers. Parish councils want housing for older people to be integrated within wider communities and close to local services and transport. They also call for more independent living opportunities for the more able elderly to allow downsizing and for accommodation to be sufficiently flexible to allow people to stay in their homes if their mobility decreases. Developers want more land set aside for specialist housing and homes for older people with specific allocations to avoid crowding out from other housing types. They argue for a greater variety of sites to increase choice for older people. They also argue that the First Proposals are too dependent on urban extensions and new settlements and call for more brownfield and windfall sites in urban and suburban locations alongside release of land in the green belt. One developer supports the continuation of the existing approach used in Cambridge based on the criteria-based Policy 47: 'Specialist Housing' within the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan.

Table of representations: H/SH - Specialist housing and homes for older people

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy supported.
Comments highlighting this issue
57748 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60800 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Specialist housing for older people should be treated as a priority.
Comments highlighting this issue
60431 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Older people should be housed within mixed developments rather than isolated or clustered.

Comments highlighting this issue
56775 (Croydon PC), 59275 (Gt Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Specialist housing for older people should be planned alongside the types of facilities that older people need.

Comments highlighting this issue
60800 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Specialist housing for older people is important and should be developed near local shops and good transport.

Comments highlighting this issue
57587* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
GCLP evidence base under-estimates the need for specialist housing for older people, especially extra-care housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
59747 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The current development plan provision does not meet national policy requirements.

Comments highlighting this issue
59747 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The GCLP should set a target for specialist housing for older people with an adequate supply maintained and effective monitoring to enable shortfalls to be identified and addressed.

Comments highlighting this issue
60145 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Provision of specialist housing should be determined on a case-by-case basis when dealing with large developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
(No direct comment number provided)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A threshold should be set at which specialist housing for older people should be included in larger developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
57286 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 60535 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60595 (Countryside Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Requirements for specialist housing should be explicitly set out in allocation policies.

Comments highlighting this issue
(No direct comment number provided)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Providers of specialist housing for older people can't compete for sites with mainstream housebuilders.

Comments highlighting this issue
57397 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 58728 (Scott Properties), 59747 (Endurance Estates), 60145 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is a need for more, and a greater variety of, sites for specialist housing to ensure sufficient delivery in the early years of the plan and that people have choices about where to live.

Comments highlighting this issue
58728 (Scott Properties), 59747 (Endurance Estates), 60145 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The First Proposals are too dependent on urban extensions and new settlements for the provision of specialist housing for older people.

Comments highlighting this issue
59747 (Endurance Estates), 60145 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Specialist housing for older people should be encouraged on brownfield and windfall sites in urban and suburban locations to enable people to stay in their communities.

Comments highlighting this issue
60145 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Allowing more growth in villages helps to sustain local services and facilities which further helps older people who have a higher propensity to live in rural communities.

Comments highlighting this issue
58728 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Disagree with the view that the need for specialist accommodation does not justify the exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue
58728 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The number of houses suitable for wheelchair users should be based on estimates of the wheelchair user population and should be sufficient to provide people with choices about where to live.

Comments highlighting this issue
57601 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There should be more independent living opportunities for the more able elderly which will also encourage downsizing, thereby freeing up larger homes for larger families.
Comments highlighting this issue
(No direct comment number provided)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need more bungalows with appropriate adaptations and flexibilities for older people and downsizers.
Comments highlighting this issue
59462 (G Rose), 58473 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Housing for older people should be suitable until end of life and not require older people to move if mobility decreases.
Comments highlighting this issue
58288 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support continuation of existing approach used in Cambridge based on criteria-based Policy 47: 'Specialist Housing' within the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan, which outlines four criteria for net loss of specialist residential floorspace.
Comments highlighting this issue
58830 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company - joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue
57448 (Huntingdonshire DC)

H/CB: Self and custom build homes

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/CB: Self and custom build homes > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 28

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to self and custom build homes. 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

Executive Summary

Some general support for the policy, however detailed comments from developers / housebuilders on specifics of the proposed approach. Support for requirement for self and custom build homes being linked to demand on the Self and Custom Build Register – site promoters highlight that this will mean that continual monitoring is required to ensure up to date information is available. Comments from some that the proposed approach will not deliver the necessary plots to meet the demand from the register and that the plots will not meet the wishes of those on the register, but this is countered by others that consider that the proposed approach will deliver more plots than there is demand for. Requests for further evidence and justification for the proposed approach, including the requirement for 5% self and custom build homes on major developments. Site promoters suggest that the policy should have a more flexible approach that supports self and custom build developments on the edge of settlements. Developers / housebuilders have highlighted concerns about the viability of the proposed approach and also that the marketing period for a custom and self build plot before it can be built without the self and custom build restrictions should be reduced to 6 months. Home Builders Federation suggest that including self and custom build plots within major developments adds to the complexity of their delivery. Specific request for custom finish to be included within the policy to enable high density developments to be able to comply with the requirements.

Table of representations: H/CB - Self and custom build homes

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support / welcome a policy / broadly support.
Comments highlighting this issue
57749 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60321 (Gladman Developments), 60801 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), 60536 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60228 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support, provided there is suitable land available.
Comments highlighting this issue
56777 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
NPPF does not stipulate requirements for sites to include custom or self-build homes, therefore positive that the policy notes that there must be demand on the register for this to be a requirement.
Comments highlighting this issue
60536 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There should be a condition on the length of time the occupant must remain before the dwelling can be sold.
Comments highlighting this issue
56655 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Where there are existing dwellings nearby, the timescales for build-out of self or custom build homes mean there is likely to be a problem of noise and disturbance.
Comments highlighting this issue
56655 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Importance of providing sufficient custom build plots for meeting local housing need has not been adequately addressed.
Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The proposed policy direction of only allowing self and custom build within large developments or where residential development would be allowed means that only urban areas are served, failing rural demand.
Comments highlighting this issue
56960 (S Jevon and D Raven)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Custom build is not in conflict with local rural exception sites policies, national exception sites policies, or emerging First Homes policies.
Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Broader approach required to ensure demand on the self-build register can be met, allowing small and medium-sized sites adjacent to all tiers of settlements.
Comments highlighting this issue
56960 (S Jevon and D Raven)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy is overly prescriptive; Council should promote self and custom build opportunities on village edges.
Comments highlighting this issue
57187 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57265 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Current approach won't deliver enough self and custom build plots in the right locations; a more positive approach needed, similar to rural exception sites at Group Villages or above.

Comments highlighting this issue
57469 (Colegrove Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Approach promoting bespoke developer-led self and custom build housing needed, with supportive policy for small/medium wholly self/custom build sites.
Comments highlighting this issue
59797 (Leaper Land Promotion)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Stronger policy basis needed for custom build sites not part of major developments.
Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
More focused policy split across administrative areas would encourage self-build plots in the right locations; combining registers is illogical given varying preferred locations.
Comments highlighting this issue
57312 (C Sawyer Nutt), 59204 (Endurance Estates), 60344 (FC Butler Trust), 60355 (FC Butler Trust), 60370 (The Critchley Family), 60393 (D Wright), 60461 (P, J & M Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Recommend flexibility to allow negotiation based on demand or viability to avoid housing delivery delays.
Comments highlighting this issue
60321 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be tested through viability assessment to ensure cumulative policy impacts don’t risk Local Plan implementation.
Comments highlighting this issue
60321 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern about viability of requiring a percentage of self-build plots on new developments.
Comments highlighting this issue
57187 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57265 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Developers of large sites may argue later that viability/construction issues prevent delivery of self/custom build homes, a concern given demand.
Comments highlighting this issue
57469 (Colegrove Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Do not support this policy.
Comments highlighting this issue
57587* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Object—need further evidence to justify 5% self or custom build dwellings within new developments; current evidence is too high level.
Comments highlighting this issue
57398 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Plots on sites of 20+ dwellings unlikely to meet register requirements.
Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Blanket approach for developments 20+ dwellings is inappropriate; should focus on strategic allocations based on identified need.
Comments highlighting this issue
60228 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60557 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
More information needed on 5% self and custom build requirement and its impact on developments.
Comments highlighting this issue
58833 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)

Summary of issues raised in comments
5% requirement equates to up to 2,220 homes—more than five times people on register; policy not justified by demand.
Comments highlighting this issue
60596 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No evidence supporting policy linked to demand or agreements on sites with custom build homes secured.
Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Needs cascade mechanism to revert unsold self/custom build homes back to market dwellings.
Comments highlighting this issue
60321 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cascade mechanism should be shortened to 6 months to avoid empty plots and delivery delays.

Comments highlighting this issue
57398 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 60144 (Home Builders Federation), 60536 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60596 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cascade mechanism should be lengthened to 24 months to allow self-builders enough time; 12 months too short.
Comments highlighting this issue
58289 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Self and custom build plots add complexity: coordination issues, health and safety concerns with multiple contractors on site.
Comments highlighting this issue
60144 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy wording needs to support custom finish; otherwise, high-density developments (e.g., North East Cambridge) may struggle to comply.
Comments highlighting this issue
60163 (U&I PLC and TOWN)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Object: existing policy ineffective; since 2017 no permissions granted despite 479 people on register, so policy shouldn't be carried forward.
Comments highlighting this issue
59797 (Leaper Land Promotion)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Demand levels seem high but unclear if registers have been reviewed; other areas have seen falling numbers.
Comments highlighting this issue
60144 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy needs to be reasonably related to demand with evidence of plot delivery to be found sound.
Comments highlighting this issue
60144 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Demand from Greater Cambridge Self Build Register cannot currently be met by implementable planning permissions.
Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Self Build Register inadequate as evidence base; lacks info on plots and locations, suggesting officers haven't identified suitable plots.

Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Continuous monitoring needed to update register to reflect permissions and any plots reverting to market dwellings after marketing period.

Comments highlighting this issue
57312 (C Sawyer Nutt), 59204 (Endurance Estates), 60344 (FC Butler Trust), 60355 (FC Butler Trust), 60370 (The Critchley Family), 60393 (D Wright), 60461 (P, J & M Crow)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Local authority should clarify how non-planning policy approaches have been considered.

Comments highlighting this issue
57398 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Query on selection criteria for register inclusion; can non-Greater Cambridge residents bid for sites?

Comments highlighting this issue
60801 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Windfall allowance should exclude custom build plots; specific sites should be identified, similar to rural exception sites for affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue
59024 (I Beamon)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Will policies on net zero buildings (CC/NZ) and water efficiency (CC/WE) apply to self and custom build homes?

Comments highlighting this issue
60801 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Specific developments promoting self and custom build dwellings: land south of Lanacre, Chrishill Road, Fowlmere.

Comments highlighting this issue
57469 (Colegrove Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
57449 (Huntingdonshire DC)

H/BR: Build to rent homes

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/BR: Build to rent homes > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 18

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to build to rent homes. 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

Executive Summary

There is support from site promoters and developers, and some Parish Councils, for the proposed approach to Build to Rent, given that it plays an important role in meeting housing needs, provides choice to residents and diversifies the housing market, and helps to create mixed and balanced communities. However, there are differing opinions on whether 20% affordable homes is the right approach, and strong objections from site promoters to any kind of restriction or limit on the amount of Build to Rent allowed within a development. Some site promoters and developers have suggested that there needs to be more flexibility within the proposed approach, and that more research is needed on Build to Rent by the Councils to inform the Local Plan and North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. An individual is concerned that there are already too many Build to Rent developments.

Table of representations: H/BR - Build to rent homes

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support
Comments highlighting this issue
57750 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy objective to create mixed and balanced communities is supported.
Comments highlighting this issue
59514 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supporting delivery of Build to Rent in appropriate locations is consistent with Housing Strategy, and failure to support Build to Rent will reduce overall delivery of good quality rental homes.
Comments highlighting this issue
59514 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Good option that should be encouraged.
Comments highlighting this issue
56778 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of Build to Rent being supported in the Local Plan as: it can help contribute towards solving the housing shortage, it can provide suitable accommodation in highly sustainable locations, it plays an important role in meeting housing needs, it provides choice to residents and diversifies the housing market, professional management services often used which can help maintain high quality of housing, tenants tend to want longer tenancies which can help foster stronger sense of community, and / or it can help increase delivery rates.
Comments highlighting this issue
57287 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 58234 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 58836 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 59274 (Brookgate), 58682 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen), 56709 (Watkin Jones Group PLC), 59533 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60597 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue
57450 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Object, as policy should require 40% affordable rented homes.
Comments highlighting this issue
58290 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Generally support the proposed 20% affordable private rented dwellings requirement, however, policy should include an option to submit and agree viability assessments where schemes cannot sustain the full policy target.
Comments highlighting this issue
58972 (Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support requirement to provide 20% of homes as affordable private rent, however policy needs to be clear this assumes a 20% discount to market rent.
Comments highlighting this issue
59515 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Do not support any potential restriction on the quantum of Build to Rent within a mixed tenure development. Need flexibility to be able to respond to change and particular housing needs. Build to Rent needs to be provided at a sufficient scale to be attractive to investors, be commercially viable, and be suitable in terms of management.
Comments highlighting this issue
59274 (Brookgate), 56709 (Watkin Jones Group PLC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Unjustified to include a limit on the proportion of Build to Rent within a development. No such restriction could be applied to other forms of private rented accommodation.
Comments highlighting this issue
59533 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60597 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposals should seek to avoid large clusters of Build to Rent homes, but the policy should allow for appropriately sized clusters that assist with viability, delivery and management.
Comments highlighting this issue
58234 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Any proposed upper limit on proportion of Build to Rent homes needs to be properly evidenced and justified. An upper limit of 10% is unlikely to support the delivery of Build to Rent homes on developments across Greater Cambridge, which are seeking to provide Build to Rent as part of the overall housing offer.
Comments highlighting this issue
58234 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should not set arbitrary restrictions on minimum or maximum proportion of homes which can be Build to Rent within individual schemes. Amount suitable should be determined having regard to a range of factors including local housing need, nature of the site, and surrounding housing provision.
Comments highlighting this issue
59514 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy requirement for the affordable homes to be distributed in a set way is unnecessary as affordable housing in Build to Rent schemes is provided/managed by the same operator as the market homes and therefore is tenure blind.
Comments highlighting this issue
59517 (Pocket Living)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Developers seem to win out over renters.
Comments highlighting this issue
59838 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Accept that private rented sector has a role to play in meeting housing need, however, the sector is failing to provide secure, affordable and high standard homes. Reform is needed at a national level, but local policy should limit the damage.
Comments highlighting this issue
60802 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Fundamental drawback is that affordability cannot be guaranteed, as it depends on wider market conditions.
Comments highlighting this issue
60802 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Unclear how much of the policy is enforceable and how much is negotiable as too many references to 'should' rather than 'must'. For example, will all developments have to meet the standards set out in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD?
Comments highlighting this issue
60802 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be greater ambition in the provision of affordable housing. Recognise national benchmark is 20%, but given affordable housing crisis in Cambridge, should require a much greater proportion of affordable housing in these developments.
Comments highlighting this issue
60802 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should include flexibility so that if 40% affordable is being provided across a mix of tenures that the Build to Rent element would not be expected to provide affordable housing above 40%.
Comments highlighting this issue
58234 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Variety of business models exist for the provision of Build to Rent and therefore flexibility is needed within the policy to reflect this.
Comments highlighting this issue
59533 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60597 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
More research is needed by the Councils to inform the Local Plan and North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and to recognise the contribution that Build to Rent can make in sustainable locations.
Comments highlighting this issue
59274 (Brookgate)

Summary of issues raised in comments
PPG is clear that the onus is on LPAs to consider how Build to Rent can meet housing needs and create mixed and balanced communities. Concern that proposed policy seeks to direct this to the applicant.
Comments highlighting this issue
59533 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60597 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There are too many Build to Rent developments already.
Comments highlighting this issue
57587* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Specific developments promoted that provide opportunity for Build to Rent schemes in sustainable locations: North East Cambridge, Devonshire Gardens, Land west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn, Bourn Airfield New Village
Comments highlighting this issue
59274 (Brookgate), 58682 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen), 58234 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd), 59533 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60597 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 8

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to houses in multiple occupation. 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

Executive Summary

Despite the low number of responses there was no consensus. Those in support recognised the contribution HMOs make to the housing mix but also wanted the policy to include purpose built self-contained housing for single person households and to be tightened to improve the quality of HMO housing. However, some respondents were concerned that the development of HMOs has a negative effect on the character and social cohesion of neighbourhoods.

Table of representations: H/MO - Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)

Summary of issues raised in comments

We support this policy

- This is also an important part of the mixed housing

This policy is supported but it should also provide support for the delivery of purpose-built self-contained housing for single person households.

HMO's can be beneficial but often offer sub-standard housing. Rather than carrying forward existing policy, it should be reviewed to inform a revised policy

Continue controls on the conversion of homes into HMOs, particularly in the new developments in the Southern Fringe, where the changes required to make a home suitable (such as conversions and extensions) can have a negative effect on the urban design

The current policy of allowing larger properties to be converted to HMO's has had a significant impact on the residential area of South Petersfield through the loss of community cohesion and the ability of larger families to find suitable housing

Need policies to protect existing neighbourhoods from the incremental impact of inappropriate conversions/creation of HMOs

Do not support this policy.

No comment

Comments highlighting this issue

57751 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56779 (Croydon PC)

59519 (Pocket Living)

60803 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

56007 (Trumpington Residents Association)

59270 (F Gawthrop)

58014 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)

57587* (D Lott)

57451 (Huntingdonshire DC)

H/SA: Student Accommodation

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/SA: Student accommodation > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 13

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to student accommodation. 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

Executive Summary

There was general support for the proposed student accommodation policy approach subject to a review of the overall student accommodation need. Croydon PC raised concern about this need detracting from permanent local housing. One member of the public commented that there were already too many students. Histon & Impington PC objected to student accommodation not providing visitor parking.

In terms of location, site promoters requested the city centre be treated as an appropriate location for new student accommodation. On this matter, Linton PC supported the conversion of unused commercial buildings to student accommodation as a means of sustaining the city centre. One property developer suggested student accommodation directly adjacent to existing/proposed educational establishments should be supported.

The University of Cambridge raise concern about the intention for self-contained accommodation to be counted towards delivering the overall housing requirement for Greater Cambridge, and highlight that this approach should not be to the detriment of meeting other housing needs. Similarly, the Home Builders Federation highlighted the need for local evidence to ensure the dwelling equivalency rate used for student accommodation avoids overestimating the supply of homes returning to the open market.

Only ARU raised concern with the policy approach which it considered unduly restrictive in that individual sites are effectively required to remain in their current general residential or student use despite both contributing towards delivering the

overall housing requirement. It suggested more policy flexibility in relation to individual sites.

Table of representations: H/SA - Student accommodation

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy supported
Comments highlighting this issue
57288 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 57752 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The numbers for this need to be reviewed, so that it does not detract from permanent local housing.
Comments highlighting this issue
56780 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy supported. The proposed policy should recognise the city centre is an appropriate location for new student accommodation.
Comments highlighting this issue
57242 (Abrdn), 58226 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue
57452 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Student accommodation should not be an excuse to not provide parking. Vehicle parking will still be required. How else will they have visitors?
Comments highlighting this issue
58291 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy is unduly restrictive in that individual sites are effectively required to remain in their current general residential or student use whilst either/both contribute towards delivering the overall housing requirement. More flexibility in relation to individual sites should be included.
Comments highlighting this issue
58448 (ARU)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Unused commercial buildings could be converted to these – would also sustain the city centre.

Comments highlighting this issue
58475 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy supported. The policy could also support student accommodation directly adjacent to existing/proposed educational establishments. This will in turn achieve the currently adopted policy's (46) aims of locating such accommodation in areas served by sustainable transport modes and reducing pressure on the existing private residential housing stock.
Comments highlighting this issue
59101 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The intention for self-contained accommodation to count towards delivering the overall housing requirement for Greater Cambridge should not be at the expense of meeting other housing needs.
Comments highlighting this issue
59209 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Dwelling equivalent for student accommodation: local evidence is needed to ensure equivalency rate for student housing avoids overestimating the supply of homes returning to the open market.
Comments highlighting this issue
60184 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy supported. Need to await 2022 findings from Universities on demand for student accommodation.
Comments highlighting this issue
60804 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Already plenty of student accommodation.
Comments highlighting this issue
57587* (D Lott)

H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 14

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There is support for the principle of the dwellings in the countryside policy from some Parish Councils and the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties. Additionally, Pembroke College state the policy would provide flexibility for development in countryside whilst ensuring the setting is not adversely affected. Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggest a need for clarification in the supporting text on the meaning of replacement dwelling in the green belt not being 'materially larger', and Parish Councils suggest dwelling density in the countryside should differ from that in towns and cities, and prioritising agricultural, low paid, essential and rural workers.

KWA Architects object to the policy, requiring wording changes to extensions in the Green Belt taking account of the permitted development precedent, occupancy of rural workers dwellings allowing family-living rights, and a three-year limit on temporary dwellings for new rural businesses.

Historic England has concerns over reuse of buildings in the countryside highlighting that any proposals need to consider the historic environment and that heritage assets may form part of the local heritage of an area. Whilst Steeple Morden PC stress the importance of ensuring structures are sound. Croydon PC comment that dwellings should remain contiguous with villages, and Gamlingay PC state that stand-alone annexes should be refused permission to limit number and sprawl into open countryside.

Table of representations: H/DC - Dwellings in the countryside

Summary of issues raised in comments
Annex Accommodation: Refuse permission for stand-alone annex accommodation in the countryside. Connect to main dwelling house, preventing additional units in the open countryside. Current plan does not limit or control sprawl of associated buildings into open countryside.
Comments highlighting this issue
56656 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should remain contiguous with villages
Comments highlighting this issue
56781 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Object to Policy
Comments highlighting this issue
57049 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy wording changes required to extensions in the Green Belt to take account of the permitted development precedent
Comments highlighting this issue
57049 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy wording changes required regarding the occupancy of a rural worker's dwelling to allow for family-living rights
Comments highlighting this issue
57049 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy wording changes required regarding the occupancy of a rural worker's dwelling to allow for family-living rights
Comments highlighting this issue
57049 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy wording changes required for implementation timing of three-year limit on temporary dwellings for new rural businesses
Comments highlighting this issue
57049 (KWA Architects)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment
Comments highlighting this issue
57453 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support/Broadly Support Policy
Comments highlighting this issue
57753 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60098 (Guilden Morden PC), 60805 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy provides flexibility for development in countryside and ensures setting not adversely affected
Comments highlighting this issue
58270 (Pembroke College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Dwelling density in countryside should differ from density in towns and cities
Comments highlighting this issue
58292 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need priority for agricultural, low paid, essential and rural workers, not commuters
Comments highlighting this issue
58478 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supporting text needs clarity on meaning of replacement dwelling in the green belt not being 'materially larger'
Comments highlighting this issue
58944 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The reuse of buildings in the countryside needs to consider the historic environment. Heritage assets, designated or non-designated, may form part of the local heritage of an area
Comments highlighting this issue
59685 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support, stress the importance that ensure structures are sound
Comments highlighting this issue
60022 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy needs careful consideration
Comments highlighting this issue
60432 (Great and Little Chishill PC)

H/RM: Residential moorings

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/RM: Residential moorings > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 2

Note

- The representation summaries for Policy H/RM: Residential moorings were reported to JLPAG as part of Strategy and Sites alongside the comments on the overall housing need made to S/JH: New jobs and homes. The representation summaries are included again here as there are comments relating to the proposed approach to the policy, as well as relating to the overall housing need.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There was support for addressing provision from Huntingdonshire DC. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight the need for engagement, and for provision of appropriate facilities.

Table of representations: H/RM – Residential moorings

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support for extending the policy to the small proportion of River Great Ouse where the banks lie within South Cambridgeshire.

Comments highlighting this issue

57454 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Important to review successes and failures of existing policy to inform any necessary updates. Need to learn from previous consultations where proposals were met with fierce opposition.

Comments highlighting this issue

60806 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

There are issues with existing provision that should be considered:

- new moorings should have appropriate pump out facilities
- pontoons should be designed with a narrowboat in mind to ensure boats will fit
- fixtures for moorings need to be designed with caution, and reflecting need for boats to be able to move as water levels change

Comments highlighting this issue

60806 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

H/RC: Residential caravan sites

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/RC: Residential caravan sites > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 6

Notes

- The representation summaries for H/RC: Residential caravan sites were reported to JLPAG as part of Strategy and Sites alongside the comments on the overall housing need made to S/JH: New jobs and homes. The representation summaries are included again here as there are comments relating to the proposed approach to the policy, as well as relating to the overall housing need.
- Some representations included in the summary of representations table have been moved from the homes headings as the comments were specific to residential caravan sites. 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

Executive Summary

The Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties raise concerns regarding sufficient provision of sites and the effective assessment of need. The Environment Agency highlight the importance of addressing flood risk.

Table of representations: H/RC – Residential caravan sites

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to review the vulnerability of tenure which may be an issue.
Comments highlighting this issue
56782 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.
Comments highlighting this issue
57455 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Needs to distinguish between mobile home parks and caravans on farms used for seasonal workers.
Comments highlighting this issue
57754 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Annex C (Flood Vulnerability Classification) of the NPPF classifies caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for residential use as highly vulnerable as if located adjacent to rivers they are at significant risk from being quickly inundated without sufficient warning or means of escape. Therefore:
• flood risk should be a key consideration in the policy criteria
• sequential test needs to be applied when considering sites
Comments highlighting this issue
59730 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Deep concern for the policy, particularly given Police, Crime Sentencing and Courts Bill which targets Gypsy and Traveller communities and effectively criminalises their way of life. This policy needs to safeguard these groups and provide sufficient pitches/plots to meet their needs.
Comments highlighting this issue
60246 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Essential that this policy is based on good evidence and on genuine consultation with the communities affected. Concerned that the Accommodation Needs

Assessment will have been unable to establish much contact with the communities affected. Local Plan should prioritise the delivery of sites for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities and ensure that they meet their needs, are sufficiently spacious and affordable, and are in locations that are desirable to this community.

Comments highlighting this issue

60807 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Should not be located in the City, but could possibly be small developments located elsewhere.

Comments highlighting this issue

57587* (D Lott)

H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 11

Notes

- The representation summaries for H/GT: Gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites were reported to JLPAG as part of Strategy and Sites alongside the comments on the overall housing need made to S/JH: New jobs and homes. The representation summaries are included again here as there are comments relating to the proposed approach to the policy, as well as relating to the overall housing need.
- Some representations included in the summary of representations table have been moved from the homes headings as the comments were specific to gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople sites. 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

Executive Summary

A number of organisations highlight the importance of provision of sites, and ensuring those sites are suitable, such as having access to facilities, and appropriate foul drainage. Best practice examples are highlighted. One developer expresses concerns regarding the provision of sites as part of major developments.

Summary of issues raised in comments
• Support for policy
• Additional suitable sites should be provided, and unauthorised sites subject to the same planning as housing and residential caravan sites
• There is a need for a traveller site to support members of the travellers community who need good access to the hospitals on CBC
• Provision for permanent and transit sites must be addressed, with a process to provide sites including on the edge of Major Developments
• A diverse range of locations should be provided to ensure they offer choice and respond to the preferences of future residents
Comments highlighting this issue
57755 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56783 (Croydon PC), 56999 (Trumpington Residents Association), 58287 (H Smith), 57456 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The principle of inappropriate in the Green Belt must be enforced for all
Comments highlighting this issue
58296 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Opposed to proposed policy. Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation is best provided through standalone Gypsy and Traveller site allocations or through windfall allocations. If there is a requirement for this accommodation to be provided as part of larger developments, this should only relate to the larger developments for new settlements and such requirements should be set out in the allocation policy for that site
Comments highlighting this issue
57399 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The current policies are not working and have delivered too few sites. Failings will be exacerbated by the Police, Crime Sentencing and Courts Bill
Comments highlighting this issue
58573 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network), 60808 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should be following best practice as set out in the London Gypsies and Travellers ‘Best Practice for assessing the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers’ This applies to consultation and needs assessment methodologies
Recent needs assessments have under-stated needs
Comments highlighting this issue

58573 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network), 60808 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to allocate better quality sites
Comments highlighting this issue
58573 (Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network), 60808 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The nature of G&T sites means they should be treated as highly vulnerable and flood risk should be a key consideration in any policy criteria
Comments highlighting this issue
59731 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The existing site at Fen Road continues to be a source of ongoing local water quality and environmental health problems due to inadequate foul drainage provision. Policy H/GT should include provision for mains foul drainage and protection of water quality as part of the policy criteria
Comments highlighting this issue
59731 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
If further need, then area on Fen Road could be developed to accommodate them
Comments highlighting this issue
57587* (D Lott)

H/CH: Community-led housing

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy H/CH: Community-led housing > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 8

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to community led housing. 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

Executive Summary

There were few comments on this policy but they were broadly supportive. It was argued that community-led housing should be seen as part of a broader package of affordable housing options but there were differing views on how community-led housing should relate to rural exception sites. There was a suggestion that the policy could adopt the approach to self/custom build whereby 5% of dwellings on larger sites should be set aside for community-led housing.

Table of representations: H/CH - Community-led housing

Summary of issues raised in comments

- Support for policy
- Community-led housing delivers benefits beyond the reach of market housing
- Need a SPD to support delivery
- Should be preferred form of delivery for rural exception sites
- Support as long as it does not conflict with exception site policy
- Support as part of broader package of affordable housing options

Comments highlighting this issue
56955 (J Mielnik), 57756 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59806 (Histon & Impington Community Land Trust), 60023 (Steeple Morden PC), 60099 (Guilden Morden PC), 60809 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
This policy could be strengthened by mirroring the self/custom build policy, which requires 5% of houses on schemes of 20+ dwellings to be self/custom built

Comments highlighting this issue
56819 (F Wright)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Must be clear which policies in the Local Plan will apply to community-led housing developments

Comments highlighting this issue
60809 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Do not support this policy

Comments highlighting this issue
57587* (D Lott)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue
57457 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Infrastructure

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section:

33

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many respondents expressed support for the broad direction of the policies. Some respondents added caveats to their support, requesting that development is located appropriately to maximise the benefits from new strategic infrastructure and that new infrastructure receives adequate investment. Shepreth Parish Council argued that new development should fund the expansion of existing infrastructure. Natural England and the Environment Agency commented that infrastructure and connectivity improvements must be achieved in balance with the need to protect natural spaces and wildlife, ensuring that adverse impacts to the natural environment are avoided.

Some comments focussed on the relationship between national and local government. One respondent argued that discussion should take place with national government to enable Water Resources East to bring forward their timelines for infrastructure projects. Great Shelford Parish Council perceived there to be little joined up thinking between local authorities in relation to overseeing different infrastructure projects. Croydon Parish Council argued that national infrastructure policy will overshadow local policy, rendering the proposals irrelevant.

There were many suggestions to improve the policies. These sought to address perceived shortcomings on issues such as utilities to support sustainable travel and net zero, the need for improved health infrastructure, the needs of disabled people in respect of reducing car travel, the management of journeys to school and college, and broadband provision. A few respondents considered that the forecasted energy grid capacity figures were too low and would need to be increased. A few respondents considered that infrastructure should be operational before new houses were occupied.

Some respondents criticised the public transport system in Greater Cambridge, arguing that it needs to be improved to bring benefits to the area. Universities Superannuation Scheme argued that the Local Plan should recognise an integrated transport solution will take years to deliver and in the interim there should be no restrictions on existing modes of transport. One respondent questioned whether

people buying new homes will necessarily be working or studying within the 30-minute walking radius. A number of respondents asked for specific traffic interventions in their area and North Newnham Resident Association asked for roads to not be destroyed when things such as bus lanes are added to them.

There were a few comments arguing against the proposed relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant on the grounds that it was functioning infrastructure. Another respondent argued that national infrastructure projects, such as East- West Rail do not align well with GCSP's proposals. A few developers argued that that their sites were well-placed to deliver the aims of the policy and therefore the Plan should allocate their sites. One commentator argued that GCSP needed to enforce all developer obligations.

Table of representations: Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments

General support for policy aims, including for the following reasons:

• Policy I/ST seeks to deliver sustainable and inclusive communities by minimising the need to travel and reducing travel distances.

• Development should be located appropriately to maximise the benefits of investment in this new strategic infrastructure, which has the ability to increase the availability and use of more sustainable modes of transport, addressing environmental impacts, and quality of life impacts of car use.

• Intent to focus on planning for the right services, facilities and transport opportunities in the right place, bringing these forwards at the right times to support growth.

• Investment in infrastructure.

• Relationship between jobs & homes and sustainable transport opportunities.

• Supports the recognition for the need to consider water, energy, digital networks, health, education, cultural facilities to support growing communities.

• Policies on EV charging points and digital infrastructure in the future, to move away from carbon-based vehicles and shift to homeworking since the pandemic.

• There should be support for community led projects (need to describe what form these take).

Comments highlighting this issue

Developer or Landowners

57915 (Martin Grant Homes), 58392 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58406 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58612 (Marshall Group Properties), 58762 (Phase 2 Planning),

Parish or District Councils

58480 (Linton PC), 59284 (Cambourne Town Council), 59703 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 60024 (Steeple Morden PC), 60100 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
National infrastructure policy will overshadow local policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
56784 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposals for extended bus network by Greater Cambridgeshire mayor should be abandoned.

Comments highlighting this issue
56793 (Prof J Kirkbride)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Public transport and bus systems fail to meet past or current needs and require immediate low-carbon improvements to meet projected growth, including:
• Integrated (electric) public transport system
• Eliminating private car use
• Trams
• Light rail
• Not guided bus ways (uncomfortable)
This would:
• Reduce congestion
• Reduce commuting times
• Reduce air pollution (including CO2 emissions) and related health problems
• Improve street and living environments
• Be efficient, reliable, desirable and implementable.

Comments highlighting this issue
59465 (S Buckingham), 56793 (Prof J Kirkbride)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There are not enough public bridges that cross the river Cam with capacity for cyclists, pedestrians, with some land privatised for College access.

Comments highlighting this issue
57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Tunnels under the City with the Cambridge Connect scheme is the only viable solution.

Comments highlighting this issue
57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Congestion issues are historical geography.

Comments highlighting this issue
57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Infrastructure and connectivity improvements must be achieved in balance with the need to protect the natural spaces and wildlife. Need to be aware of the effects on the landscape and avoid adverse impact to the natural environment (delivering net gain in accordance with Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity).

Comments highlighting this issue
58480 (Linton PC), 59732 (Environment Agency), 59989 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A holistic approach should be adopted to consider the multifunctional possibilities that provision of new transport and utilities infrastructure provide. For example, by integrating new road or rail schemes with flood resilience measures, energy generation, and green infrastructure enhancements.

Comments highlighting this issue
59732 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Disabled people are not considered in mentions of reducing car travel in favour of cycling and walking.

Comments highlighting this issue
59768 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No mention of transport infrastructure in Queen Edith’s area.

Comments highlighting this issue
59768 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Shouldn’t destroy roads by adding bus lanes, lights, gantries, new roundabouts.

Comments highlighting this issue
57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The plan fails to optimise the distribution and location of proposed housing in relation to existing rail connectivity as at Whittlesford. Refer to Grosvenor's main representations on the spatial strategy and RSC.

Comments highlighting this issue
59184 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Stapleford site is being promoted as ‘good transport links’ when there is one train per hour from Great Shelford Station. The connectivity problems arise from the A1307 (connecting Campus sites that are a ten-minute cycle from the village), and the lack of rail route from Haverhill where employees live due to affordability of

housing there. Re-opening the Haverhill train line would remove traffic created by the A1307.

Comments highlighting this issue
57549 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need for a set of traffic lights at the A505 New Road exit due to being dangerous. Accidents will be inevitable with increased development.

Comments highlighting this issue
60494 (Melbourn PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
USS notes the ambitions of the infrastructure policies to deliver transport improvements and USS is supportive of an integrated transport solution and the benefits this will bring for the city centre. However, the Local Plan should recognise that such a solution will likely take many years to deliver and in the interim there should not be onerous restrictions on the existing modes of transport that are used to access the city centre.

Comments highlighting this issue
58227 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Plan should allocate circa 8.6ha of land at Scotland Farm for the Scotland Farm Travel Hub. Information has been submitted separately through the call for sites.

Comments highlighting this issue
58392 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58406 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
C2C is a key part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's sustainable transport programme. Scotland Farm Travel Hub is a key element of the C2C route. This should be recognised within the Plan and the land should be allocated.

Comments highlighting this issue
58406 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cambridge East provides an opportunity to deliver transformational solutions that unlock the investment needed in transport infrastructure to fix its economic geography.

Comments highlighting this issue
58612 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The role of existing infrastructure, in particular public transport infrastructure, and the

existing public transport links, should be recognised as a means of achieving sustainable growth.

Comments highlighting this issue
58762 (Phase 2 Planning)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Cambridge Biomedical Campus and immediate area will benefit from significant planned improvements in transport infrastructure, including from the Cambridge South Station and CSET extension. It is an appropriate, sustainable location for development that will provide access to new infrastructure and address deficit. Planning at scale enables the greatest opportunity to achieve modal shift and reduces pressure to existing transport networks.

Comments highlighting this issue
58908 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
School and college journeys need to be taken into account. Cambridge to Peterborough is too slow by public transport.

Comments highlighting this issue
58968 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
EWR and CSET current preferred routes do not align well with GCSP's proposals and policies and CSET does not take Addenbrookes 3 into account.

Comments highlighting this issue
58968 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is no guarantee that those buying the new homes will be those working/studying within the proposed 30-minute walking radius.

Comments highlighting this issue
59465 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green Belt, City Conservation Areas, and all Historic Approach roads including: Madingley Road, Barton Road, must be protected with principles of enhance and protect in the transport strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue
57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Do not support the proposal to relocate the functioning Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to Green Belt land. Reasons include:
• Not a good use of taxpayer's money

• Infrastructure to treat the sewage is already in place and has capacity until 2050
• The proposed relocation 1.5km away will build a site that has capacity until 2050.

Comments highlighting this issue
58074 (Horningsea PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Development in the context of the local plan should benefit and expand the surrounding infrastructure and not be a burden on already overloaded waste and sewage networks in particular.

Comments highlighting this issue
59488 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Drainage concerns over Darwin Green 3 coming through Histon & Impington into a single award drain. There needs to be infrastructure in place before work starts.

Comments highlighting this issue
58332 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need discussion with higher government to seek means to enable Water Resources East to bring forward the timelines for their infrastructure project to mesh with timescales in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
59768 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is little joined up thinking when looking at the infrastructure projects for the area which various authorities are undertaking.

Comments highlighting this issue
59198 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The document provides a list of new technologies but does not address the supply of utilities. The Local Plan document comments on the need for grid reinforcement but there are no comments for example in the Local Plan regarding continuing use of Natural Gas or conversion to hydrogen. Water supply and sewage handling does not appear to be considered although they are an essential part of infrastructure provision, the same is true of “green infrastructure”.

Comments highlighting this issue
58956 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The growth assumed in the Local Plan does not explain how public services (for example in health and social care) are going to cope with the substantial projected population growth. Health infrastructure has been wrongly considered or ignored,

including:
• Hospitals
• Social care
• NHS projects and need for securing and allocating S106 and CIL funds to deliver them
• Impacts from development on healthcare requirements
• Recognise statutory duty to help finance improved healthcare services through effective estate management.

Comments highlighting this issue
58968 (A Sykes), 59213 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)), 59465 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Infrastructure should be operational before occupation of new housing particularly needing to manage surface water runoff from hard surfaces to minimise sewage in waterways.

Comments highlighting this issue
60064 (Steeple Morden PC), 60100 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In addition, the planning authority is assuming approval will be given for transport infrastructure such as CSET, which has not yet gone for planning approval, which will not benefit the community of Great Shelford at all. Indeed, GSPC is opposed to the current CSET plans.

Comments highlighting this issue
59198 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concern for WiFi Broadband provision. Some villages lack signal/have issues connecting which is fundamental in supporting home working and jobs, including:
• Teversham

Comments highlighting this issue
59243 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to enforce all developer obligations and not allow retrospective excuses.

Comments highlighting this issue
59314 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No clear renewable energy plans.

Comments highlighting this issue
59465 (S Buckingham)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Concerned about forecasted energy grid capacity figures as these seem significantly too low.

Comments highlighting this issue
59768 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Electricity capacity needs to triple in the West of Cambourne. New development will have impact on already over-reliance on Little Barford power station (a gas turbine power station).

Comments highlighting this issue
56657 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
57358 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

62

Notes

- Representation 59954 (Suffolk Council) is a duplication of rep 59555 I/ID but is relevant to this policy, so it has been pasted below.

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many respondents supported the policy. However, a substantial number of respondents added caveats to their support and provided suggestions to improve the policy. For example, some respondents stated that a more ambitious approach is needed, that the effects of home working need to be considered in the policy and concerns were raised about e-scooters. The full list of suggestions is listed in the table below.

Some respondents argued that the policy had omitted things such as how elderly and disabled people will be included in the design of transport routes. Some argued that the policy should focus on designing active transport routes and not the provision of car parking. Other comments emphasised the importance of integrating new developments and new communities into existing facilities and transport routes.

Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) suggested including a reference to CCC's Transport Assessment Team's guidelines for new developments. North Hertfordshire District Council asked for more data relating to Cambridge South Station due to their concerns that it could create pressures in North Hertfordshire. Suffolk Council suggested that the policy should aim to enable transport across administrative boundaries. Suffolk Council also argued that there is a need to add rail dualling to the infrastructure delivery plan. Persimmon Homes East stated that the findings from the Active Travel Toolkit must be included in viability assessments. One commentator asked for the Active Travel Toolkit to be available for consultation prior to publication.

Many developers and landowners argued that the policy's aims will be achieved if development is directed to sustainable locations. Linked to this, many developers and landowners argued that their sites were well-placed to deliver the policy's aims. Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that growth in the region will lead to an increase in Park and Ride usage, but the Plan has not allocated land for this. SCT also suggested that the Plan safeguards land for infrastructure and includes a policy for planning gain to retrofit infrastructure which is missing from areas which are not reached by funding.

Gamlingay Parish Council suggested that there needs to be a cycle link between Potton and Cambourne to address the missing link in the Bedford and Cambridge route. There were a few comments criticising the location of East West Rail. Some respondents objected to redeveloping NEC on the grounds that it would increase traffic. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) perceived there to be a lack of joined-up thinking between Greater Cambridge's local authorities. CPRE and a few other respondents argued that there needs to be an integrated transport plan which aligns with the Local Plan. Trumpington Residents Association stated that development should be restricted unless essential infrastructure is planned and financed. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that travel hubs are incorrectly equated as Park and Ride locations.

Table of representations: I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy, including for the following reasons:

- Minimise need to travel and distances
- Strategy approach consistent with NPPF paras 104 & 105
- Encourages innovative and flexible solutions to internalise trips and reduce vehicle use
- Delivers sustainable and inclusive communities
- Addresses community transport and connections for non-motorised users
- Provides tools to start generating modal shift to sustainable modes
- Support for high quality cycle infrastructure; attractively designed, covered parking for all types of cycle, plentiful parking, direct routes
- Positive impact on historic environment through reduced noise, air pollution, parking, traffic and congestion
- Environmental and health benefits, including reduced emissions, air quality, and climate change
- Whittlesford Parkway Station improvements will deliver on aims, enabling sustainable rail travel
- Welcome initiatives to reduce movements in settlements, enhance active or electric transport and easily incorporated

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
57304 (A J Johnson), 57696 (J Conroy), 58887 (J Pavey), 59785 (B Hunt)
Parish Councils, District Councils or Government organisations
56658 (Gamlingay PC), 57459 (Huntingdonshire District Council), 57490 (ESFA – Department for Education), 59686 (Historic England), 59988 (Natural England), 60025 (Steeple Morden PC), 60101 (Guilden Morden PC)
Landowners or Developers
57066 (C Meadows), 57088 (Shelford Investments), 57289 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 57434 (Mission Street Ltd), 58443 (NW Bio and Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58525 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58605 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet site), 58620 (Marshall Group Properties), 58845 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58849 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58919 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and private family trust), 58978 (North of Barton Road Landowners Group), 60165 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60358 (H J Molton Settlement), 60537 (Taylor Wimpey), 60598 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Charities or Political groups
57567 (Save Honey Hill Group), 58966 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60810 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Education Institutions
59239 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments on the policy, including:

- Recognise some uses (education) are justified and important despite generating trips from wider sub-region
- More innovative and ambitious approach needed (GCP and CPCA) for sustainable commuting
- Recognise the effects of home working
- Some travel will always be necessary, facilitate sustainable travel rather than hinder it
- Design to avoid rat runs through villages
- Recognise travel to market towns
- Support dedicated cycling and walking infrastructure but provide segregation between the two
- Trials of Mobility as a Service and e-scooters raise concerns about anti-social usage
- Needs huge investment in safe and permeable active mode routes and public transport to achieve modal shift away from cars
- Protect existing cycle and walking routes from development during construction and upon completion
- Require commitment to clean, clear, de-ice and maintain the safety, usability and accessibility of cycle and walking routes
- No indication how current infrastructure will change to integrate innovative transport solutions proposed by developers.
- Design should focus on active travel and public transport, not provision of car parking
- More detail and clarity is needed; travel hubs, 15-20 minute neighbourhood design principles
- Sequencing of delivery before occupation is critical to promote sustainable travel behaviour
- Ensure new development is integrated into existing facilities and services as well as seamless connectivity

- Public Transport contributions need to be used effectively and have a long term impact
- Address sustainable deliveries (cargo bikes); design, space requirements
- Integrate existing and new communities with public and active transport routes
- Provision for low carbon, electric vehicles is also important.
- No mention of the elderly and disabled in relation to design of transport routes; disability scooters, blue badge holders
- Improvements needed to rural public transport and last mile congestion into City
- Need to address congestion and pollution by dissuading car use
- Clarity is needed on thresholds for triggering developer contributions
- Enable regular bus services to travel hubs and demand centres
- Consider convenient and economical end to end journeys

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals
57696 (J Conroy), 57978 (D Lister), 58125 (P Bearpark), 58318 (I Butnar), 59785 (B Hunt), 60232 (H Warwick)
Landowners or Developers
60537 (Taylor Wimpey), 60598 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
Parish Councils, District Councils or Government organisations
57490 (ESFA – Department for Education), 57757 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60025 (Steeple Morden PC), 60101 (Guilden Morden PC)
Charities, Resident Associations, or Political groups
57567 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57922 (North Newnham Residents Association), 58966 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59043 (Cambridge cycle Campaign), 59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport), 59244 (National Trust), 60810 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Education Institutions
59239 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need a cycle link between Potton and Cambourne to address the missing link in strategic Bedford and Cambridge route.

Comments highlighting this issue
56695 (Gamlingay PC), 57796 (PC of Waresley-cum-Tetworth)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support proposals for enhancing rights of way network for safe use by all users, particularly horse riders. Provide for carriage drivers.

Comments highlighting this issue
56705 (British Horse Society)

Summary of issues raised in comments
This is critical

Comments highlighting this issue
56785 (Croydon PC), 59935 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Danger of tokenism on the part of developers preparing transport plans. Developers seek to maximise development footprint at expense of sustainable travel.

Comments highlighting this issue
56792 (J Kirkbride)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Suggest reference CCC Transport Assessment Team's guidelines as to what development sizes need to do

Comments highlighting this issue
56951 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Align Local Plan and Local Transport Plan. Need a policy which limits development unless essential infrastructure is planned and financed.

Comments highlighting this issue
57001 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy aims will be achieved if development is directed to sustainable locations

Comments highlighting this issue
57066 (C Meadows), 57088 (Shelford Investments), 57289 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 57304 (A J Johnson), 58443 (NW Bio and Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58525 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58605 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet site), 58620 (Marshall Group Properties), 58806 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58838 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58845 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58849 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58919 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and private family trust), 58978 (North of Barton Road Landowners Group), 60537 (Taylor Wimpey)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Finds of the Active Travel Toolkit must be included in viability assessments

Comments highlighting this issue
57401 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Flexibility is needed to take account of long term connectivity and travel projects.

Comments highlighting this issue
57434 (Mission Street Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Objection to redeveloping NEC; will generate increase in commuting traffic. Better location is the airport.

Comments highlighting this issue
57498 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need emphasis on preserving green spaces and value for money (references GCP scheme)

Comments highlighting this issue
57799 (Coton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
By locating growth in most sustainable locations, delivers the tools to start generating a modal shift towards sustainable travel methods. Cambridge East can contribute significantly towards a holistic solution for the whole city.

Comments highlighting this issue
58620 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Pressure on A10 may be relieved by Cambridge South station, but will create pressures in North Hertfordshire; passenger throughput and access to stations. Need data to help quantify and respond appropriately.

Comments highlighting this issue
58687 (North Hertfordshire District Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Expansion of campus offers significant benefit; close to existing and proposed public transport connections, encourage modal shift, reduce emissions and pressure on road network. Development will be guided by a Mobility Strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue
58919 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Transport Evidence shows traffic is assumed to grow from 2015 baseline, contravening local transport objectives, and huge growth in Park and Ride use for which land is not allocated.

Comments highlighting this issue
59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Safeguard land for infrastructure: alignments for new railway, sites for new stations, land for new / rerouted roads, new non-motorised user routes

Comments highlighting this issue
59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Include a policy for planning gain (match funded) to retrofit infrastructure missing from areas funding doesn’t reach

Comments highlighting this issue
59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Currently revising Local Transport and Connectivity Plan; includes same themes, likely to be alignment in plans. Continue engagement.

Comments highlighting this issue
59295 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Prefer EWR approach Cambridge from the north

Comments highlighting this issue
59489 (Shepreth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Lack of joined-up thinking between 4 authorities; transport planning should sit with CPCA with delivery by County Council, National Highways and Network Rail as appropriate. Concerned by activities of unelected GCP and impacts of schemes. EWR route will maximise damage to countryside and poorly integrate with rail network. Desperate need for integrated transport plan for whole county and current approach will not realise one.

Comments highlighting this issue
59592 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Bicycle lane and green walkways

Comments highlighting this issue
59708 (Caldecote PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Please could the “Active Travel Toolkit” be available for consultation prior to publication?

Comments highlighting this issue
59785 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to add electrification - non diesel - zero carbon policy to this.

Comments highlighting this issue
59839 (Dry Drayton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Look forward to an integrated approach between SCDC and CCC Highways for the development and delivery of integrated sustainable transportation for pedestrian, cyclists and vehicle users.

Comments highlighting this issue
59881 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Look forward to more consideration of sustainable transport in rural area, including bus and cycle links to rail hubs at Waterbeach and Cambridge North, improved direct bus to Cambridge and generally better cycling connectivity.

Comments highlighting this issue
59881 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should aim to enable transport across administrative boundaries. Welcome inclusion of key links (Figure 11). Strategic transport corridor to the East; A14 and rail. Developing bus improvement strategy; seek to improve cross border connections. Local Plan policies can assist joint working.

Comments highlighting this issue
59954 (Suffolk Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Infrastructure delivery plan; add rail dualling, welcome inclusion of improved bus services.

Comments highlighting this issue
59954 (Suffolk Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Not expected chosen distribution will create significant impact on infrastructure in Suffolk, but ensure mitigation considers cross boundary impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue
59954 (Suffolk Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Housing is planned in north and northwest but EWR to the south and not stopping at villages along the route.

Comments highlighting this issue
60639 (D Lean)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Scale of development puts pressure on travel links to City. Development should be net reducer of greenhouse gases and cars into City, not just provide access to Park and Ride. Subsidise buses, provide for other modes. Long delivery times for large scale infrastructure projects, no immediate effects. Public transport is lifeline to some people; consider good value, single ticketing. Travel hubs are incorrectly equated to Park and Ride; suggest pilots be set up.

Comments highlighting this issue
60810 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

37

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

A variety of organisations expressed general support for the policy. Some organisations supported the policy but suggested changes, including providing additional information about the required parking standards, providing flexibility to consider site specific circumstances, and minimising visual clutter.

Some respondents provided critical responses to the policy; North Newnham Residents Association for example wrote that there is a tension between parking provision and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport which could require improvements at the expense of cars. B Hunt questioned whether the policy is needed when the Greater Cambridge Partnership are preparing an integrated parking strategy. A few respondents, including the Home Builders Federation, asserted that electric vehicle requirements should be addressed through building regulations. A few respondents, including Smarter Cambridge Transport stated that the policy title should be amended to reflect a wider range of transport modes.

Cambridge Past and Present and Future argued that the electric grid will need an increase in capacity of local substations by around 50% to deliver the policy. Persimmon Homes East wrote that viability does not consider the upgrades to the national grid that would be required by the policy.

Some respondents provided comments specific to the cycle and mobility parking elements of the policy and included suggestions to improve the policy. Examples include using S106 monies to retrofit neighbouring communities, ensuring there is space for non-standard cycles such as e-scooters in new developments, and ensuring that new developments deliver storage for all users. Some respondents provided comments specific to the car parking elements of the policy. Examples

include addressing the lack of parking for visitors and deliveries in new developments, including operational parking for logistics uses, and designing new developments in a way which will prevent parking on the pavement.

Some respondents provided comments specific to the electric vehicle elements of the policy. Examples of the suggestions include addressing the issue of charging points in public car parks and on streets, the need for more charging points at community facilities in rural areas and rapid charging points were perceived to be essential.

Table of representations: I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy, including for the following reasons:

- Future proofing car parking for electric vehicles.
- Provision of charging points is critical to meeting national targets.
- Consistent with climate change agenda at local and national levels.
- Welcome that parking standards provide flexibility to adapt to site-specific circumstances.
- Developers should be required to provide extensive and inclusive cycle parking.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations:
56659 (Gamlingay PC), 56952 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 59687 (Historic England), 60102 (Guilden Morden PC)
Landowners or developers:
57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 58848 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58921 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 59534 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60599 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
Charities or Political Organisations:
58998 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
General comments on policy, including:

- Need for flexibility to consider site-specific circumstances.
- Need detailed, quantified standards for all sizes of development, with guidance for mixed-use developments where facilities may be shared.

- More detailed standards are needed for: parking and access for cycles/micromobility, car and cycle visitor parking, motorcycle parking, car club spaces, delivery bays, customized for car-free and mixed-use developments.
- Preparation of Supplementary Planning Guidance to address micromobility parking.
- Clarify what is meant by communal parking areas.
- Be mindful of Making Connections and proposal for congestion charging and parking within potential charging area.
- Need for flexibility to respond to changing travel habits and technologies.
- Minimise visual clutter, especially from post-mounted traffic signs, and use materials or furniture that is appropriate for the historic environment. Historic England has produced good practice guidance.
- Clarify the threshold for 'larger development'.
- Provide indicative standards, outlining the difference between urban area of Cambridge and surrounding settlements.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals:
58128 (P Bearpark)
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations:
59687 (Historic England)
Landowners or developers:
57291 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 58904 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 59534 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60538 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60599 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
Charities or Political Organisations:
58586 (Smarter Cambridge Transport), 58998 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments on the cycle and mobility parking elements of policy, including:

- Needs clear minimum standards and more specific guidance.
- Need for flexibility to consider site-specific circumstances, including public transport availability, whether an urban or rural location.
- Assume multiple bikes of different types per person.
- Space for maintenance, storage lockers, accessories.
- Safe & secure storage for all users.
- Community-wide spaces for shared facilities; trailers, e-cargo-bikes.
- Use S106 monies to retrofit neighbouring communities without sufficient facilities.

- Mandate higher levels on all developments, to higher standards.
- Use a ratio of space per person not per bedroom.
- Car-free developments should provide minimum 1 space per person.
- Space for non-standard cycles, micromobility vehicles, mobility scooters, e-scooters.
- Cap the proportion of two-tier parking, as not accessible to all.
- Provide guidance on parking; two-tier racks, access and ramps, security and personal security.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations:
56952 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Landowners or Developers:
57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 57865 (Histon and Impington PC), 57977 (D Lister), 58128 (P Bearpark)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments on the car parking elements of policy, including:

- Lack of parking for visitors, deliveries.
- Include operational parking for logistics and warehousing uses.
- Need for flexibility to consider site-specific circumstances.
- Reduce residential parking to improve financial viability; wastes land and encourages cars.
- Facilitate lower parking with car clubs / shared vehicles, smart parking, and safe cycling routes.
- Design developments to prevent pavement parking and minimise car traffic near homes, schools, gathering places.
- Plan for 40% short/medium trips by non-car modes, comparable to Netherlands.
- Provide guidance on ratio of short/medium/long stay for visitors, deliveries and service providers, and controls particularly where not on public highway.
- Address motorcycle parking.
- Shared and pool car parking should have precedence in space allocation.
- Implement innovative and flexible solutions in existing areas as well as new developments.
- Design on ‘need to have’ rather than ‘nice to have’ basis to disincentivise car ownership.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals:
57002 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57291 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 57780 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58128 (P Bearpark), 58175 (H Brown), 58319 (I Butnar), 60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Comments on the electric vehicle elements of policy, including:

- 7kW charging is slow for retail, suggest 20-75kW depending on dwell time.
- Address charging points in public car parks and on-street.
- Prioritise a network of charging points.
- Clarify how residential charging will work where there is no on-plot parking.
- Charging points for employment and retail appear arbitrary, need to be supported by further evidence.
- Need for flexibility to consider site-specific and changing circumstances.
- Support provision of at least one charging point per home.
- Proportion of active spaces and minimum power should reflect likely length of stay.
- Charging infrastructure must not impact cycle and walking accessibility.
- Clarity needed on what active and passive charging points are.
- Need Management Strategy for communal charge points.
- Be mindful of national and local policy and technical requirements.
- Communal points should be minimum 20kW to accommodate short-term parking.
- Address requirements for student accommodation.
- Support for rural public charging points at community facilities.
- Rapid charging is essential.
- Unambitious; minimum 11kW with smart loading, easy access to 3-phase charging.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals:
56683 (S Houlihane), 57977 (D Lister), 58128 (P Bearpark), 58319 (I Butnar)
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations:
56952 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 58334 (Histon and Impington PC)
Landowners or Developers:

57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 59106 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 60538 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
Charities, Resident Associations, or Political Organisations:
57002 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57780 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58998 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60026 (Steeple Morden PC), 60143 (Home Builders Federation), 60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Critically important.

Comments highlighting this issue
59936 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Prevent garages being turned into living accommodation with consequent increase in on-street parking.

Comments highlighting this issue
57758 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Tensions between parking provision and encouraging use of sustainable modes, which need improvements at the expense of cars. Car commuting should be discouraged; needs City-wide parking controls.

Comments highlighting this issue
57927 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Extend residents' parking schemes to prevent commuter parking.

Comments highlighting this issue
57957 (F Goodwille)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Question why policy is needed when GCP are preparing an Integrated Parking Strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue
59786 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy has potential to exclude vulnerable people who rely on cars from participation in aspects of society.

Comments highlighting this issue
59786 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Strongly support a workplace charging levy to further disincentivise all but essential car ownership and fund eco-travel infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue
60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Demand for fast charging in accessible locations. New EV charging stations (similar to petrol stations) need space for longer dwell times, ancillary services. Proposal for Lolworth, accessed from Bar Hill junction of A14, adjacent to site being proposed for commercial including hotel, restaurant, and convenience uses.

Comments highlighting this issue
57258 (R Cowell)

I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 13

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Many respondents expressed support for the policy, for example, the Universities Superannuation Scheme requested that the role of larger logistics, warehousing facilities and last-mile hubs are supported in the Local Plan. Huntingdonshire District Council suggested more information needs to be included to understand how unacceptable impacts to the strategic networks are to be assessed and also requested additional information to assess the impact of developments upon surrounding areas. Histon and Impington Parish Council emphasised the need for GCSP to speak to people in the logistics industry so they can gain more expertise.

Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that the Local Plan needs to identify a logistics hub location and included possible suggestions where it could be located and requirements it needed to meet. SCT also asserted that there should be a variety of sites in different locations to provide break-out and consolidation logistic centres. I Butnar argued that cargo cycles for local deliveries and the provision of cycling logistics depots should be common across Greater Cambridge. Similarly, SCT stated that the access roads for logistic hubs should be appropriate in relation to weight and size of vehicles and non-motorised user routes should be sufficiently wide for cargo bikes to use. Endurance Estates argued that Logistical hubs will not address longer journeys by delivery vehicles because the identified need for strategic logistics floorspace will not be met and therefore their site should be allocated.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties requested stronger wording in the policy to support the need to move to a system of rail freight and suggested a further 'Green Line' should be established so that existing levels of road freight transport will not increase as a result development. They also proposed ensuring villages have access to freight travel hubs to lower net carbon emissions. A few developers explained how their sites could potentially deliver the aims of the policy.

Table of representations: I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58321 (Isabela Butnar), 58897 (J Pavey)
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 56660 (Gaminglay Parish Council), Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
Landowners or Developers: 57292 (Universities Superannuation Scheme Commercial)
Charities or Political Organisations: 57759 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 57781 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supportive of policy, which is felt to be particularly important for villages.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 56660 (Gaminglay Parish Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Requests that the role of larger logistics/warehousing facilities as well as last-mile hubs are recognised and supported in the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57292 (Universities Superannuation Scheme Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Consideration should be given to how unacceptable impacts to the strategic networks are to be assessed to ensure a clear approach for developers and further detail would be useful for surrounding districts to assess knock-on impacts of such developments, especially in terms of congestion and carbon emissions.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57461 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is important for planners to speak to industry about their ideas in relation to travel/freight to avoid bad planning outcomes. They asserted that Officers who have been writing the NE Cambridge Travel Plan have not spoken to industry about this issue.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57864 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Would support a local delivery hub, or edge of city collection point if it can be shown to be commercially viable.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 57951 (Daniel Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Logistic hub location needs to be identified in the Local Plan to ensure efficient functioning and minimisation of vehicle-milage associated with moving freight. Appropriate locations are identified as:

- Major hubs on strategic roads
- Hubs for processing rail-born freight
- Smaller hubs to serve all parts of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire villages
- Land within the Girton interchange could be a prime location for the principal road-freight hub for Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58604 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Cargo cycles for local deliveries and the provision of cycling logistics depots should be common across Greater Cambridge area and not only in new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58321 (Isabela Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The comment includes further detail about how this policy should be implemented including:

- The policy depends on having land available in the right locations to create a functional hierarchy of break-out/consolidation centres.
- Site should operate around the clock.
- Site should not disturb nearby residents.
- Access roads should be appropriate in relation to weight, size, and weight of vehicles.
- Non-motorised user routes should be sufficiently wide for cargo bikes to use.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58604 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support the idea for Travel Hubs set out by Smarter Cambridge Transport.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Logistical hubs will not address longer journeys by delivery vehicles because the identified need for strategic logistics floorspace will not be met in Greater Cambridge's Local Plan. The respondent made a similar point to Policy J/NE and argues that Greater Cambridge is relying on other parts of the region to provide industrial and logistical premises. Policy I/FD is therefore judged to only address the 'last mile' part of the delivery chain. Therefore, the respondent requests for a specific strategic employment allocation at land at Caxton Gibbet for Class B2 and Class B8 uses.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58607 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Want stronger wording in the policy to support the need to move to a system of rail freight and other sustainable delivery mechanisms. The Party suggests that a further 'Green Line' should be established so that existing levels of road freight transport will not increase as a result of developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
As in the case of human transport, planning should be made to account for end-to-end journeys and to provide infrastructure broad enough to lower net carbon emissions. This could be achieved by ensuring villages have access to freight travel hubs.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to I/FD, it requested that the development strategy for freight and delivery consolidation includes an additional allocation at Buckingway Business Park as promoted by Cambridgeshire County Council, with the policy requirements of: Site area of 7.54 HA, provision of highways depot and associated facilities and access from Anderson Road and A1307.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57515 (Cambridgeshire County Council as landowner)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to I/FD, the respondent requests for a specific strategic employment allocation at land at Caxton Gibbet for Class B2 and Class B8 uses.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58607 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to I/FD, the respondent states that land within the Girton interchange could be a prime location for the principal road-freight hub for Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58604 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

13

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy's direction. The policy was supported by the Environment Agency, who also noted that they expected safeguarding to include what is required for water infrastructure more broadly (water supply and waste), green infrastructure and biodiversity. The University of Cambridge supported the intention to continue to safeguard research at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge.

Anglian Water Services Ltd requested that GCSP considers safeguarding land in the next stages of the Local Plan for new infrastructure, possibly including a recognition of the need for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plan relocation. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) which is linked to the Ministry of Defence, stated that Bassingbourn Barracks should be identified as safeguarded infrastructure to support its ongoing defence needs and protect it from being impacted by external development. The DIO suggested that GCSP should consider including a specific planning policy to deliver this. DIO also stressed the importance of safeguarding the airspace above Cambridge airport and keeping it free from obstruction. The DIO also noted that the Plan needs to ensure that new development does not disrupt their technical asset 'East 2 WAM Network' which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system.

B Marshall criticised the policy for not mentioning water infrastructure and did not perceive the Lord's Bridge Telescope to be important infrastructure. I Butnar asserted that the rail infrastructure plans are not ambitious enough and instead the policy should place a greater emphasis upon how the provision of station can help neighbouring communities thrive. Steeple Morden Parish Council suggested including disused railway lines for potential infrastructure needs.

Table of representations: I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for the policy direction and intent.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 56661 (Gamlingay PC), 57760 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60027 (Steeple Morden PC), 60103 (Guilden Morden PC)
Landowners or Developers: 60482 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Charities or Political Organisations: 60813 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Welcome the intention to work with infrastructure providers to consider whether planned strategic infrastructure or future land should be safeguarded. This should also include land for flood storage and flood risk infrastructure which is likely to include river corridors.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 59733 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Creating extra flood storage to allow space for flood waters will be a vital component of that plan. We'd also expect safeguarding to include what is required for water infrastructure more broadly (water supply and waste) and green infrastructure/biodiversity.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 59733 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Would like to consider with the Councils the merits of safeguarding land or identifying areas of search in the next stages of the Local Plan for new infrastructure including, if appropriate recognition of the need for the Cambridge Wastewater facility relocation. One consideration will be the timing and progression of the Local Plan when the relocation application is brought forward and then determined by the Secretary of State.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 60482 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Bassingbourn Barrack should be considered for two reasons:

- Ongoing operational defence needs
- To protect operational defence land from being affected adversely from third party development proposed in the area.

To ensure that the site delivers on its defence output there will be times when further developments are required at the site. It is important for national defence that the local plan is able to support the principle of such developments. The Council may consider it prudent within the new local plan to include a specific planning policy.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57486 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation – MOD)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No mention of water infrastructure (a finite resource).

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 580781 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The intention to continue to safeguard research at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge, from the adverse effects of development, is supported.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 59263 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Don’t see the Lords Bridge telescope as being important infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 580781 (B Marshall)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Rail infrastructure plans do not seem ambitious. It is not about protecting those four train stations from being negatively impacted by development, but they should be at the heart of new development, which should thrive around them.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58323 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments
A rail station at Cherry Hinton should be open and connected to Cambridge main rail station. Other targeted locations for new developments would also benefit from enhanced rail availability. This only can be made with appropriate planning and investment.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58323 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Should also include disused railway lines with potential for future use.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 60027 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
MOD interest in the plan area is a new technical asset known as the East 2 WAM Network which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system in the Eastern areas of England. There is the potential for development to impact on the operation and/or capability of this new technical asset which consists of nodes and connecting pathways, each of which have their own consultation criteria. Elements of this asset are located within and/or pass through the Greater Cambridge Local Plan area of interest.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 60040 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue

Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57462 (Huntingdonshire District Council.

I/AD: Aviation development

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/AD: Aviation development> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

8

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

A limited number of representations were received to this policy. A few parish councils expressed general support for the policy. There were some criticisms of the policy: Cambridgeshire County Council questioned the wording of the policy, specifically the implication that aviation would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties also argued that, due to environmental concerns, the policy should support no development of the airport except under exceptional circumstances. Contrastingly, D Lister perceived the balance of the Plan to be weighted too far towards protecting other parties from aviation and does not do enough to protect airfields.

There were some suggestions to improve the policy: Imperial War Museum and Gonville and Caius College argued that the proposed policy does not consider Policy T1/5 from South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan and stated that the Local Plan needed to align with policy proposals from Civil Aviation Authority. Steeple Morden Parish Council argued that the Local Plan should recognise the need for a national network of general airfields.

Table of representations: I/AD: Aviation Development

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57761 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60104 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Question the wording of the policy which implies that aviation will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Specifically, it is unclear how the development could not have an adverse impact on the environment given aviation's carbon emissions.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 56953 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Argue that the proposed policy does not fully consider the previous policy T1/5 which is being taken from South Camb's Local Plan. Specifically, T1/5 (1) (a), from South Camb's Local Plan highlights the economic benefits from aviation and this is omitted in the new policy.

It is therefore requested that Policy I/AD fully recognises and supports the potential economic benefits of aviation growth in assessing proposals which will also reflect NPPF 104.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58026 (Imperial War Museum/ Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Expect the Local Plan to align with revisions to CAP738 currently being proposed by CAA to enhance clarity on protection for airfields from local development.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58026 (Imperial War Museum/ Gonville and Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Local Plan should recognise the need for a national network of general airfields.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 60028 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Environmental health concerns should be taken into account when deciding on housing location, i.e. Local Plan should carefully consider the decision to place houses next to airfields.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 60028 (Steeple Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Perceives that the balance of the Plan seems weighted too far towards protecting other parties from aviation and does not do enough to protect airfields from the possibility of being sold off for development.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 57969 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57463 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policy should support no development of the airport except under exceptional circumstances (such as replacing outdated infrastructure with safer or lower-impact alternatives).

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 60814 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Party would like to add an additional objective to future planning applications. Permission should be granted on the criterion of ‘whole project’ emissions reduction and positive ecological impacts.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 60814 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
MOD interest in Cambridge Airport for which Statutory Aerodrome Height and Birdstrike Safeguarding Zones have been designated. The statutory Aerodrome Height safeguarding zone serves to protect the airspace above and around aerodromes to maintain an assured, obstacle-free environment for aircraft manoeuvre. This airspace is to be kept free of obstruction from tall structures to ensure that aircraft transiting to and from or circuiting the aerodrome can do so safely.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 60040 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)

I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning> then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

17

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

There were many comments expressing support for the policy. A few respondents added caveats to their support: Carbon Neutral Cambridge wanted the policy strengthened to require developers to contribute to the costs of improving the power grid and I Butnar argued that smart localised energy systems should be the new norm, no matter the size of new development and that new development provides an opportunity to bring this service to existing developments.

Some comments criticised the policy; Persimmon Homes East Midlands argued that clarification is required on the definition of an energy masterplan and the outcomes of these should be fully considered within any viability assessment. D Blake stated that the policy mentions digital systems but omits discussion of water supply, sewage, gas, and hydrogen. Metro Property Unit Trust stated that the policy only sets requirements for households and should also set the requisite non-residential floorspace threshold, including whether thresholds/exemptions for other types of applicable accommodation. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the threshold should be based on impact, not scale. R Pargeter stated that the policy focusses on new development, but a significant increase in electric cars is likely to require grid reinforcement, especially in rural locations, even in the absence of any new site developments.

A few comments wanted to change the scope of the policy. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC argued that the timespan for these changes should be brought forward in anticipation of new demand from new railways. D Lister stated that the plan should consider the role of a distributed grid of micro generation, not just large power station supply and substation infrastructure. Cambridge Past, Present & Future states that there needs to be committed way forward for strategic electrical energy supply planning.

Table of representations: I/EI Infrastructure masterplanning

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 57761 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59937 (Fen Ditton PC)
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57762 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59937 (Fen Ditton PC)
Landowners or Developers: 58856 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company, a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme), 58926 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
Charities or Political Organisations: 60483 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60815 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy, but with caveats:
• Would like to see it strengthened, so that developers were required to contribute to the costs of improving the power grid in order to enable widespread connections of distributed renewable power generation

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 57782 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Support policy, but with caveats:
• Why is there a requirement that smart grids apply to developments over 100 dwellings? The new developments are neighbouring existing residential and commercial areas, smart grids could expand to cover adjacent areas (if the 100 dwellings is what is required for e.g. efficiency purposes).
• Smart localised energy systems should be the new norm, no matter the size of new development. The new development provides the opportunity to bring this service to existing developments. You should plan for cross-funding new infrastructure which could benefit existing built areas and new developments together.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58329 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Further clarification is required on the definition of an energy masterplan and the outcomes of these should be fully considered within any viability assessment.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57404 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)

Summary of issues raised in comments
This policy appears to be aimed at ensuring adequate energy infrastructure for new developments only. Particularly in rural locations where people will have to rely on car transport, a significant increase in electric cars is likely to require grid reinforcement even in the absence of any site developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 57602 (R Pargeter)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Likely demand for future rail electrification (including East West Rail and routes east of Cambridge should be included) so action should be taken early in the plan period.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57762 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The plan should consider the role of a distributed grid of micro-generation, not just large power station supply and substation infrastructure. By mandating and investing in micro-generation on all new sites, this could potentially help meet future demands.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 57963 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There are many comments regarding digital systems but nothing about water supply, sewage, gas - hydrogen and natural. Looks like work in progress as currently not fit for purpose.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58032 (D Blake)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No restriction should be put in place for those requiring more than the average amount of electricity. Advising how to use less power fine but some will require more than the estimated amount of power.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 58336 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Back-up needed. Cannot have only one type of fuel that we are not producing ourselves.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 58484 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The detail for energy infrastructure provision at the Campus is to be developed through the joint working process with GCSP.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58926 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is good that the Local Plan recognises the need for grid reinforcement. However, whilst there is recognition of the need for strategic electrical energy supply planning, there appears to be no committed way forward. Without adequate power, the Local Plan will not succeed. The issue must be addressed.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 59002 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy sets the requirement at 100 dwellings or over. The policy should set the requisite non-residential floorspace threshold also, including whether thresholds/exemptions for other types of applicable accommodation.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 59113 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57464 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Anglian Water supports the intentions of Policy I/EI as planning for infrastructure including low and net zero options is more effective when growth is concentrated rather than dispersed. We agree with the need for the plan to identify and protect existing infrastructure locations and to provide for growth at these locations.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 60483 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Proposal aligns with our policy, should be seen within the context of ‘net reductions’ for the city. Puts a community obligation on those responsible for developments that would otherwise result in an increase in emissions. The criterion should be impact not scale.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 60815 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery > then go to the sub-heading ‘Tell us what you think’ > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

20

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to infrastructure and delivery. 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

Executive Summary

Some respondents expressed general support for the policy, although a few added caveats to their support. The Wildlife Trust stated that greater emphasis should be placed on funding strategic natural greenspace and green infrastructure which needed to be delivered with explicit funding mechanisms outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the policy should include penalties for not delivering on infrastructure commitments.

Some respondents criticised the policy; D Lister stated that thresholds for contribution to infrastructure should be replaced as it allows for developments to be sized just under the threshold to avoid contributions. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group stated that funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services to meet growing demand.

Cambridgeshire County Council expressed a preference for contributions towards educational facilities to be sought through S106. The Education & Skills Funding Agency of Department for Education posted a substantial representation and made many points, including their request that the Plan identifies specific sites that can deliver school places to support growth based on the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan, that viability assessment inform options analysis and site selection in the district, and they recommend that to pass the soundness test of ‘effectiveness’, the Plan should ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to

deliver the school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments.

A few respondents argued that the scope of infrastructure provided for in the Local Plan should be widened. North Hertfordshire District Council requested that GCSP shares data with them to understand the potential impact of Cambridge South Railway Station. Suffolk County Council provided a substantial representation which emphasised the importance of cross-boundary working on a number of key planning issues, such as transport and green infrastructure and the need to ensure that planning obligations can be used to mitigate impacts upon neighbouring authorities.

Table of representations: I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 59787 (B Hunt)
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 59734 (Environment Agency), 59938 (Fen Ditton PC)
Landowners or Developers: 58611 (Endurance Estates), 60484 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Charities or Political Organisations: 59259 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Expressed a preference for contributions towards educational facilities to be sought through S106 as this allows for cost per place to be calculated.

Comments highlighting this issue
56954 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Greater emphasis should be placed on funding strategic natural greenspace and green infrastructure in the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 57301 (The Wildlife Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Policies such as BG/BG and BG/GI and the required strategic natural greenspaces will not be delivered without explicit funding mechanisms linked to all new development. Such mechanisms need to be developed with partners and included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to make the Local Plan sustainable.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 57301 (The Wildlife Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Acknowledge the preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will comment on it in due course.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57405 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 57465 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There is a need for more detailed assessment of the infrastructure requirements rising from the development strategy of the Local Plan. Linked to this, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan would help to ensure that new development does not create additional strain.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57465 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Local Plan should seek to identify specific sites (existing or new) which can deliver school places to support growth based on the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Viability assessment should inform options analysis and site selection in the district. Site allocations should clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including:
• Minimum site area
• Preferred site characteristics
• Requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is especially important to identify and secure education sites at an appropriate value because the Department of Education's 'Basic Need' funding allocations do not factor in the costs of site acquisition.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Local Plan should, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance, assume that applicable developments will provide both land and funding for the construction of new schools. Total cumulative cost of complying with all relevant policies should not undermine deliverability, so important education needs should be incorporated at the outset to inform local decisions about site selection and infrastructure priorities.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Retaining a degree of flexibility is necessary because the need for school places can vary over time. It is recommended that the next Local Plan include the below:
• At the application stage, specific requirements for developer contributions to increase capacity of existing schools and provision of new schools should be confirmed.
• Requirements to deliver schools on some sites could change if the schools are deemed surplus to requirements.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
One of the tests of soundness is that a Local Plan is 'effective', relating to this there is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Education infrastructure requirements should be set out for the plan period within an Infrastructure Funding Statement, which would be reviewed annually. This Statement should identify where anticipated CIL and/or S106 funding should be spent on additional infrastructure needs. This Statement should also report on the amount of funding received via developer contributions and how it has been used, providing transparency to all stakeholders.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In the Local Plan, it is requested that a reference is included explaining that developer contributions may be secured retrospectively where it has been necessary to forward fund infrastructure projects in advance of anticipated housing growth.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Department is particularly interested in responding to any update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan/ Infrastructure Funding Statement, viability assessment, or other evidence relevant to education which may be used to inform local planning policies and CIL charging schedules. Linked to this, it is requested that the Department is added to the database for future consultations on relevant plans and proposals.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Appropriate funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services in order to meet growing demand. Request that when setting planning obligation policies that the Council seek to address strategic as well as local priorities and engage the NHS in the process as early as possible.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 59196 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Thresholds for contribution to infrastructure should be replaced as it allows for developments to be sized just under the threshold to avoid contributions, yet small developments still strain services. Instead, a sliding scale contribution from all developments should be adopted.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 57965 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
This area needs more thinking and consultation as it is currently vague. More thought should go into topics such as the circular economy, energy-to-waste, community zones including repair cafes and ‘libraries of things’ to reduce consumption.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58330 (I Butnar)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The promoted employment development by Endurance Estates at land at Caxton Gibbet would be well-related to following infrastructure proposals:
• National highways proposed A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvement project
• Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport project
• Making Connections Project that identifies St Neots/ St Neots East and Cambourne/ Cambourne West as transport hubs
• East-West Rail project identified preferred options via Cambourne and station at Cambourne.

The proposed piece of land at Caxton Gibbet would also be consistent with the economic objectives of the plan and the principle of sustainable development.

Comments highlighting this issue
Landowners or Developers: 58611 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Cambridge South railway station will possibly relieve pressures on the A10 but will create different pressures in North Hertfordshire. To address these pressures,

North Herts, Hertfordshire and Great British Railways will need data from GCPS to quantify those pressures and respond appropriately to them- in terms of funding and installation of walking/cycling infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 58691 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Local Plan should include all infrastructure, including water supply, sewage handling and green infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 59006 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is important to avoid placing unnecessary pressure on existing services and places across the Local Plan area, so it is vital that the right infrastructure is provided at the right time to ensure that new development is supported.

Comments highlighting this issue
Charities or Political Organisations: 59259 (National Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Councillors commented that infrastructure was needed including:
• Installation of charging points
• Bicycle lane and green walkways
• Adequate community facilities
• Access to mental health care was needed
• Adequate community facilities
• Communication infrastructure (fibre)

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 59709 (Caldecote PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
As noted for Policy S/DS, the Agency support the idea of development limited to levels that can be supported by a sustainable water supply until the time the strategic infrastructure is in place. It is important that development is sustainable, and the environment is protected throughout the process of infrastructure planning.

Comments highlighting this issue
59734 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Agency supports the policy direction to propose only permitting development if there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the requirements arising from the new development. The developer has a role in delivering this within

a robust and deliverable strategic framework led by the Council and other strategic infrastructure providers.

Comments highlighting this issue
59734 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is not expected that the chosen distribution will create significant impacts on infrastructure in Suffolk. Nevertheless, where the evidence identifies negative impacts are occurring, policies in the Plan should ensure that planning obligations can be used to mitigate impacts in neighbouring authorities. For example, rural communities in Suffolk around Haverhill are reporting increased traffic due to increased development of housing in South Cambridgeshire. Related to this, policies which require site assessments should also account for the impacts across boundaries where this is relevant.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to the specific issue of A1207 communities, SCC officers recently met with a Villages Working Group formed to address this issue. SCC would encourage the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership to continue engaging with this group, SCC and other community groups where cross-boundary impacts result from growth in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Green Infrastructure is an issue which is a cross-boundary issue. Development management policies should enable the development of green infrastructure across boundaries where relevant.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is recommended that the Local Plan takes a positive stance towards contributing to the aims of statutory Nature Recovery Strategies established by the Environment Act 2021. The Council are awaiting secondary legislation to specify the details of these strategies, but planning policies could take a positive stance towards them by pre-empting them.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The SCC Green Access Strategy (Rights of Way Improvement Plan) sets out the Council’s approach to improving the rights of way network within Suffolk. The

Council would welcome joint working to improve cross boundary rights of way connections.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The chosen spatial option to achieve net zero is supported by Suffolk. The chosen distribution, focusing additional areas of development largely near Cambridge City, is also the least likely to impact on infrastructure within Suffolk and is therefore supported.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Reference to improved bus services between Haverhill and Cambridge in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is welcome. SCC is working on a bus improvement strategy but will need to work with operators and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver the strategy. The Local Plan can assist by ensuring transport policies support the provision of public transport measures which cross administrative boundaries.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Council welcomes the enabling of transport across administrative boundaries which should be a key aim of Local Plans. The Council also welcomes the identification of key transport links specifically the rail links from Ipswich via Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket within the plan area and beyond. The Council also welcomes the identification of the corridor between Ipswich and Cambridge as a corridor of regional and national importance. In addition to this, the Council recommends that the dualling of the rail link to Newmarket is included in the infrastructure delivery plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Greater Cambridge is in a severely water stressed area; development should be curtailed until new water supply and sewage infrastructure is operational.

Comments highlighting this issue
60029 (Steeple Morden PC), 60105 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The need to ensure infrastructure capacity is available to serve growth underpins Anglian Water's five-year WRMP and DWMP planning process with its 25-year horizon. Anglian Water therefore considers the policy to appropriately identify the

need for developers to fund infrastructure.
Related to this, Anglian Water agrees that the funding and timing of infrastructure should be set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Anglian Water notes that they work closely with developers to ensure they plan for water sector investment. For residential development this includes connections and improvements to the wastewater network.

Comments highlighting this issue
60484 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Supports policy subject to new development should not result in net increase of life-cycle emissions.

Comments highlighting this issue
60816 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy should include severe penalties for not delivering on agreed infrastructure commitments. Penalties should not be factored into project costings.

Comments highlighting this issue
60816 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
In relation to I/ID, assessment of infrastructure needs should specifically include the impact of traffic from the Fulbourn Road East and Fulbourn Road West (GB3 and GB4) sites together with Cambridge East. It should also include a focus on traffic into and out of Queen Edith's Way and Cherry Hinton Road, including at the Robin Hood junction.

Comments highlighting this issue
59787 (B Hunt)

I/DI: Digital infrastructure

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

22

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to infrastructure and delivery. 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

Executive Summary

Some organisations expressed general support for the policy, with a few organisations such as Carbon Neutral Cambridge emphasising its importance. A few parish council stated that there was a need for enhancement of mobile phone coverage in villages with poor reception by well sited and suitably camouflaged masts.

Trumpington Residents Association stated that there was a need for the GCSP to ensure that the policy is properly implemented so that residents have connectivity when they move into new homes. D Lister criticised the policy, stating that the wording of the policy provides a loophole for developers and instead the policy should mandate that new developments have at least 1 gigabit per second connectivity. D Lister also stated that it should be mandated that developers supply Category 6 network points in every room in new dwellings to allow hard wiring equipment. Cambridge Past, Present & Future also criticised the policy stating that it was disappointing that developers are not required to consider gigabit connections at all sites and that Cambridgeshire needs to support the delivery of gigabit connections in areas where fibre connections are not cost effective.

A few developers asked for confirmation in relation to whether all development is required to provide a 'Connectivity Statements', or whether the policy direction is intended for major developments. If the latter, floorspace, and dwelling thresholds should be stated, to provide applicants with clarity. Some other developers argued that it is important that the eventual policy wording recognises to what degree digital infrastructure is under the control of the developer themselves as opposed to statutory bodies. Linked to this, the Home Builders Federation argued that the Council should not impose new electronic communications requirements beyond the provision of infrastructure as set out in statutory Building Regulations.

Table of representations: I/DI: Digital infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments
General support for policy including:

- Proposal to increase the quality and availability of superfast broadband and mobile coverage.
- Importance of this policy.
- Inclusivity to the communities.

Comments highlighting this issue
Individuals: 58331 (I Butnar)
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 57763 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56662 (Gamlingay PC), 58338 (Histon & Impington PC), 59490 (Shepreth PC), 59712 (Caldecote PC), 59939 (Fen Ditton PC), 60030 (Steeple Morden PC), 60106 (Guilden Morden PC)
Landowners or Developers: 59535 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)
Charities or Political Organisations: 57784 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 59011 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59593 (CPRE), 60600 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60817 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need for enhancement of mobile phone coverage in villages with poor reception by well-sited and suitably camouflaged masts.

Comments highlighting this issue
Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations: 60030 (Steeple Morden PC), 60106 (Guilden Morden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
This is essential for home working and for new settlements.

Comments highlighting this issue
56786 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
This is important for enabling a thriving low carbon economy, because it reduces the need to travel, and improves the quality of life while reducing carbon emissions, congestion, and road building (with its associated embodied carbon and habitat destruction).

Comments highlighting this issue
57784 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments
There are references to support "via multiple providers" and "in all cases, to encourage competition and consumer choice, this will include the provision of multiple ducts to enable several providers to access the site" (both page 322), but in our experience in the Southern Fringe we are aware that this may not happen. The infrastructure would be in place for early residents, who should not be expected to live without connectivity for months, as was the case in some areas of the Southern Fringe.

Comments highlighting this issue
57004 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Gigabit capable broadband connectivity should be download speeds of at least 1Gbps, not “up to”. This wording provides a loophole and doesn’t match the

intention. It should be mandated that new developments have at least 1Gbps capable connectivity, even if the service level chosen by the consumer is lower. Anything less is not sufficient investment for increased demands from home working etc.

It should be mandated that developers supply CAT6 network points in every room in new dwellings to allow hard wiring equipment. High density developments are relying on wifi with poor service.

Comments highlighting this issue
57973 (D Lister)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Need to look at infrastructure needed to support future generations (in 15 years) without major changes.

Comments highlighting this issue
58338 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Using wide conduit (for example) should prevent roads pavements being dug up again when new generation is needed.

Comments highlighting this issue
58338 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Disappointing that developers are not required to consider Gbit connections at all sites. “That housing developers are obliged to provide a gigabit-capable connection unless the cost to the housing developer of providing connectivity exceeds £2,000 per connection, or the network operator declines to provide a connection.” The UK Government has invested heavily in the OneWeb company to provide gigabit connections in remote areas. Cambridgeshire needs to support similar ventures to deliver gigabit connections in areas where fibre connections are not cost effective.

Comments highlighting this issue
59011 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The policy direction should confirm whether all development is required to provide a ‘Connectivity Statement’, or whether the policy direction is intended for major developments. If the latter, floorspace, and dwelling thresholds should be stated, to provide applicants with clarity.

Comments highlighting this issue
59116 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 60539 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments
It is important that the eventual policy wording recognises to what degree elements

of digital infrastructure to support new developments are under the control of the developer themselves as opposed to statutory undertakers.

Comments highlighting this issue
59535 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60600 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)

Summary of issues raised in comments
The Council should not impose new electronic communications requirements beyond the provision of infrastructure as set out in statutory Building Regulations. In 2020, the Government confirmed future legislation to ensure that new build homes are built with gigabit-capable broadband. Any type of technology may be used, which is able to provide speeds of over 1000 Mbps. All new build developments will be equipped with the physical infrastructure to support gigabit-capable connections from more than one network operator.

The Council's approach is therefore unnecessary and repetitive of Building Regulations and should not be taken forward into the local plan.

Comments highlighting this issue
60142 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments
Digital infrastructure should align with best practice for futureproofing in order to ensure that incentives to work without the necessity to use car transport are clearly established.

Comments highlighting this issue
60817 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments
No comment.

Comments highlighting this issue
57567 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment

Sustainability Appraisal 916

Habitats Regulation Assessment 932

Sustainability Appraisal

Hyperlink for comments

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

Number of Representations for this policy: 48

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Some parties such as Parish Councils and Statutory Bodies welcomed the production of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to help to ensure that the Plan is sustainable, however there were comments about areas where it was considered that it was flawed or could be improved. A large number of landowners/developers questioned the assessment that development in the villages would not be sustainable, when some have good access to sustainable modes of transport and a good range of services and facilities and a need for affordable housing. The majority of these comments were also promoting a particular site within a village location and seeking to demonstrate why the site would have a more positive sustainability outcome than the preferred development strategy. There were questions whether the SA looked adequately at the in-combination impacts of the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to the preferred Anglian Water site at Honey Hill and whether a decision on the NEC site should be made ahead of a future assessment. There was also some criticism from developers/ landowners of the process for identifying and appraising the sites in the SA. There were some suggestions for improvements to the Sustainability Objectives and making use of up-to-date evidence in the next iteration of the SA to accompany the Draft Local Plan.

Table of representations: Sustainability Appraisal

Summary of issues raised in comments

Evidence in the Gamlingay Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment supports the principle that South Cambridgeshire District Council must

lower the reliance on the private car, as there are significantly higher carbon dioxide emissions here than the rest of East of England and England in general.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56569 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land should not be taken out of the Green Belt behind Mingle Lane, Stapleford for 100 new houses, as this is clearly not exceptional circumstances and needs revisiting.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56706 (M Howe)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority welcomes the inclusion of minerals as an objective but would encourage the consideration of 'sustainable resource use' or 'waste minimisation' when considering objectives for future local plans.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 56921 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA has not sought to make the emerging GCLP more sustainable. In respect of the villages, the assessment against sustainability objectives is not robust because it does not critically review the evidence provided by the Councils. For example, some villages have good access by sustainable modes of transport, contain a good range of services and facilities and there is an identified need for affordable housing in most villages, which is ignored in the assessment process. There is limited capacity within existing settlement boundaries for villages to accommodate additional development.

Comments highlighting this issue

57006 (Hastingwood Developments), 57055 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57067 (C Meadows), 57089 (Shelford Investments), 57100 (RO Group Ltd), 57109 (J Francis), 57117 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57125 (KG Moss Will Trust and Moss Family), 57640 (Dudley Developments), 57656 (Endurance Estates – Balsham Site), 58179 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58200 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58459 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58560 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58563 (J Manning), 58568 (Hill Residential), 58699 (Hawkswren Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA has not sought to make the emerging GCLP more sustainable. In respect of the villages, the assessment against sustainability objectives is not robust because it

does not critically review the evidence provided by the Councils. For example, some villages have good access by sustainable modes of transport, contain a good range of services and facilities and there is an identified need for affordable housing in most

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57006 (Hastingwood Developments), 57055 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57067 (C Meadows), 57089 (Shelford Investments), 57100 (RO Group Ltd), 57109 (J Francis), 57117 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57125 (KG Moss Will Trust and Moss Family), 57640 (Dudley Developments), 57656 (Endurance Estates – Balsham Site), 58179 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58200 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58459 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58560 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58563 (J Manning), 58568 (Hill Residential), 58699 (Hawkswren Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA has not sought to make the emerging GCLP more sustainable. The assessment against sustainability objectives is not robust because it does not critically review the evidence provided by the Councils in relation to the economy objective (SA14) and employment objective (SA15) and highlights how unambitious the development strategy is towards supporting the economy of Greater Cambridge.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58616 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA is flawed as it is based on the preconceived judgement that development in villages is unsustainable due to car dependency. The SA acknowledges that affordability is a key issue in Greater Cambridge but this does not form a key measure to rate sustainability. A sensible approach for the strategy would be a blend of options which results in some growth in villages. This would also support the viability of existing services and facilities in the villages. The SA is a lengthy and unwieldy document and the brief conclusion is not adequate to summarise such a complex document.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57357 (Clarendon Land)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The inclusion of North East Cambridge AAP is premature and inappropriate as it is predicated on the relocation of the fully functioning Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plan. The SA does not assess the significant effects the relocation will

have on the site identified by Anglian Water. This site is in the Green Belt in an area of 'very high harm' and it would impact on significant green infrastructure, the River Cam corridor, SSSI sites, registered house and gardens, PRoW network, National Trust Wicken Fen vision and is contrary to many policies in the emerging Local Plan. The assessment of the effects of the NEC policy have been deferred to Anglian Water and the DCO planning process and not included within the Local Plan process or its SA which seems an extraordinary position.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57531 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57621 (J Pratt), 57698 (J Conroy), 59264 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments

These documents are very sound. The problem is that many of the above policies don't fully meet these document statements.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57550 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA does not appear to consider all the relevant factors and appears incomplete or inaccurate. It says that the WWTW relocation will be added later as 'in-combination effects'. Policy S/NEC and the relocation is contrary to a wide range of policies including capital carbon and Green Belt. The effects of the WWTW relocation are not considered providing an imbalanced assessment. The relocation should be included fully within the SA or alternatively Policy S/NEC omitted until a balanced assessment can be made.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58153 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The sites selected in the strategy do not create a balanced distribution of need and affordability. In the formation of the First Proposals the impacts of a new settlement option or village expansion have been unfairly discounted. The narrow-focused distribution does not provide sufficient confidence that delivery rates can be sustained over short-medium and long-term. Until all reasonable alternatives are appraised it is not possible to conclude the First Proposals is the most sustainable strategy. More work is required to establish which infrastructure projects can be relied upon.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58730 (Vistry Group and RH Topham and Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA has not sought to make the emerging GCLP more sustainable. The assessment against sustainability objectives is not robust because it does not critically review the evidence provided by the Councils. Detailed comments are provided in relation to Policy S/DS and SA objective on housing (SA1) and that there is an over reliance on existing new settlements and planned new neighbourhoods to meet housing requirements. An alternative approach should have been recommended in the SA to improve sustainability outcomes – such as additional strategic allocations on the edge of Cambridge that deliver affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58986 (North Barton Road

Summary of issues raised in comments

It is not clear whether any 'in-combination' effects of the First Proposals and CWWTP have been adequately assessed. We expect the SA to be updated to reflect a proper assessment of these impacts together.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59004 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

There is a lack of transparency as to why the components of the First Proposals development strategy has been taken forward and it seems to be in isolation from the evidence testing and results of the SA. It is difficult to understand why certain spatial options have been discounted when they seem to perform well in the SA. For example, Spatial Option 6: Public Transport Corridors seems to perform equally well as Spatial Option 9: Preferred Option. The justification for taking forward expansion of Cambourne needs to be more robust.

In the scoring exercise there are no SA objectives where Spatial Option 9: Preferred Strategy performs better than the other spatial options.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59049 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Concern with the process for identifying sites to take forward for Sustainability Appraisal and therefore to be considered as part of the First Proposals Development Strategy. The 'source of supply' categories are different in the SA with 'public transport corridors' combined with 'villages' with no clear explanation. Sites considered not suitable, not available or not achievable in the HELAA were excluded from the SA assessment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59049 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA fails to properly assess options in relation to employment land requirements in relation to a number of the SA objectives. Detailed justification is provided for each, with the conclusion that existing employment evidence is not sufficiently robust as it fails to provide a full an objective assessment of distribution and industrial needs. In relation to Policy J/NE (New employment and development proposals) the only alternative option is 'no policy', but this is not legitimate and at Draft Plan stage the SA should appropriately assess alternative options in relation to strategic employment requirements and land supply.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59105 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA would benefit from additional consideration and clarity and should be improved by:

Confirmation why updates to policy and Government strategy do not require alterations to Sustainability Framework

- Baseline data should reflect latest available datasets
- Further clarification on how mitigation measures have been factored into scoring reasonable alternatives
- For climate change mitigation consideration of whole life carbon in developments, ecosystem services and reduction in travel alongside the measures on energy efficiency in buildings and low carbon energy sources.

A detailed review of the SA is provided.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59135 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support for SA. If the LPA sticks to what has been written it would be beneficial to the plan.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59208 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA does not provide a thorough and consistent assessment of the growth options, particularly in relation to Option 5 – dispersal – villages. It makes assumptions which are not applicable to all villages resulting in an overly negative score which has unjustly influenced the decision to distribute limited growth to villages. Detailed comments about the SA assessment of Option 5 in relation to the SA objectives. Do not support the approach of allocating less than 3% growth in villages as this is inconsistent with the NPPF and the Council's objectives to support rural communities to thrive and sustain services.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59272 (Scott Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Welcome the production of the SA. However, as many of the site allocations are grouped together under particular policies, the different impacts for individual sites are not always drawn out in the assessment tables – this sometimes has the effect of neutralising the scoring.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59690 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Whilst there is an objective for Air Quality within the SA, there is no objective included for Transport and Access.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59704 (Central Bedfordshire Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The Council's approach to the SA and undertaking a detailed assessment of only its Preferred Option is unsound (not justified) and not legally compliant. The SA

findings for Policy H/SH are not supported by the assumptions underlying the Preferred Option. There is no discussion on an alternative option to allocate specific sites to deliver specialist housing to meet the identified issues of potential under delivery of housing on strategic sites and urban extensions.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59788 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Supportive that up-to-date evidence on landscape and townscape character was used to identify and consider key landscape issues early in the plan making process and feed into the SA.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59984 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Supportive that:

- A range of reasonable alternative options have been assessed including alternatives to the preferred policy approaches, Strategic Spatial Options and site options.
- The findings of the HRA will be incorporated into the SA and will provide further insight into biodiversity impacts specifically at designated sites, presenting the opportunity to limit adverse impacts at these locations.

recognition that the over-abstraction of water is a serious concern and that action is required now to ensure the availability of water for future uses is without detrimental impact on the environment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59992 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Suggest that the overall conclusion of the SA, that the Local Plan performs well in sustainability terms, is premature in the current absence of strategic water supply infrastructure and sustainable interim measures. Further development of Green Infrastructure Initiatives is also required to ensure adequate GI to meet development needs and alleviate recreational pressures on some of the most sensitive site habitats.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59992 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA fails to tackle the key environmental capacity issues arising from existing growth, let alone that now proposed. The definition of sustainable development is too narrow and should also include culture (in line with the UN) and Cambridge's historic environment is a cultural asset of worldwide significance. Historic landscape setting is important and open spaces should be valued not only as green infrastructure but also part of the historic environment. Detailed assessment of policies is provided.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60208 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The SA fails to identify any reasonable alternatives relating to quantum of development. The representation refers to the alternatives given for Policy S/JH (New jobs and homes) and says that the justification for discounting the higher growth scenario in Option B is erroneous because 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. The higher growth scenario is entirely possible. To withhold the full assessment of Option B effectively blinds the decision maker to the differences in environmental effect and sustainability between them.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60247 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments

The Councils should ensure that the future results of the SA clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of this assessment why some policy options have progressed, and others have been rejected. This must be undertaken through a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives. The Councils' decision-making and scoring should be robust, justified, and transparent.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60308 (Gladman Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land at Bury End Farm, Meldreth

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing, SA2 Access to Services and Facilities and SA8 Efficient Use of Land from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57006 (Hastingwood Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land west of Malton Road, Orwell

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.**Comments highlighting this issue**

- 57055 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land to rear of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57067 (C Meadows)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Cabbage Moor, Great Shelford

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RSC and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57089 (Shelford Investments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land south of Hall Lane, Great Chishill

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57100 (RO Group Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS and S/SB and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57109 (J Francis)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land at Two Mill Field and land north of Oakington Road, Cottenham

Detailed comments provided about policies S/SH and S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing

and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.. The decision to reclassify Cottenham as a Minor Rural Centre is not supported by any evidence and has not been informed by any assessment against sustainability objectives.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57117 (Cambridge District Oddfellows)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Home End and land at Court Meadows House off Balsham Road (as amended), Fulbourn

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57125 (KG Moss Will Trust and Moss Family)

Summary of issues raised in comments

HELAA Site OS216

The site scores well against sustainability objectives compared to alternative site options. There are 3 sustainability objectives where negative effects are identified. Access to services score appears incorrect as Great Shelford and Stapleford have a good range of services. Efficient use of land score depends partly on the quantum of development proposed. Mineral resource issue would need to be assessed but unlikely the site would be suitable for extraction due to proximity of residential areas. Request the comments are taken into account when the SA is updated.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57305 (AJ Johnson)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Limekiln Road, Cambridge

Detailed comments about policy S/DS and that additional small allocations in sustainable locations such as on the edge of Cambridge, including land at Cherry

Hinton on land within the Green Belt, are important to the strategy because such sites can also deliver affordable housing.

Comments on each SA objective in relation to the promoted site.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57640 (Dudley Developments)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Old House Road, Balsham

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 57656 (Endurance Estates – Balsham Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land east of Ridgeway and Old Pinewood Way, Papworth Everard

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58179 (Bloor Homes Eastern)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Meadow Drift, Elsworth

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing, SA2 Access to Services and Facilities and SA8 Efficient Use of Land from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the

site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58200 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Mill Lane site, Sawston

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RSC and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58459 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land west of Linton

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RSC and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.**Comments highlighting this issue**

- 58560 (Bloor Homes Eastern)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Station Road, Willingham

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for

housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58563 (J Manning)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land east of Balsham Road, Fulbourn

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58568 (Hill Residential)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land at Caxton Gibbet

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/CB, J/NE and the sustainability objectives SA14 Economy and SA15 Employment from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for Class B2 and B8 employment uses to meet floorspace needs and provide job opportunities close to Cambourne.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58616 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land off Leaden Hill

Detailed comments provided about policies S/DS, S/SB, S/RRA and the sustainability objectives SA1 Housing and SA2 Access to Services and Facilities from the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate that the site should be allocated for housing and affordable housing to deliver better and more positive sustainability outcomes compared with the preferred development strategy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58699 (Hawkswren Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land North of Barton Road and land at Grange Farm, Cambridge

Detailed comments are provided on the SA assessment of the site against each SA objective, justifying why the scores should be altered to be more positive for this site.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58986 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land North of Cambourne

Detailed assessment provided about how the SA assesses the site, highlighting that it performs better than any of the other sies in the Growth around transport nodes Cambourne Area site options. Also how the areas that showed a negative impact could be mitigated through good design and urban planning. The rejection of the site in Appendix E of the SA is questioned as it does not make any reference to the SA objectives and focuses on the uncertain delivery of the station as part of East-West Rail. Request that the North Cambourne proposal is confirmed in future drafts of the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59440 (Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Branch Lane and Long Lane Comberton

This site is in a sustainable location in close proximity to a number of services and facilities and the Council should consider allocating specific sites such as this to support integrated living and extra-care accommodation within existing communities.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59788 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambridge Science Park North site (HELAA site 40096 - Land East of Impington)

The Sustainability Appraisal prepared to support the emerging JLP includes policy interventions in the scoring of other employment designations that somewhat skews the results.

For edge of Cambridge Green Belt sites such as CSPN the HELAA process identified that most sites would result in significant landscape impacts. However, the edge of Cambridge performs well in many aspects of sustainability due to its proximity to the jobs, homes and infrastructure of the city. All individual sites on the edge of Cambridge including

those in the green belt were subject to site specific consideration for allocation, and for sustainability appraisal.

The results for CSPN are similar to the Green Belt sites proposed for release, and with regard to certain criteria actually performs better. It is noted that the sustainability appraisal relating to sites including Cambridge Biomedical

Campus, Babraham Research Institute and Wellcome Genome Trust includes policy interventions which then improve the sustainability appraisal score once these are translated into planning policy appraisals. For example, the application of criteria 6 (Landscape and Townscape) at Cambridge Biomedical Campus amended a HELAA assessment which identified the potential the site extension would have resulting in a significant adverse effect on the landscape to a policy intervention moving the rating to a positive via a comprehensive landscaping plan.

Comprehensive landscaping is proposed at CSPN which similarly would result in a movement in sustainability appraisal scoring. If this approach (of including policy mitigation in the scoring) was undertaken for CSPN the site would score similarly well through the SA process.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60686 (Trinity College)

Habitats Regulation Assessment

Hyperlink for all comments

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

Number of Representations for this section: 4

Abbreviations

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

Executive Summary

Only four respondents made representations to the Habitats Regulation Assessment. Cambridge Past, Present and Future submitted a critical representation which expressed concerns about potential recreational impacts, the consequences of increased water supply and quality issues arising from the Plan. CPPF argued that a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of European sites cannot be reached without further work on the issue of water quantity and quality. Natural England wrote that they would submit a fuller response once the complete HRA is submitted, but noted that the wording for policy BG/BG needs to be strengthened. Endurance Estates wrote in their representation that they expect the policies of the First Proposals to be revised to ensure that the emerging plan secures appropriate mitigation in connection with the development strategy - in particular North-East Cambridge.

Table of representations: Habitats Regulation Assessment

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support the recognition at Para 1.10 that the HRA report is based on the precautionary principle and the statement that ‘where uncertainty or doubt remains, an adverse effect should be assumed’.

Cambridge Past, Present & Future has also commented on the Biodiversity and green spaces policies in the GCLP First Proposals consultation and our comments on the HRA report should be read in together with these.

Cambridge PPF are concerned about the potential recreational impacts and the consequences of increased water supply and quality issues arising from the Plan. We also note the caveat that the HRA report indicates that (on a precautionary basis) a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of European sites cannot be reached without further work on issue of water quantity and quality - both key concerns.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Chapter 3 of the HRA report refers to the assessment of potential in combination effects and the identification of other Local Authority plans that could contribute to these. The scope of this is welcomed. It should be noted though that broader projects such as the Oxford-Cambridge Arc still require more work and detail to enable potential in combination effects to be identified. This also applies to any other site allocations and development that have yet to be defined or that may emerge in future versions of the GCLP.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

It is noted that para 4.3 indicates a list of policies that will not result in development and will contribute to ensuring the safeguarding of European sites. This intention is welcomed but much will depend on how these polices are worded and framed.

We have commented on the need to prioritise polices to ensure that the protection of all sites of biodiversity importance is the first principle - this should also provide clear guidance for future developments on the standards and process that will be required. This includes the assessment of projects, the application of the mitigation hierarchy and justification and compensation for harm to sites where an unavoidable adverse effect might happen.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Recreational pressure arising from future development because of development planned for in the GCLP could have a serious impact on existing European sites and those of national and local importance that are, of course, not covered by the HRA Report. It is also evident that the potential effect on Wicken Fen and the related Fenland SAC has only been identified because of specific survey work. With this in mind, we are concerned with the confidence that can be placed on a finding of no LSE for other European sites based on a zone of potential risk for recreational pressure based on a 2Km and 5km distance.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Para 5.5 summarises the LSEs indicated in Table 4.8. That table indicates no LSE from Air Pollution on any European sites. Para 5.5. however indicates to the contrary - we assume this is an error as the subsequent AA does not address this issue.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

In relation to 5.35 of the HRA, more clarity will be needed on how this will work in practice. Again, it is appreciated that the policy wording has still to be written. However, this is such an important issue that a clear statement of intent should be made in the GCLP now. If developments are proven to have an adverse effect or, applying the precautionary principle, a risk of an adverse effect, then they should only be normally permitted when clear tests are applied. Arguably this should also include being satisfied that applicants have demonstrated that there are no less damaging alternatives they could pursue.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Clarification will also be needed of what tests will be used to determine whether public benefits outweigh adverse impacts on important sites, because an approach solely on a case-by-case basis could risk a lack of consistency and consequent serious harm to biodiversity interests without sufficient justification. The level of public interest that would need to be demonstrated will also need to be commensurate with the level of interest affected - this is likely be very high if for example, an internationally or nationally important interest is at risk.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

In relation to 5.46 of the HRA, this overall commitment is welcomed and we are pleased to see that it concludes the need to manage alternative natural greenspace in perpetuity. However, the success of any mitigation (and ultimately any finding of no risk of any adverse effects) will all depend on alternative green space being delivered in a timely fashion to serve new development in the Cambridge Area. At this point in time that assumption is questionable. Specifically, proposed new development at Waterbeach, North East Cambridge and Cambridge East will result in a substantial population within approximately 10 miles of these highly sensitive sites. Existing recreational green spaces such as Milton Country Park are already at capacity. Our recent understanding is that the relevant local authorities do not propose to create any new large scale greenspace for North East Cambridge. Whilst

the need for such space is accepted, as yet the local authorities have no mechanism to deliver it. Failure to secure and deliver the required open space would thus place the Wicken Fen Ramsar site and Fenland SAC at considerable risk from increased recreational pressure and could not support a HRA finding of no adverse effect.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

We are concerned that potential harmful effects on European sites have yet to be resolved. This also has implications for effects other sites of national and local biodiversity and must be addressed as a matter of urgency if the GCLP is to proceed. Whilst water availability is, of course, a relevant constraint that the planning system should consider, the capacity of our watercourses to dispose of treated water waste is likely to be a more binding one.

Furthermore, consideration must also be given to the climate-change-induced, greater frequency of storm events. Without increased investment by the water authorities the frequency of storm events leading to raw sewerage being discharged is likely to increase, even at current levels of development. At this stage, it is unclear whether there is sufficient capacity available within existing infrastructure and as part of upgrades to WRC to support the increase in wastewater treatment as part of proposed development in the GCLP. It is recommended that exact mitigation measures are informed by the findings of the Greater Cambridge IWMS, including Outline Water Cycle Study and upcoming Detailed Water Cycle Study is recommended that there is a specific inclusion of wording that outlines that any development will only be permitted where there is sufficient capacity within the WRC infrastructure.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Subject to the findings of the Greater Cambridge IWMS being confirmed and delivered a conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity can be reached. However, in the absence of this study and in line with a precautionary approach, a conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity cannot be reached in relation to the effect of water quality on Ouse Washes SAC, SPA and Ramsar site, Wicken Fen Ramsar site, Chippenham Fen Ramsar site, Fenland SAC and Portholme SAC either alone or in-combination until further detail is provided and presented in the GCLP.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

We note and appreciate the point made regarding next steps at para 6.6 that the HRA is an iterative process and is expected to be updated. We will of course comment on further information when this is available. We remain concerned however, that fundamental issues such as the impacts of recreation and water as described above are still to be resolved.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 5816 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments

It appears from the HRA Report that the relocation of the CWWTP is part of the mitigation measures which will be necessary to provide certainty that water quality impacts arising from the First Proposals will not adversely affect the integrity of several designated nature sites, in combination with other plans and projects. We expect the policies of the First Proposals to be revised (including to provide for the relocation of the CWWTP) in order to ensure that the emerging plan secures appropriate mitigation in connection with the development strategy - in particular North East Cambridge.

This will require the emerging plan to include proposals for the CWWTP's relocation and if that update is made to the plan we expect the Sustainability Appraisal to be updated to reflect the effects of the CWWTP as part of the assessment of the impacts arising from Policy S/NEC and for this to be re-assessed alongside the alternatives to this policy option.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59010 (Endurance Estates)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Natural England is generally supportive of the interim findings of the HRA and will provide further advice as the HRA is updated in line with the development of Plan policies and further evidence.

It is recommended that policy wording in the plan is strengthened to include specific inclusion of the safeguard measures detailed in the representation (completion of bat surveys and ensuring proposed development will avoid habitat features and to create and enhance suitable habitats for species) and that Policy BG/BG Biodiversity and geodiversity is strengthened to include specific reference that mitigation provided should be suitable to the level of protection afforded to designated sites.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59991 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Whilst the assessment has ruled out likely significant effects on all relevant European sites Natural England has been unable to carry out a detailed review of this information and will provide comments at the next stage of Plan consultation.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59991 (Natural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments

Please note that Natural England is reviewing the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC to consider the findings of emerging SAC barbastelle tracking surveys being undertaken for major development schemes. It will also take into consideration the availability of suitable foraging resource which is scarce in the local area. In the meantime, until the IRZ is formally amended, and accompanying guidance prepared, we welcome application of a precautionary 20km buffer zone for SAC barbastelles in line with Natural England's current local guidance.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 59991 (Natural England)

Table of representations: Habitats Regulation Assessment site-specific comments

Summary of issues raised in comments

New housing beyond Ninewells must not find a rat run through Ninewells to our homes on Greenland's adding to the already extensive drug running and antisocial groups coming into a cul-de-sac of only 32 homes. Ninewells needs to be redirected to CBC and Park and Ride/cycle route needs to go around NW not through Greenlands. Ninewells needs its own cycle route out to main road and to school/work/leisure routes. Footfall of thousands on Greenlands needs to be reduced not increased.

The representation is not fully copied here as it lists all the problems to do with the CBC and is not relevant for this topic.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 58084 (I Blackburn-Horgan)

Summary of Representations: Quick Questionnaire

Contents

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? 941

Q2. Do you agree that new development should mainly focus on sites where car travel, and therefore carbon emissions, can be minimised? 942

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?..... 943

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? 973

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? 1007

Q6. We think East-West Rail provides the opportunity for Cambourne to grow up into a proper town. What housing, jobs, facilities or open spaces do you think should be developed in and around Cambourne? 1031

Q7. We think that the ‘southern rural cluster’ of villages near the rail line and the business parks south of Cambridge, could see some limited development. What housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces do you think this area should provide? 1056

Q8. We think we should be very limited about the development we allow in villages, with only a few allocated sites in villages with good public transport connections and local services. Which villages do you think should see new development of any kind? 1075

Q9: What housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces do you think should be provided in and around these villages? 1095

Q10. Are there any sites which you think should be developed for housing or business use, which we haven't got on our map so far? 1113

Q11. What kinds of home do you think you will need in the next 20 years? Choose as many as you think may apply to you. 1124

Q12. What should we prioritise when planning homes for the future? Choose 4 from the following: 1126

Q13. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about what Greater Cambridge should be like in 2041? 1126

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:

Do not need to build in this area because:

- It destroys the Cambridge landscape and biodiversity
- Creates 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, GPs, 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
- Site is too big
- Planned for more housing than nationally required
- No need for housing
- No need for 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Are Marshalls willing to vacate the site and relocate – there's been discussion of this for years?

Comments highlighting this issue:

113

Summary of issues raised:

I suspect that given Marshalls are already actively looking at relocating, this is already a done deal.

Comments highlighting this issue:

187

Summary of issues raised:

Agree with rational approach in choosing sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:

245, 247, 520, 574

Summary of issues raised:

The sites for development should be chosen after a comprehensive evaluation of the impacts on the environment, current and required infrastructure including water, sewage, transport and future risks (e.g., flooding due to climate change). Looking only at car travel is disingenuous.

Comments highlighting this issue:

439

Climate change

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

28, 123, 134, 141, 242, 255, 283, 291, 311, 373, 378, 431, 436, 485, 495, 521

Summary of issues raised:

How much absorbent surface will be lost?

Comments highlighting this issue:

28

Summary of issues raised:

Paved areas should be permeable where possible.

Comments highlighting this issue:

255, 510, 511, 526

Summary of issues raised:

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
- Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs)

Comments highlighting this issue:

68, 510, 511, 526

Summary of issues raised:

Ensure that rain water is captured and used in houses as grey water and then recycled.

Comments highlighting this issue:

148

Summary of issues raised:

Everything should be carbon net zero.

Comments highlighting this issue:

86, 218

Summary of issues raised:

All homes should be 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
- Outstanding BREAAM rating
- Insulating walls and roofs
- Green walls and roofs
- Nature spaces integrated into design

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

255

Summary of issues raised:

Encourage community renewable energy projects, with any profits going towards local good causes or to invest in more renewables.

Comments highlighting this issue:

89

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

123, 173, 276, 495

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

506

Summary of issues raised:

With no track record on creating any development to date that is carbon neutral, this is a sham to suit the needs of developers and banks. Planning Authorities are likely to agree compromises during negotiation with developers – for example the number of social housing units is often reduced.

Comments highlighting this issue:

495, 506, 596

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

134

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

26, 63, 84

Summary of issues raised:

Should provide biodiversity through planting and green landscaping of all scales including:

- Re-foresting the airport site
- Increasing woodland and small woodlands
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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, 401, 404, 406, 411, 423, 463, 476, 484, 500, 527, 537, 553, 562, 568, 588

Summary of issues raised:

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).

Comments highlighting this issue:

17, 129, 135, 387, 519, 566

Summary of issues raised:

If Marshall did move, then the area should become a wooded area like Wandlebury enabling local recreation.

Comments highlighting this issue:

90, 183, 242

Summary of issues raised:

Significant potential effect on biodiversity including:

- Deer
- Owls
- Newts
- Mice
- Voles
- Wildflowers
- Bees
- Butterflies

- Sustainable chalk streams

Comments highlighting this issue:

109, 255

Summary of issues raised:

Existing sites are already at capacity including:

- Wandlebury
- Anglesey Abbey
- Fulbourn Fen

Comments highlighting this issue:

373, 592

Summary of issues raised:

The grassland of the airport does remove some carbon and supports a certain amount of species diversity.

Comments highlighting this issue:

330

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Green spaces in between housing, not just on the edge of a housing development.

Comments highlighting this issue:

179

Summary of issues raised:

Keep development to a minimum as you are in danger of destroying the very elements of living here including:

- Green spaces
- Countryside
- Separation with Teversham
- Nearby nature reserves such as Fulbourn Fen Nature Reserve, Little Wilbraham Nature Reserve, Little Wilbraham River and Quy Water

Comments highlighting this issue:

200, 397, 484, 486, 855

Summary of issues raised:

Development opportunity to build sustainably on brownfield sites.

Comments highlighting this issue:

200, 365, 397, 498

Summary of issues raised:

Build as much at Cambridge East rather than spoil the villages.

Comments highlighting this issue:

370

Summary of issues raised:

Ensure integrated completely with CBC.

Comments highlighting this issue:

454

Summary of issues raised:

It should all be open space to compensate for open space taken already by new developments such as Eddington and Northstowe.

Comments highlighting this issue:

115

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised:

Should provide indoor community facilities including:

- Community centres like Clay Farm
- 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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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, 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:

Should provide space for Cambridge United Football Club.

Comments highlighting this issue:

253, 577

Summary of issues raised:

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, 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

514

Summary of issues raised:

Should provide ambulance and police standby location.

Comments highlighting this issue:

279

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

295, 368

Summary of issues raised:

Access within 15 minutes to all primary care services, schools, and essential shopping to minimise travel.

Comments highlighting this issue:

190, 232, 289, 425, 468, 490, 497, 508, 510, 511, 526, 544, 545, 548, 571, 572, 586

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

495, 496, 506, 521

Summary of issues raised:

Provision of a cemetery.

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Provision of community centres and open spaces before residents move in, not several years later as done elsewhere including Northstowe and Cambourne.

Comments highlighting this issue:

106, 232, 268

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

212, 251, 262, 291, 306, 327, 347, 349, 356, 363, 378, 386, 387, 496, 500, 596

Summary of issues raised:

Safe open streets for children.

Comments highlighting this issue:

544

Summary of issues raised:

Should use lessons learnt from growth of CBC where infrastructure surrounding the site are polluted, noisy, and has antisocial behaviour.

Comments highlighting this issue:

308

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

106

Great Places

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

26, 278, 291, 356, 470, 482, 492, 525, 561, 568, 584, 582, 592, 596

Summary of issues raised:

A learning centre teaching others how to build sustainable communities

Comments highlighting this issue:

54

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

502

Summary of issues raised:

Part of Marshall was in the Green Belt, and taken out for them to expand, moving that land should return to greenbelt

Comments highlighting this issue:

90

Summary of issues raised:

Green Belt should be replaced/extended and be accessible if built on at all

Comments highlighting this issue:

330, 339, 363, 566

Summary of issues raised:

Think outside the box, this will impact future generations

Comments highlighting this issue:

365

Summary of issues raised:

Should celebrate the aviation heritage of this space

Comments highlighting this issue:

551

Jobs

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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, 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:

Should provide more facilities that will contribute to a circular economy in the city

Comments highlighting this issue:

6

Summary of issues raised:

Retail Park to prevent having to go to the city centre or along Newmarket Road

Comments highlighting this issue:

130, 538

Summary of issues raised:

Should service the established Tech / Silicon Fen in terms of enabling companies already here to develop and expand

Comments highlighting this issue:

191

Summary of issues raised:

More of a focus on remote working, enabling people to work where they like and less need for office space

Comments highlighting this issue:

168, 385, 496, 500

Summary of issues raised:

Has COVID impact on homeworking been considered and the fact that a large proportion of people now want to live in rural community

Comments highlighting this issue:

520

Summary of issues raised:

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
- Affordable/low-cost retail units
- An enterprise area
- Early product development facilities
- Manufacturing space
- ‘Green jobs’
- Lab space
- Research jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Employment opportunities for low skilled workers, including apprenticeships and training for local people

Comments highlighting this issue:

190, 400, 489

Summary of issues raised:

An eastern science/business park to rival/complement those on the north of Cambridge with associated housing

Comments highlighting this issue:

170, 284

Summary of issues raised:

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 to find jobs to work at nearby?

Comments highlighting this issue:

20, 41, 80, 90, 251, 283, 503, 568, 579

Summary of issues raised:

Support existing jobs only – don't attract any new business or jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

119, 173, 248, 304, 330, 378, 385

Summary of issues raised:

Opportunity to relocate many businesses currently spread along Newmarket Road between Coldham's Lane and the football ground, including:

- DIY
- Electrical goods

Comments highlighting this issue:

432, 577

Summary of issues raised:

Good commercial links to the site

Comments highlighting this issue:

563

Summary of issues raised:

Employers would want to choose from a pool of people applying for jobs, not just from people living in those new development sites

Comments highlighting this issue:

259

Summary of issues raised:

Don't think people would want to live next to their place of work

Comments highlighting this issue:

259

Summary of issues raised:

Not convinced how the council proposes to offer jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

281

Homes

Summary of issues raised:

Provision of homes is critical. Should provide a mix of housing that is:

- 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
- 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)

Comments highlighting this issue:

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, 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:

Should limit student accommodation

Comments highlighting this issue:

241

Summary of issues raised:

Provision of well-designed homes including:

- With good sized gardens
- Roof gardens
- Private space

- Flats with large balconies
- Homes with lots of storage
- Space available to work from home
- Downstairs toilets for the elderly
- Use example of Marmalade Lane

Comments highlighting this issue:

236, 237, 253, 266, 296, 407, 418, 424, 491, 493, 526, 550, 554, 567, 575, 584, 594

Summary of issues raised:

Encourage renovation of existing housing stock and other existing buildings (including converting current airport facilities) to cut carbon cost

Comments highlighting this issue:

173

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

66

Summary of issues raised:

Numbers of homes proposed on site are too high and should deliver fewer houses than planned

Comments highlighting this issue:

175, 386, 480, 562

Summary of issues raised:

Mixture of low-density mid-rise housing to minimize the burden placed on water infrastructure, transport and the environment

Comments highlighting this issue:

120, 239, 397

Summary of issues raised:

Should include space for informal outdoor camping and for the Gypsy and Traveller community to use as a transit stop

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

The site has good access to employment areas such as Addenbrooke's so should provide housing for potential employees of these locations

Comments highlighting this issue:

68

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

111, 461

Summary of issues raised:

Limit the amount of overseas investment in the housing market in Cambridge. No property should be allowed to stand empty

Comments highlighting this issue:

223, 443, 550, 554

Summary of issues raised:

May be a challenge for housing delivery depending on the plan for the airport usage in the mid/long-term

Comments highlighting this issue:

301

Summary of issues raised:

No opinion on housing

Comments highlighting this issue:

166

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised:

Should make it a car-free development. See example of car-free Vauban in Freiburg, Germany or Cayala in Guatemala.

Comments highlighting this issue:

6, 119, 143, 208, 248, 263, 468, 527, 544, 545, 552

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

19, 29, 233, 236, 261, 340, 351, 392, 474, 488, 554

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

175, 208, 266, 425, 490, 510, 511, 526, 571

Summary of issues raised:

Should not negatively impact on existing infrastructure including water, drainage, sewage, gas and electricity.

Comments highlighting this issue:

189, 351, 480

Summary of issues raised:

Fully self-contained site where travel is kept to a minimum.

Comments highlighting this issue:

163, 189, 195, 201, 218, 350, 405, 459, 504, 505, 540, 544, 547, 548, 570, 572, 573, 586

Summary of issues raised:

Car trips should only be allowed for trips east of the site.

Comments highlighting this issue:

144

Summary of issues raised:

Zero carbon transport.

Comments highlighting this issue:

158, 256, 497, 510, 511, 526

Summary of issues raised:

Hireable cars (including electric).

Comments highlighting this issue:

59

Summary of issues raised:

Electric Vehicle charging stations and access for people at their homes. And EV pods.

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 45, 147, 203, 233, 340, 594

Summary of issues raised:

Should build infrastructure before housing and other uses.

Comments highlighting this issue:

260

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

Summary of issues raised:

Too far for most people to cycle into town particularly for the elderly who cannot use bus services. Promoting cycling and limiting car use is for advantaged groups of people. Cannot stop people using cars or taxi services for vulnerable groups.

Comments highlighting this issue:

192, 272, 275, 306, 560

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

Summary of issues raised:

Should have high quality bus shelters at all bus stops.

Comments highlighting this issue:

253, 275

Summary of issues raised:

Provision of a new public transport hub e.g., Park and Ride or a bus way.

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 233, 256, 411, 508, 575

Summary of issues raised:

Connection to the rail network including:

- Provision of a train station near to Cherry Hinton
- A station constructed on the existing line to Ipswich

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 77, 510

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

59, 82, 108, 192, 203, 260, 262, 424

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 77, 82, 87, 99, 203, 211, 373, 378, 419, 466, 519, 560, 582, 592

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

45, 137, 190, 264, 278, 298, 328, 367, 379, 407

Summary of issues raised:

Wide roads for easy movement, including for vans and trailers.

Comments highlighting this issue:

261, 306

Summary of issues raised:

Provision of public toilets.

Comments highlighting this issue:

545

Summary of issues raised:

Multiple well-designed entrances and exits to the site.

Comments highlighting this issue:

261, 299

Summary of issues raised:

Reducing road capacity will not represent the ordinary voters of the area, or the viability of Cambridge as a commercial and retail centre.

Comments highlighting this issue:

306

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:

445

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

92, 150, 433, 503, 521, 577, 592

Summary of issues raised:

Good recycling infrastructure including:

- Recycling centre
- Facilities for recycling electrical items and repair of broken/damaged goods
- Similar to as in Eddington

Comments highlighting this issue:

12, 29, 179, 262

Summary of issues raised:

Underground delivery points for goods and maintenance

Comments highlighting this issue:

54

Summary of issues raised:

Drop-off and pick-up parcel points

Comments highlighting this issue:

158

Summary of issues raised:

Good digital connectivity such as fast broadband for working from home, and innovative sectors that need reliable internet connectivity

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 500, 551, 594

Summary of issues raised:

Need a detailed and new public transport proposals

Comments highlighting this issue:

82

Summary of issues raised:

Should provide an airport for the Cambridge area

Comments highlighting this issue:

27

Summary of issues raised:

It will need appropriate drainage and sewage processing plant

Comments highlighting this issue:

113, 260

Summary of issues raised:

Should not provide a new sewage treatment site

Comments highlighting this issue:

339

Other comments

Summary of issues raised:

No comment

Comments highlighting this issue:

57, 185, 270, 332, 533

Summary of issues raised:

Don’t feel qualified to comment

Comments highlighting this issue:

374, 595

Summary of issues raised:

Has this site already got planning permission?

Comments highlighting this issue:

10

Summary of issues raised:

Heard that the option of moving the airport wouldn’t be able to progress?

Comments highlighting this issue:

506

Summary of issues raised:

Retain Green Belt at Honey Hill

Comments highlighting this issue:

63

Summary of issues raised:

This is a leading question, why is there no option to say we do or don't agree to development at Cambridge East?

Comments highlighting this issue:

117, 223, 382, 495

Summary of issues raised:

More honesty required as developments are agreed long before the public are made aware

Comments highlighting this issue:

202, 495

Summary of issues raised:

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 you put in place that legally stops them doing this?

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

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
- 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 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
- 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
- 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
- Residents 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

71

Summary of issues raised:

Ask for a mixed development without going into detail about what should be included

Comments highlighting this issue:

53, 86, 96, 174, 196, 244, 543, 551

Summary of issues raised:

Keep the current plant and develop it with low-density housing / keep plant and put social housing on site

Comments highlighting this issue:

130, 460

Summary of issues raised:

Need as much development as a small town would need?

Comments highlighting this issue:

137

Summary of issues raised:

Should not be delivered until water supply is guaranteed

Comments highlighting this issue:

141

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

63, 101, 112, 203, 224, 264, 291, 330, 359, 383, 386, 500, 521, 527, 578, 594

Summary of issues raised:

Support building it high/dense

Comments highlighting this issue:

15, 66, 190, 544, 565

Summary of issues raised:

Would prefer other sites to be prioritised

Comments highlighting this issue:

156

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

187

Summary of issues raised:

Balanced amount of development as appropriate to a normal town

Comments highlighting this issue:

174

Summary of issues raised:

Concern that this area as planned will become the low-income quarter of Cambridge while houses to the South and East will become high value/high income areas. One commentator worried it might become a "banlieue" on edge of rich city

Comments highlighting this issue:

191, 339

Summary of issues raised:

Given the site's proximity to Cambridge North station, it should not become another area of housing for London commuters and not address the housing need relating to local jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

247

Summary of issues raised:

Support new development, but wastewater treatment plant’s relocation should not damage small villages or ecosystems

Comments highlighting this issue:

261

Summary of issues raised:

If this area doesn’t flood it’s OK to build

Comments highlighting this issue:

289

Summary of issues raised:

Support development/Good opportunity to use and repurpose land

Comments highlighting this issue:

301, 317, 498

Summary of issues raised:

Modified plans are beginning to get there, but there should be replacement of the Green Belt

Comments highlighting this issue:

330

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

373

Summary of issues raised:

No preference

Comments highlighting this issue:

397

Summary of issues raised:

Adhere to 15-minute city principles

Comments highlighting this issue:

425, 459, 468, 490, 497, 510, 511, 526, 545, 571

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

548

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

578, 594

Summary of issues raised:

The overall new development in all locations needs to be definitive and balanced

Comments highlighting this issue:

595

Climate change

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Development must be carbon net-zero

Comments highlighting this issue:

86, 101, 143

Summary of issues raised:

Encourage community renewable projects with profits used for good causes

Comments highlighting this issue:

89

Summary of issues raised:

Encourage retrofitting before new housing

Comments highlighting this issue:

(No comment numbers provided)

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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
- Housing should offer natural surveillance
- Connect to the river

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

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 fridges
- Multi-purpose space for farmer's market
- Gardening area

Comments highlighting this issue:

6, 12, 127, 135, 253, 262, 325, 337, 349, 363, 371, 400, 401, 508, 545

Summary of issues raised:

Provision for informal camping for Traveller community

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

More open space than has been currently proposed / not bare minimum

Comments highlighting this issue:

38, 84, 473

Summary of issues raised:

New development should have access to green spaces and ensure residents don't have to travel across town

Comments highlighting this issue:

93, 242, 291

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

109, 216, 484, 521, 527, 557

Summary of issues raised:

Recreation areas should be dog-free

Comments highlighting this issue:

228

Summary of issues raised:

The recreational areas should be easy to maintain

Comments highlighting this issue:

228

Summary of issues raised:

Protect the river area as a green oasis

Comments highlighting this issue:

317

Summary of issues raised:

It should be 100% green space / all land given to a new forest or park

Comments highlighting this issue:

75, 393, 469, 588

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

484

Summary of issues raised:

Open spaces corresponding to the work opportunities created in the area

Comments highlighting this issue:

493

Summary of issues raised:

Possible replacement of the open grassland with more formal park facilities. Greater emphasis on mixture of retail outlets

Comments highlighting this issue:

543

Summary of issues raised:

Half the area should be allocated as green open space

Comments highlighting this issue:

562

Summary of issues raised:

Milton Country Park is nearby so the need for open space is reduced

Comments highlighting this issue:

564

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised:

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
- Riding school

- Football pitch
- Cycling routes

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Community / leisure facilities, including:

- Community centres
- Libraries
- Playgrounds for children (a respondent asked for 5) + playgrounds aligned with best practice 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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Out of town shopping / cinema complex

Comments highlighting this issue:

11

Summary of issues raised:

An open area that can be used for outdoor shows

Comments highlighting this issue:

11, 54

Summary of issues raised:

Farmers markets and events

Comments highlighting this issue:

11

Summary of issues raised:

Cemetery

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Youth club

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Healthcare institutions, including:

- GP surgeries
- Convalescent / respite care
- Dentists

- Opticians
- Mental health hub
- Care home

Comments highlighting this issue:

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, 423, 425, 434, 456, 459, 466, 487, 490, 493, 504, 505, 508, 510, 511, 519, 525, 543, 549, 545, 551, 557, 571, 574

Summary of issues raised:

Education / childcare:

- Primary schools
- Secondary schools
- Nurseries
- Pastoral care
- Special needs schools

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

Summary of issues raised:

Leisure facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

51, 229, 282

Summary of issues raised:

Faith facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

56

Summary of issues raised:

A major theatre / concert hall is needed as the current cultural infrastructure is inadequate

Comments highlighting this issue:

78

Summary of issues raised:

Artists' studios are needed

Comments highlighting this issue:

78

Summary of issues raised:

Outdoor space for sport, health and fitness

Comments highlighting this issue:

78

Summary of issues raised:

Need to actually deliver community / leisure facilities otherwise this will strain existing facilities. Deliver at the start, not like at Cambourne

Comments highlighting this issue:

90, 468

Summary of issues raised:

Activities shouldn't 'cost the earth' to enjoy, i.e., fishing lake at Milton used to be cheap, but now £700 membership a year

Comments highlighting this issue:

236

Summary of issues raised:

Ambulance / police standby location

Comments highlighting this issue:

279

Summary of issues raised:

Safe community, including:

- CCTV
- Well-lit footpaths

Comments highlighting this issue:

328

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

572

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

368

Great Places

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

15, 93, 190, 376, 405, 459, 489, 504, 508, 545, 540, 561, 571

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

78

Summary of issues raised:

Whatever is built needs to be sympathetic to its surroundings

Comments highlighting this issue:

224, 482

Summary of issues raised:

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 community amenities, transport, leisure facilities and outdoor markets

Comments highlighting this issue:

171, 364

Summary of issues raised:

Mid-rise housing that makes good use of space and leaves public open spaces available for parks, public squares, outdoor seating, cycle lanes etc.

Comments highlighting this issue:

239

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

278, 425, 459, 490, 510, 511, 526, 545, 557, 571

Summary of issues raised:

Avoid excessive road space to create a cycling/walking campus with high quality landscape (like Accordia)

Comments highlighting this issue:

287

Summary of issues raised:

The working and living areas must be well divided and screened with attractive planting and trees

Comments highlighting this issue:

358

Summary of issues raised:

Quiet streets are needed

Comments highlighting this issue:

401

Summary of issues raised:

Shops are needed to take the pressure off town

Comments highlighting this issue:

475

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

502

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

405, 459, 425, 490, 508, 510, 511, 525, 526, 545, 557, 561, 571

Summary of issues raised:

It would be good to preserve the rural character

Comments highlighting this issue:

538

Summary of issues raised:

Further reduction to the height of buildings should be strongly considered without any reduction of green spaces

Comments highlighting this issue:

548

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

568

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

212

Summary of issues raised:

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)

Comments highlighting this issue:

424

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

545

Jobs

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Small number of jobs needed. One commentator suggested 1,500

Comments highlighting this issue:

228, 562

Summary of issues raised:

Better commercial facilities:

- Local shops
- More retail generally
- Grocery
- Hardware
- Pharmacies
- Restaurants
- Pub
- Nightlife facilities
- Cafes
- Bakery
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Include enough amenities so that people don’t have to go into Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue:

50, 89, 425, 459, 508, 490, 510, 511, 526, 544, 545, 571

Summary of issues raised:

Diverse shops, not just one superstore / local goods + food should be encouraged

Comments highlighting this issue:

56

Summary of issues raised:

Should be more of a focus on remote working with homes allowing space for it

Comments highlighting this issue:

168, 266

Summary of issues raised:

An extension of the existing Trinity Science Park / business park

Comments highlighting this issue:

170, 221, 259, 302

Summary of issues raised:

There should be light industrial / industrial sites

Comments highlighting this issue:

293, 315, 459, 544, 570

Summary of issues raised:

Less jobs are needed, comments include:

- Already close to Science Park, no more jobs are needed
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

144, 173, 191, 248, 331, 339, 526

Summary of issues raised:

Keep the same jobs that are currently there

Comments highlighting this issue:

297

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

302

Summary of issues raised:

Ideally residents would work locally

Comments highlighting this issue:

315

Summary of issues raised:

Needs better infrastructure to support new businesses

Comments highlighting this issue:

520

Summary of issues raised:

Need cycling connections with surrounding more industrial job sites to further reduce the need for cars

Comments highlighting this issue:

544

Summary of issues raised:

New jobs should be non-polluting

Comments highlighting this issue:

583

Homes

Summary of issues raised:

More housing generally

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

Summary of issues raised:

Lots of apartments

Comments highlighting this issue:

237, 262, 544

Summary of issues raised:

Mix of housing types including small homes for those that want them

Comments highlighting this issue:

67, 76, 151, 159, 238, 274, 327, 340, 375, 540

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Houses should have access to the river

Comments highlighting this issue:

93

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

192, 203, 205, 296, 349, 311, 347, 407, 492, 503

Summary of issues raised:

A few houses are needed / less houses for population growth

Comments highlighting this issue:

175, 242, 566, 583

Summary of issues raised:

Nothing should be too tall, one commentator suggested capping storeys at 4 storeys

Comments highlighting this issue:

237, 562

Summary of issues raised:

Mid-rise housing, similar to Cambridge North

Comments highlighting this issue:

239, 510

Summary of issues raised:

Housing could also be quite dense with smaller houses & apartments

Comments highlighting this issue:

565

Summary of issues raised:

Apartment buildings with mandated larger than normal apartments and with lots of green space through the streets. Terraced housing/detached housing should be prohibited

Comments highlighting this issue:

544

Summary of issues raised:

Absolute maximum 3000 new homes

Comments highlighting this issue:

562

Summary of issues raised:

Homes should be 1–3 bedroom with a garden

Comments highlighting this issue:

575

Summary of issues raised:

Homes should have garages so cars don’t need to be parked on the street

Comments highlighting this issue:

233

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised:

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 green space, and for it to be central and overlooked, not 'round the back'

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

All infrastructure should be completed before development of houses/factories begins. This should include development of good roads

Comments highlighting this issue:

260, 547, 560

Summary of issues raised:

All facilities should contribute to the circular economy, including:

- Recycling centres
- Spaces for repairing broken/damaged goods + workshops

Comments highlighting this issue:

6, 12, 262

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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
- 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
- New developments should site and finance new arterial roads where possible, not just place extra load on existing ones

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

19, 29, 112, 120, 233, 261, 287, 351, 474, 580

Summary of issues raised:

Electric parking charging points for residents and visitors

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 147, 179, 203, 233, 287, 340, 474, 548

Summary of issues raised:

Digital connectivity

Comments highlighting this issue:

29

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

121, 151, 282, 394

Summary of issues raised:

Reduce the need for cars, so a neighbourhood provides everything in walking/cycling distance

Comments highlighting this issue:

143, 163, 376, 544, 548

Summary of issues raised:

First and foremost, there should be new drainage and sewage processing

Comments highlighting this issue:

260

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

282

Summary of issues raised:

Limited parking, i.e., one per house

Comments highlighting this issue:

328

Summary of issues raised:

Need to ensure adequate infrastructure for new incoming residents as there is already too much pressure on infrastructure / cannot just simply add more houses

Comments highlighting this issue:

367, 403

Summary of issues raised:

Support EWR

Comments highlighting this issue:

546

Summary of issues raised:

Pro car comments, including:

- 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
- Do not punish cars/van users as not everyone can cycle. Reducing road capacity 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 one's interest
- Even with public transport, people will still use cars + you will have to take account of commuting traffic created into Cambridge from towns

Comments highlighting this issue:

306, 506, 560

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

351, 468

Other comments

Summary of issues raised:

Moving the sewage works has been assigned as a nationally significant important infrastructure project, so why isn't it mentioned in the Local Plan? This omission breaches the democratic process of 'public consultation'

Comments highlighting this issue:

26, 63

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

33

Summary of issues raised:

Fair consultation did not take place

Comments highlighting this issue:

41

Summary of issues raised:

It's good you intend to overpopulate Cambridge so current residents can move out and get a good sale price

Comments highlighting this issue:

59

Summary of issues raised:

Pre-defined survey answer, why no option to say we don't agree

Comments highlighting this issue:

117

Summary of issues raised:

I guess ‘dense and lively’ wouldn’t accommodate that. More things like the above somewhere else to offset this maybe?

Comments highlighting this issue:

166

Summary of issues raised:

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?

Comments highlighting this issue:

192

Summary of issues raised:

Hope it’s sufficient with all the new citizens incoming

Comments highlighting this issue:

(no comment number provided)

Summary of issues raised:

How are the Gypsy Roma Traveller residents up Fen Road featuring in your Plan? I asked Town and had not got a reply

Comments highlighting this issue:

223

Summary of issues raised:

Arbury Road east is very dangerous and polluted – must be filtered or made one way as recommended in your own LCWIP

Comments highlighting this issue:

276

Summary of issues raised:

More special needs schools are needed. My daughter is currently unable to find a place and it’s 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

361

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

385, 496, 518, 594

Summary of issues raised:

Concerned / dislike / unsure about the word “dense”

Comments highlighting this issue:

389, 423, 582

Summary of issues raised:

All the development on NEC should not be in this Local Plan as there is no guarantee it can happen

Comments highlighting this issue:

427, 428, 429, 433

Summary of issues raised:

Difficult to see how this project can be considered a nationally significant project as Anglian Water say there is no need to move

Comments highlighting this issue:

443

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

488

Summary of issues raised:

A robust monitoring system 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

548

Summary of issues raised:

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?

Comments highlighting this issue:

597

Summary of issues raised:

Use brownfield sites

Comments highlighting this issue:

89

Summary of issues raised:

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 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

106

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

- easing the chances of flooding
- There are also significant issues to do with pumping and sewage which already affect the Ninewells development

Comments highlighting this issue:

303, 435, 547, 598, 523, 543

Summary of issues raised:

No development due to concerns about:

- Water infrastructure
- Impact on traffic
- Strain on existing infrastructure

Comments highlighting this issue:

335, 378, 141, 431, 471, 485, 95, 100, 106, 203, 275, 419, 487, 515, 527, 555, 559, 588, 249, 260, 289, 117, 87

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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, GPs, 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

There should be no development that infringes on the Gog and Magog Hills

Comments highlighting this issue:

68, 106, 289, 477

Summary of issues raised:

No development should go ahead, with no reasons given

Comments highlighting this issue:

138, 167, 173, 268, 273, 491

Summary of issues raised:

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 Addenbrooke's Road and the M11. Both could link to sustainable transport in better ways

Comments highlighting this issue:

523

Summary of issues raised:

The commentator questions the Council's ability to deliver the scheme

Comments highlighting this issue:

409

Summary of issues raised:

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?

Comments highlighting this issue:

106, 191, 236, 358, 340, 386, 399, 432, 450, 521, 523, 561, 565

Summary of issues raised:

Other parts of the country should be developed rather than Cambridge / biomedical industry needs to be spread across a wider area

Comments highlighting this issue:

339, 479, 436, 311

Summary of issues raised:

Proposals would significantly impact upon the amenity of residents at the edge of the city

Comments highlighting this issue:

523, 545

Summary of issues raised:

BMC growth should be halted. Growth should be spread across city, i.e., north Cambridge site / Milton Science Park

Comments highlighting this issue:

40, 70, 95

Deliverability

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

42, 86, 407, 308, 340, 395, 497, 572

Summary of issues raised:

The hospital and its facilities should be prioritised for development. Specific changes include:

- Large horticultural therapy should be created at Addenbrooke's as a referral unit for people with stress and high blood pressure + staff
- Care homes and recuperation facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

226, 308, 386, 507, 554, 514, 543

Summary of issues raised:

Supportive of developing all the suggested uses

Comments highlighting this issue:

244, 245, 248, 353

Summary of issues raised:

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 be instated. This would preserve Cambridge's view and maintain the city's 'soft edge'

Comments highlighting this issue:

365

Summary of issues raised:

Before development can go ahead, the following improvements would have to be made, including:

- Road improvements

Comments highlighting this issue:

211

Climate Change

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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 captured in houses and then recycled

Comments highlighting this issue:

66, 89, 93, 109, 117, 148, 150, 151, 179, 233, 239, 296, 324, 392, 474

Summary of issues raised:

Encourage community renewable energy projects

Comments highlighting this issue:

89

Summary of issues raised:

All surfaces should be permeable to facilitate drainage into an aquifer

Comments highlighting this issue:

564

Summary of issues raised:

Non-polluting activities should occur at the campus

Comments highlighting this issue:

583

Summary of issues raised:

Rain gardens by roads and walkways to assist the cleaning of surface run-off and drainage into an aquifer

Comments highlighting this issue:

564

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised:

Green Spaces including:

- Open spaces
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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, 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

Summary of issues raised:

Skateboarding facilities / skatepark that is well-lit / indoor skating facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

67, 413, 422, 502

Summary of issues raised:

Cemetery

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

179, 148

Summary of issues raised:

Avoid building on low-lying flood-prone areas and instead keep them as recreational areas

Comments highlighting this issue:

410

Summary of issues raised:

Informal camping which the Traveller community could use

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Ninewells, Great Kneighton, Cherry Hinton Chalk Pits should be joined up with Wandlebury and the Beech Woods to make a proper wildlife corridor

Comments highlighting this issue:

401

Summary of issues raised:

Woodland

Comments highlighting this issue:

262, 343, 498

Summary of issues raised:

New or more parkland / parkland should be easily accessible by community + children

Comments highlighting this issue:

74, 75, 79, 262, 278, 306, 318, 321, 323, 362, 375, 379, 425, 466, 470, 490, 498, 511, 525

Summary of issues raised:

Outdoor facilities such as:

- A running track
- Tennis courts
- A football pitch
- Outdoor gyms
- Outdoor splash pools
- Playgrounds
- Community gardens
- Swimming pool

Comments highlighting this issue:

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, 505, 535

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised:

Changes to encourage wellbeing on the site, including:

- Farm animals (for patients and their families) should be provided for therapeutic visits

Comments highlighting this issue:

506

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

96, 278, 407, 425, 490, 497, 511, 544, 571, 572, 578, 545

Summary of issues raised:

Healthcare facilities, including:

- GP surgeries
- Dental practice

Comments highlighting this issue:

12, 128, 179, 190, 212, 216, 261, 274, 324, 325, 343, 396, 466, 505, 518, 586, 545

Summary of issues raised:

There needs to be more health facilities and beds provided, nothing else

Comments highlighting this issue:

368

Summary of issues raised:

Space for alternative therapy

Comments highlighting this issue:

506

Summary of issues raised:

Community facilities such as:

- Libraries
- Allotments
- Toilets
- Community centre
- Cultural and social places to give the area an atmosphere

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

Summary of issues raised:

Meeting places for adults

Comments highlighting this issue:

67

Summary of issues raised:

Communal hubs

Comments highlighting this issue:

317, 324, 233

Summary of issues raised:

Youth clubs

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Childcare facilities including:

- A special needs school
- School
- Nursery

Comments highlighting this issue:

31, 50, 67, 76, 79, 146, 156, 179, 190, 194, 216, 261, 274, 280, 323, 360, 426, 505, 523, 580, 545, 550

Summary of issues raised:

Swimming pool

Comments highlighting this issue:

213, 371, 545

Great Places

Summary of issues raised:

Recreational areas are needed for staff to socialise

Comments highlighting this issue:

334

Summary of issues raised:

Needs more buildings on a walkable / human scale with a diversity of users as currently too many massive single purpose buildings

Comments highlighting this issue:

108, 537

Summary of issues raised:

Public square / public spaces

Comments highlighting this issue:

239, 410

Summary of issues raised:

Changing art space – a 4th plinth style system which residents can vote to change every 2–5 years

Comments highlighting this issue:

502

Summary of issues raised:

Space for local craft and farmer's markets

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Public benches and picnic tables

Comments highlighting this issue:

12, 239

Jobs

Summary of issues raised:

More general research facilities (i.e. not only healthcare)

Comments highlighting this issue:

6, 11, 66, 162, 174, 190, 194, 323, 426, 437, 477

Summary of issues raised:

More of a focus should be placed on remote working

Comments highlighting this issue:

168

Summary of issues raised:

Pub

Comments highlighting this issue:

58, 93, 179, 279, 470

Summary of issues raised:

Dining / cafes

Comments highlighting this issue:

46, 93, 148, 238, 296, 309, 398, 401, 470, 522, 529, 537

Summary of issues raised:

Co-working spaces

Comments highlighting this issue:

564

Summary of issues raised:

Training site for different jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

127

Summary of issues raised:

Education sites for qualifications for different jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

127

Summary of issues raised:

An alternative idea could be making a medical school on the site

Comments highlighting this issue:

113

Summary of issues raised:

More healthcare research facilities / Biomedical facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

6, 39, 174, 301, 389, 396, 482, 503

Summary of issues raised:

No more research facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

315

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

229, 343, 506

Summary of issues raised:

Small shops (not a big supermarket) / local shops / independent

Comments highlighting this issue:

58, 93, 179, 264, 267, 278, 309, 411, 456, 470, 567

Summary of issues raised:

Post office

Comments highlighting this issue:

93, 156, 261, 398

Summary of issues raised:

Spaces for recycling and repairing damaged goods

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Focus on health care provision, not houses

Comments highlighting this issue:

232

Summary of issues raised:

Small business spaces / support for business clusters

Comments highlighting this issue:

12, 148, 261, 274, 379, 502

Summary of issues raised:

Jobs for local people that are not medicine-related

Comments highlighting this issue:

25

Summary of issues raised:

High quality jobs / high-tech jobs / research jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

52, 127, 192, 323, 456

Summary of issues raised:

More jobs generally

Comments highlighting this issue:

159, 162, 206, 274, 571, 592

Summary of issues raised:

Secure jobs that are not on zero-hour contracts and which provide living wage

Comments highlighting this issue:

327

Summary of issues raised:

Hi-tech facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

120

Summary of issues raised:

Shops

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

No more housing / minimal new housing

Comments highlighting this issue:

4, 6, 39, 64, 75, 80, 135, 289, 293, 294, 301, 311, 360, 437, 503, 523, 559, 563, 566, 583, 592

Summary of issues raised:

Houseowners should be banned from converting front gardens to parking spaces to reduce cars

Comments highlighting this issue:

208

Summary of issues raised:

Housing shouldn’t be too dense

Comments highlighting this issue:

101, 597

Summary of issues raised:

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
- 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
- Housing for those who have family members 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 living and working in the same vicinity
- Small 1-room flats or studios, possibly with shared gardens
- Is there no aim to create a new community like Cambourne or Northstowe? / Build a copy of Cambridge North here

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Densify the Addenbrooke’s site in-between buildings already there

Comments highlighting this issue:

147, 190, 287, 296, 483

Summary of issues raised:

Acceptable to increase housing density / reduce garden size to increase provided public green space

Comments highlighting this issue:

544

Summary of issues raised:

Houses need garages so cars aren’t parking on-street

Comments highlighting this issue:

233

Summary of issues raised:

A trust could be set up to ensure that properties remain in use for low-income biomedical staff and NHS staff

Comments highlighting this issue:

495

Summary of issues raised:

A lot of housing in Trumpington has been bought by buy-to-rent investors and this should be stopped

Comments highlighting this issue:

194, 368

Summary of issues raised:

Student accommodation

Comments highlighting this issue:

253, 323

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

363

Summary of issues raised:

High quality housing is needed as the stock in the area is already looking a bit care-worn

Comments highlighting this issue:

284

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

523

Summary of issues raised:

New housing should be near the site to minimise the need for private transport

Comments highlighting this issue:

367

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised:

Addition of research hubs could create S106 funds which could be used to fund staff facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

117

Summary of issues raised:

These facilities need cash to be built

Comments highlighting this issue:

295

Summary of issues raised:

Create a mini-Science Park

Comments highlighting this issue:

293

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

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

Summary of issues raised:

Houseowners should be banned from converting front gardens to parking spaces to reduce cars

Comments highlighting this issue:

208

Summary of issues raised:

East–West Rail should enter Cambridge via Northstowe to take traffic off the road and assist the Addenbrooke's site by enabling more people to use the train

Comments highlighting this issue:

328

Summary of issues raised:

Cycle improvements, including:

- Cycle paths
- Making it safer for cyclists
- Sustainable transport
- Cycling paths should be built in-line with LTN 1/20
- Cycle storage
- Segregated cycle paths
- Multi-user cycle paths
- Should emulate Dutch infrastructure
- Enable children to travel

Comments highlighting this issue:

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:

Safer for pedestrians / walking routes / running routes

Comments highlighting this issue:

45, 263, 280, 297, 367, 379, 142, 445

Summary of issues raised:

Additional road capacity / new arterial roads which should be financed by the development / wider roads

Comments highlighting this issue:

306, 261, 475, 559

Summary of issues raised:

Minimise the need to travel into the town centre

Comments highlighting this issue:

410

Summary of issues raised:

Parking improvements, including:

- Disabled parking
- Parking for incoming residents
- Parking for staff
- More parking generally
- Parking for residents
- Parking modelled on the Freiburg or Ypenburg models

Comments highlighting this issue:

24, 51, 158, 180, 233, 261, 353, 416, 417, 424, 426, 474, 506, 549, 478, 511, 545

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

526

Summary of issues raised:

A public transport hub

Comments highlighting this issue:

131

Summary of issues raised:

Better transport links generally / consideration of transport impact

Comments highlighting this issue:

15, 51, 58, 62, 109, 143, 180, 264, 267, 291, 293, 301, 364, 416, 417, 468, 511, 525, 567

Summary of issues raised:

Multiple entrances and exits to the site

Comments highlighting this issue:

261

Summary of issues raised:

Car facilities should be kept to a minimum

Comments highlighting this issue:

109, 47, 477, 483, 508, 544, 571, 572, 208

Summary of issues raised:

More attention needs to be paid to the transportation of hospital staff to the site

Comments highlighting this issue:

291, 87, 117, 289

Summary of issues raised:

A railway station

Comments highlighting this issue:

99, 156, 177, 265, 283, 301, 373, 411, 546, 564

Other Comments

Summary of issues raised:

It is a leading question

Comments highlighting this issue:

382

Summary of issues raised:

Where is your analysis of the radical changes to work-life patterns / travel needs from the Covid-19 pandemic?

Comments highlighting this issue:

395

Summary of issues raised:

Natural elements are currently lacking in the CBC

Comments highlighting this issue:

408

Summary of issues raised:

CBC has brought anti-social behaviour into nearby communities. Parking on drives, littering and did not socially distance during Lockdowns

Comments highlighting this issue:

559

Summary of issues raised:

Affordable housing is a ‘joke’, you need a large mortgage to get a house near Addenbrooke’s

Comments highlighting this issue:

171

Summary of issues raised:

It is a high-quality asset in Cambridge and therefore needs to be planned and developed well, not saturated with housing

Comments highlighting this issue:

286

Summary of issues raised:

It currently feels soulless / architecture is horrible / area lacks amenities which means residents have to drive

Comments highlighting this issue:

337, 598

Summary of issues raised:

Uncertain whether the campus is a housing development / industrial site or university campus

Comments highlighting this issue:

424

Summary of issues raised:

It appears that you have already planned new development. The Council needs to 'come clean' about it

Comments highlighting this issue:

202

Summary of issues raised:

National chains should be banned from owning shops or property in the area

Comments highlighting this issue:

71, 73

Summary of issues raised:

Addenbrooke's should be treated like a small town / neighbourhood with appropriate facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

343, 350, 525

Summary of issues raised:

Fundamental aim of the Local Plan should be aiming to design for children

Comments highlighting this issue:

545

Summary of issues raised:

A mixture (undefined) of things are needed

Comments highlighting this issue:

53

Summary of issues raised:

Any new development needs to be definitive and balanced

Comments highlighting this issue:

595

Summary of issues raised:

Less unimaginative development

Comments highlighting this issue:

63

Summary of issues raised:

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

Comments highlighting this issue:

500

Summary of issues raised:

Better food is needed for people who are visiting the hospital

Comments highlighting this issue:

135

Summary of issues raised:

Only ethical medical companies should be allowed to move to the campus

Comments highlighting this issue:

187

Summary of issues raised:

CBC should be leading the environmental, social and governance efforts of Cambridgeshire

Comments highlighting this issue:

486

Summary of issues raised:

Has anyone done a survey of where campus staff live? Where would they ideally like to live to inform questions on housing + transport links?

Comments highlighting this issue:

373

Summary of issues raised:

Any new development needs a proper centre / centre needed that is not based solely on a supermarket

Comments highlighting this issue:

376, 233

Summary of issues raised:

Impact of this development will be less because it is near a lot of jobs

Comments highlighting this issue:

353

Summary of issues raised:

Fully self-contained site where travel is kept to a minimum

Comments highlighting this issue:

163

Q6. We think East-West Rail provides the opportunity for Cambourne to grow up into a proper town. What housing, jobs, facilities or open spaces do you think should be developed in and around Cambourne?

Opposition to development

Summary of issues raised:

Oppose with no reason given

Comments highlighting this issue:

5, 10, 17, 30, 57, 62, 120, 210, 241, 328, 457, 492, 575

Summary of issues raised:

Oppose EWR because:

- It will ruin villages
- Not needed
- It will strain infrastructure
- Misguided aim, instead ‘coast to coast’ provision would be beneficial
- Proposal to use diesel trains is wrong
- Cambourne could become a ghetto
- Removes access between Hauxton & Little Shelford which is harmful
- It will never get its money back
- No need for freight
- Money should be used to ‘level-up’ the North
- Was conceived pre-Covid and should be reassessed

- Should go for a light rail network
- EWR should connect northern populations providing commuting
- Biodiversity loss
- No business case is available
- Potential for those living in N/W band of Cambridgeshire
- Rail travel only affordable for those on high incomes
- EWR is a vanity project
- EWR not needed as less people commuting due to remote working practices
- Road access is already good to Cambridge
- Stop at Cambourne would lead to unacceptable environmental degradation
- It is more important for the railway to join up the Biomedical campus with Oxford and Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue:

7, 18, 33, 40, 41, 49, 50, 95, 109, 126, 170, 183, 189, 203, 205, 244, 256, 283, 289, 328, 339, 354, 359, 368, 378, 382, 409, 498

Summary of issues raised:

Oppose development because:

- Increasing its size will increase crime
- Needs more farming land
- It will create problems in the rural parts of the area
- Council won’t deliver it
- Satisfies developer’s needs, not the community’s
- EWR Station would split Cambourne into two
- No as it will lead to people working from home and commuting to Cambridge
- Will impact water supply of this area which is a key area for farming
- Area is already over-developed
- Object to the urbanisation of West Cambridge
- No brownfield sites, but against the use of greenfield sites
- Cambourne is already over-developed
- Isn’t it large enough?

- Cambourne should remain isolated and become self-sufficient
- Infilling undermines the point of Cambourne which was to be villages with plenty of green space / Expansion would betray the original vision for Cambourne
- Cambourne should grow organically
- Concerned about ‘strip development’ along the East-West rail line
- Spatial strategy is incorrect, instead small development should be allowed in small settlements to allow for natural evolution of communities
- EWR is a good idea, but the development proposed along it will harm nature, the quality of village life and create an unsustainable water supply

Comments highlighting this issue:

7, 11, 26, 70, 71, 95, 141, 175, 183, 204, 242, 285, 304, 356, 359, 382, 386, 387, 403, 409, 415, 422, 425, 460, 485, 487, 495, 506, 591

Deliverability

Summary of issues raised:

Support for scheme, but prefer EWR to follow the Northern route to Northstowe / northern route is preferable

Comments highlighting this issue:

68, 69, 95, 117, 144, 147, 247, 263, 289, 358, 399, 546, 582

Summary of issues raised:

Decision needs to clarify whether the railway goes between Cambourne and Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue:

211

Summary of issues raised:

If EWR has to go ahead, make it electric, not diesel

Comments highlighting this issue:

19, 561

Summary of issues raised:

Support the scheme

Comments highlighting this issue:

76, 247, 263, 251, 287, 291, 293, 301, 317, 353, 365, 482, 424, 500, 503, 563, 587, 588, 590

Summary of issues raised:

Should support EWR and run south, not go north, to support the Biomedical Campus / this route is cheaper, faster and more logical

Comments highlighting this issue:

191, 222, 561

Summary of issues raised:

All new development should focus on the need to build 15-minute neighbourhoods to reduce the need to travel / aim to reduce carbon consumption

Comments highlighting this issue:

278, 425, 490, 497, 545, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:

If the rail goes ahead, then it should travel along the guided bus route, via Northstowe

Comments highlighting this issue:

368

Summary of issues raised:

Concerns about EWR including:

- EWR will deliver more jobs however, it will split the town into two
- Commuter towns are old-style thinking
- Need to research whether EWR is needed now more people are working from home
- Railway stations must be properly incorporated into the town

Comments highlighting this issue:

218, 275, 474, 520

Summary of issues raised:

Comments advising the Council, including:

- The Council should learn from the example of Thetford to understand how a ‘proper town’ works, as this has kept much employment in the town, and much of the original green space has been kept and schools are still functioning

- Cambourne needs an envelope to constrain the development
- Should be a clear natural border between Cambourne ‘town’ and surrounding villages
- Villages around Cambourne should be developed to provide destinations for new residents, including retail, craftwork and heritage industry. Need to ensure surrounding villages do not become mono-cultural
- Cambourne is very ‘samey’. It needs more diversity of shops and facilities
- Cambourne should become a ‘model’ town for the 21st century

Comments highlighting this issue:

9, 24, 181, 436, 506, 597

Summary of issues raised:

Council should let the free-market determine what is needed

Comments highlighting this issue:

268

Summary of issues raised:

Development needs to be conducted at a high density, not urban sprawl

Comments highlighting this issue:

190

Summary of issues raised:

Science parks should be set up around Cambridge to ease the pressure off Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue:

138

Summary of issues raised:

A mixture of things is needed (undefined what these things are)

Comments highlighting this issue:

53, 196

Summary of issues raised:

No objections if it is well-thought out

Comments highlighting this issue:

578

Summary of issues raised:

If there must be more development, then facilities and infrastructure must be in place before it is implemented

Comments highlighting this issue:

39, 73, 131, 260, 339, 360, 392, 395, 560

Climate Change

Summary of issues raised:

In relation to sustainability, housing should include:

- Solar panels
- Heat source pumps
- Insulation
- EV charging points
- Centralised water storage
- Should reach an environmental standard as high as Eddington
- Ventilation systems
- Air tightness

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 39, 69, 109, 158, 179, 248, 296, 497

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised:

Open spaces + Green spaces, including:

- Trees and wildflowers
- Meadows with long grass
- Ponds
- Insect hotels
- Bee-friendly areas
- Wildlife corridors
- Wildlife buffer zones

Comments highlighting this issue:

8, 12, 78, 86, 128, 136, 143, 166, 200, 206, 231, 238, 251, 261, 264, 274, 293, 296, 311, 315, 340, 349, 363, 366, 371, 376, 403, 404, 466, 473, 483, 493, 498, 508, 518, 527, 538, 543, 545, 571, 572, 583

Summary of issues raised:

Food-growing / native trees and shrubs should be incorporated throughout the area, including parks, street-verges, parks

Comments highlighting this issue:

363, 400, 545

Summary of issues raised:

There should not be a reduction in existing open space / don't destroy natural areas

Comments highlighting this issue:

393, 406, 433

Summary of issues raised:

Streets with meadow grassland

Comments highlighting this issue:

527

Summary of issues raised:

Reduce the need for parking to free up green space

Comments highlighting this issue:

425, 490

Summary of issues raised:

Mixture of things (undefined) is needed

Comments highlighting this issue:

294

Summary of issues raised:

Additional community gardens, including:

- 'Co-farms' allotments dedicated for peri-urban agriculture to increase the provision of local food
- Community kitchens and food sharing, i.e., community fridges
- Allotments

Comments highlighting this issue:

262, 271, 349, 363, 371, 400, 502, 508, 527, 545

Summary of issues raised:

The pre-existing nature reserve is a great facility and needs encouragement for local people to get involved

Comments highlighting this issue:

39, 282

Summary of issues raised:

An area that was earmarked as a golf course should be turned into parkland

Comments highlighting this issue:

68

Summary of issues raised:

More woodlands + trees / Ancient woodlands and farmlands of Cambourne should be preserved

Comments highlighting this issue:

74, 261, 401

Summary of issues raised:

Reforesting / reforesting of wastewater treatment

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Spaces for informal outdoor camping

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Green spaces in-between housing, not just on the edge of a housing development

Comments highlighting this issue:

179, 543

Summary of issues raised:

Car-free areas

Comments highlighting this issue:

401

Summary of issues raised:

Spaces for the Traveller community to use as a transit stop

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Parks, including:

- Trees
- Lakes
- Country Park

Comments highlighting this issue:

23, 158, 278, 311, 375, 411, 466, 535, 538, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:

Parks should link up with walking and cycling routes and neighbourhoods surrounding them / should be easily accessible by children

Comments highlighting this issue:

56, 425, 490, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:

Parks should be situated within built-up areas, overlooked by houses and shops, designed in a welcoming way to ensure they are safe

Comments highlighting this issue:

425, 490, 571, 572

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised:

Healthcare facilities:

- GP surgery
- Dentist
- Respite care
- Opticians
- Pharmacy
- Community hospital
- Public toilets

Comments highlighting this issue:

7, 8, 12, 13, 29, 34, 39, 46, 48, 51, 58, 73, 96, 128, 179, 261, 274, 296, 351, 367, 395, 425, 466, 483, 490, 493, 518, 537, 538, 545, 549, 555, 565, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:

No swimming pool

Comments highlighting this issue:

48

Summary of issues raised:

More facilities (not defined)

Comments highlighting this issue:

162

Summary of issues raised:

Needs a lot of support for community cohesion

Comments highlighting this issue:

190

Summary of issues raised:

A mixture of services is needed to make Cambourne a self-contained community / new development in all locations needs to be definitive and balanced

Comments highlighting this issue:

350, 595

Summary of issues raised:

Recreation areas for children and adults

Comments highlighting this issue:

29, 128

Summary of issues raised:

Skatepark / roller skating facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:

422, 502, 579

Summary of issues raised:

Hang-out spaces for young people / youth clubs + more things for young people to do

Comments highlighting this issue:

12, 553

Summary of issues raised:

Community facilities including:

- Community spaces (undefined)
- Community centres
- Playgrounds
- Libraries
- Outdoor and indoor recreation areas
- Swimming pool

Comments highlighting this issue:

7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 51, 52, 68, 96, 101, 128, 238, 248, 280, 348, 375, 416, 425, 432, 438, 466, 490, 498, 500, 508, 518, 545, 551, 565, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:

Spaces for recycling and repair of broken goods

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Summary of issues raised:

Childcare facilities, including:

- Schools
- Nurseries
- Special needs school

Comments highlighting this issue:

9, 13, 29, 34, 51, 73, 128, 179, 248, 261, 274, 280, 296, 331, 350, 361, 367, 375, 395, 396, 416, 477, 483, 493, 508, 518, 535, 538, 545, 549, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:

All community buildings should offer space for cooking, eating and learning about food

Comments highlighting this issue:

363

Summary of issues raised:

Public benches + picnic spaces

Comments highlighting this issue:

12

Great Places

Summary of issues raised:

It needs better public architecture

Comments highlighting this issue:

282

Summary of issues raised:

Proper town centre is needed with improvements to the public realm

Comments highlighting this issue:

39, 68, 108, 181, 190, 376, 521

Summary of issues raised:

Cambourne has been poorly planned. What is needed is a thoughtful plan, providing on-site work, social and cultural facilities and creating a community and identity for the area / the area needs investment as businesses do not survive there / it is lacking a heart

Comments highlighting this issue:

171, 190, 233, 238, 284, 286, 299, 360, 432, 468, 489

Summary of issues raised:

More interesting things to do in town

Comments highlighting this issue:

101, 553

Summary of issues raised:

The area should be safe for children to exercise and play

Comments highlighting this issue:

419

Summary of issues raised:

Changing art space in style of 4th plinth system that allows residents to choose artwork every 2–5 years

Comments highlighting this issue:

502

Jobs

Summary of issues raised:
More jobs, including:
• More jobs generally
• IT Companies
• Healthcare jobs
• Locally based jobs
• Conservation jobs
• Teaching, science and more creative jobs for a diverse workforce
Comments highlighting this issue:
46, 206, 251, 274, 282, 315, 330, 340, 350, 397, 425, 490, 508, 545, 555, 561, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Supermarket
Comments highlighting this issue:
47, 179

Summary of issues raised:
Entertainment facilities including arts centre, concert/performance centre, cinemas, and theatre
Comments highlighting this issue:
48, 51, 68, 293, 456, 555, 597

Summary of issues raised:
Shops, including:
• Decent neighbourhood shops
• Food shops
• Hardware shop
Comments highlighting this issue:
9, 29, 34, 47, 51, 56, 58, 73, 78, 96, 128, 146, 159, 238, 261, 264, 280, 286, 311, 362, 367, 379, 396, 411, 425, 436, 466, 483, 490, 493, 500, 508, 535, 565, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
An outdoor market should be considered
Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 112, 148, 171

Summary of issues raised:
There are no jobs in Cambourne at the moment unless you want a minimum wage retail job

Comments highlighting this issue:
171

Summary of issues raised:
Post Office
Comments highlighting this issue:
9, 31, 68, 261

Summary of issues raised:
Pub
Comments highlighting this issue:
7, 51, 179, 280, 416, 500

Summary of issues raised:
Leisure facilities, such as a cinema and galleries
Comments highlighting this issue:
78, 128, 158, 286, 311, 367, 537, 538, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Restaurants/Cafés
Comments highlighting this issue:
51, 101, 128, 179, 238, 280, 282, 296, 500, 571, 572, 597

Summary of issues raised:
Balanced mix of housing, jobs, community facilities and open space as appropriate to a normal town / increase commercial activities so fewer people commute to Central Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
174, 565, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Business space improvement, including:
• Affordable rent for small businesses
• Low rent units small to medium for retail and light commercial
• Offices/Office space for smaller businesses/start-ups
• Support for business clusters/a significant business district
Comments highlighting this issue:
64, 80, 96, 179, 171, 315, 12, 179, 261, 274, 280, 376, 444, 489, 461, 502, 545

Summary of issues raised:
Good location for jobs if EWR goes ahead
Comments highlighting this issue:
505

Summary of issues raised:
Question whether more jobs are a necessary corollary of the East-West Rail link
Comments highlighting this issue:
4

Summary of issues raised:
Existing business park is underutilised, there is enough office space
Comments highlighting this issue:
39, 64

Summary of issues raised:
More local companies and jobs not just large corporations. These should create a community feel / jobs should be related to the social and community needs of the area
Comments highlighting this issue:
148, 543

Summary of issues raised:
Could Cambridgeshire County Council move there?
Comments highlighting this issue:
297

Summary of issues raised:
Non-polluting activities (research etc.)
Comments highlighting this issue:
583

Summary of issues raised:
A new science/innovation park
Comments highlighting this issue:
406, 479

Summary of issues raised:
Putting jobs in Cambourne without houses would be good because it would rebalance work vs. accommodation and enable less travel between Cambourne and Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
134, 540

Summary of issues raised:
Industrial estates/Business parks
Comments highlighting this issue:
158, 315, 500

Summary of issues raised:
Some industry (undefined what it is)
Comments highlighting this issue:
362

Summary of issues raised:
i-business parks and drop offs/parcel points
Comments highlighting this issue:
158

Homes

Summary of issues raised:
Building more houses without facilities only benefits the developer
Comments highlighting this issue:
68

Summary of issues raised:
Lower density of housing is needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
187

Summary of issues raised:
Less housing is needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
7, 58

Summary of issues raised:
Moderate amount of housing is needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
228, 492

Summary of issues raised:
A limited amount of housing is needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
388, 566, 583

Summary of issues raised:
No more housing is needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
64, 65, 74, 285, 403, 438

Summary of issues raised:
Housing is essential, it should deliver:
• A mix of social/affordable and private housing
• Co-housing scheme
• More affordable housing generally
• Affordable three-bedroom houses
• Not as expensive as Eddington
• Maybe a housing association is needed
• Council housing

• Housing for key workers
• Less emphasis on executive housing
• Suitable for wheelchair users
• Have proper gardens
• Accommodation for public health workers
• Sheltered accommodation for elderly people
• Houses should have toilets downstairs for elderly people
• Suitable for working from home

Comments highlighting this issue:
8, 29, 86, 109, 136, 179, 274, 238, 251, 262, 263, 274, 296, 340, 344, 346, 349, 401, 416, 419, 477, 500, 527, 545, 554, 568

Summary of issues raised:
A mix of housing sizes, including:
• 1–5-bedroom houses
• Flats to cater for smaller family units, people who haven't settled properly + those who are getting on property ladder

Comments highlighting this issue:
238, 461, 568

Summary of issues raised:
Don't allow properties to be sold overseas

Comments highlighting this issue:
554

Summary of issues raised:
Housing needs to be less squeezed together

Comments highlighting this issue:
296, 360, 349, 543

Summary of issues raised:
Properties should have at least 2 parking spaces

Comments highlighting this issue:
554

Summary of issues raised:
High density housing is needed around the railway station

Comments highlighting this issue:
66

Summary of issues raised:
Gardens are too small and become waterlogged

Comments highlighting this issue:
360

Summary of issues raised:
More housing is needed / better to build here than in villages

Comments highlighting this issue:
15, 31, 237, 317, 350, 362, 375, 425, 490, 538, 555, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Cambourne is very ‘samey’. It needs more diversity of houses
Comments highlighting this issue:
436

Summary of issues raised:
Houses that look like houses, not ‘shoe boxes’ and no wooden siding, especially black wooden siding
Comments highlighting this issue:
528

Summary of issues raised:
Housing should be high-density, but low-height level if no provision of cars
Comments highlighting this issue:
527

Summary of issues raised:
No provision of parking spaces for houses and future conversion of front gardens to parking space to be banned
Comments highlighting this issue:
208

Summary of issues raised:
Quality of housing is poor in Cambourne and only people that benefit are developers
Comments highlighting this issue:
290

Summary of issues raised:
Housing only with no more jobs
Comments highlighting this issue:
331

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised:
Transport needs to be considered as it is very difficult to travel already
Comments highlighting this issue:
216

Summary of issues raised:
There needs to be a decision about whether EWR is a commuter link or link to the biomedical park. It cannot be both

Comments highlighting this issue:
344, 365

Summary of issues raised:
Guided bus plan is flawed in relation to cost per user
Comments highlighting this issue:
263

Summary of issues raised:
A guided busway between Cambourne and Cambridge is needed as we have the infrastructure that embraces this transport model and electric buses
Comments highlighting this issue:
283, 256

Summary of issues raised:
The town must be self-sufficient in terms of community services to avoid excessive travel
Comments highlighting this issue:
96, 163

Summary of issues raised:
Traffic is increasing and original concept of 3 connected villages has been thrown out of the window / Cambourne has now become a town and is now soulless
Comments highlighting this issue:
65, 370

Summary of issues raised:
Cycling, suggestions include:
• A route that doesn't involve the old A428
• Cycle paths
• Cycle routes to the station
• Safe cycle route into Cambridge
• Build them to Dutch standards
• Cycle paths are good and should be extended
• Safe routes for children
• Easier to travel within Cambourne
• The routes need to be well-lit
• Links to existing villages
• All local services should link with cycle infrastructure, designed and built in-line with Local Transport Notes 1/20
• Make it safer for Cambourne residents to commute to surrounding areas
• Segregated cycle lanes
Comments highlighting this issue:
6, 12, 15, 71, 121, 142, 155, 264, 282, 293, 311, 394, 425, 490, 527, 544, 545, 552, 566, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Road layout needs to change because the amount of parking on roads is dreadful
Comments highlighting this issue:
233

Summary of issues raised:
Need more entrances and exits to the roads
Comments highlighting this issue:
261

Summary of issues raised:
Reducing car travel does reduce emissions, but most of our carbon emissions come from heating our homes
Comments highlighting this issue:
153, 376

Summary of issues raised:
Upgrade of A428 will provide transport links necessary for Cambourne
Comments highlighting this issue:
170

Summary of issues raised:
More services in Cambourne to reduce the need to travel
Comments highlighting this issue:
34

Summary of issues raised:
Zero carbon transport
Comments highlighting this issue:
158

Summary of issues raised:
Lack of jobs in Cambourne means cars must drive into Cambridge as public transport is poor
Comments highlighting this issue:
48

Summary of issues raised:
Most important thing is easing the pressure off the city centre of Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
136

Summary of issues raised:
Reduce the need for cars so neighbourhoods can provide within walking and cycling distances / minimum amount of space should be given to cars
Comments highlighting this issue:
143, 497, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Cheaper parking
Comments highlighting this issue:
416

Summary of issues raised:
More entrance points into the town
Comments highlighting this issue:
47

Summary of issues raised:
A new railway station should be located south of the A428 and not north. Why not use the siting of the old Varsity Railway Line?
Comments highlighting this issue:
42

Summary of issues raised:
Assume everyone will own two cars and plan on that basis
Comments highlighting this issue:
7

Summary of issues raised:
Metro and a sub-station into the town centre / new light-rail / tram
Comments highlighting this issue:
64, 260, 264, 530, 566

Summary of issues raised:
EWR should be situated within the centre of Cambourne to encourage sustainable travel
Comments highlighting this issue:
9

Summary of issues raised:
Better transport links more generally and road infrastructure
Comments highlighting this issue:
280, 466, 493, 508

Summary of issues raised:
A transport hub
Comments highlighting this issue:
411, 555

Summary of issues raised:
Better public transport, including:
• Faster buses
• Cheaper buses
• Good links to Cambridge
• Cheaper train fares
• Free transport is needed into the city

• Active travel networks
• Train to Cambridge
• Reliable buses
• Tram link into Cambridge
• Better links with surrounding villages
• Easier to travel within Cambourne
• Make it safer for Cambourne residents to commute to surrounding areas

Comments highlighting this issue:
15, 179, 248, 262, 264, 75, 142, 349, 375, 404, 416, 422, 438, 456, 466, 474, 497, 508, 527, 530, 534, 544, 545, 551, 552, 554, 566, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Car parking

Comments highlighting this issue:
261

Summary of issues raised:
The guided bus route is already subscribed and buses on the busway are full by the time the buses reach Northstowe, so how do residents from Northstowe get into Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue:
113

Summary of issues raised:
Wide roads allowing for easy movement of vans and trailers / roads need to be improved to alleviate traffic / don’t just focus on public transport

Comments highlighting this issue:
261, 395, 419, 560

Summary of issues raised:
Make sure buses or trains stick to their timetables and don’t leave their stops early

Comments highlighting this issue:
392

Summary of issues raised:
Cycle storage

Comments highlighting this issue:
425, 490, 545, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Improvements to walking routes, including:
• Walking routes to the station
• Access to greenery
• Pedestrianised to encourage markets and events
• Safer to walk within Cambourne
• Make it safer for Cambourne residents to commute to surrounding areas

Comments highlighting this issue:
15, 101, 142, 264, 286, 401, 425, 490, 497, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
A private school is needed because a lot of Cambourne residents use the money saved in a cheaper area to send their children to private school in Cambridge, which places strain on the traffic of the area
Comments highlighting this issue:
553

Other comments

Summary of issues raised:
Question whether this rail line will be diesel?
Comments highlighting this issue:
81

Summary of issues raised:
Commenter notes West Cambourne, and South Cambs Council are placing strain on Cambourne as it is
Comments highlighting this issue:
73

Summary of issues raised:
Something to stop the wind which is bad in Cambourne
Comments highlighting this issue:
67

Summary of issues raised:
Why does development have to rely on EWR
Comments highlighting this issue:
42

Summary of issues raised:
EWR seem to be given a free choice how to direct development
Comments highlighting this issue:
181

Summary of issues raised:
Cambourne needs to be a lively, interesting town to retain young workers which they can commute to Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
52

Summary of issues raised:
Opportunity for planning a town centre has gone
Comments highlighting this issue:
285

Summary of issues raised:
Residents of Cambourne should have the major say
Comments highlighting this issue:
4, 135, 418, 468

Summary of issues raised:
EWR was never premised on being a commuter solution for South Cambs residents. If EWR comes north, the expansion of Cambourne will effectively create a new town and have a detrimental environmental and social impact on the area from increased vehicle traffic / human footfall and loss of green fields, which is surely contrary to govt. policy?
Comments highlighting this issue:
474

Summary of issues raised:
Proportionate development based on ‘need not greed’
Comments highlighting this issue:
445

Summary of issues raised:
EWR route needs to be settled upon
Comments highlighting this issue:
113

Summary of issues raised:
It appears it has already been decided
Comments highlighting this issue:
389

Summary of issues raised:
This is a pre-defined answer question, why no option to say we do or don’t agree to development at Cambourne?
Comments highlighting this issue:
117

Summary of issues raised:
New developments should model themselves on the car-free development Vauban in Freiburg, Germany, or Cayala in Guatemala
Comments highlighting this issue:
545

Summary of issues raised:
Isn’t Cambourne already a ‘proper town’

Comments highlighting this issue:
113

Summary of issues raised:
What is a ‘proper town’
Comments highlighting this issue:
20, 42, 51, 168

Summary of issues raised:
It already is a proper town. Increase in size should be accompanied with increase in services / appropriate increase in-line with increase in jobs
Comments highlighting this issue:
202, 351, 353, 367, 493

Summary of issues raised:
Cambourne shows how unaccountable developers are, poor town centre with little infrastructure and poor public realm. It would be heartening to see any evidence that developers can be held accountable to providing better infrastructure
Comments highlighting this issue:
171

Summary of issues raised:
There was no planning to support the community in Cambourne. New developments, such as Northstowe do not seem to be learning from these lessons
Comments highlighting this issue:
168, 171

Summary of issues raised:
Cambourne should be designed for children, and this should be the central aim of Local Plan’s
Comments highlighting this issue:
545

Summary of issues raised:
Cambourne has room to grow, but not at the expense of major development happening north of the A428
Comments highlighting this issue:
42

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

Q7. We think that the ‘southern rural cluster’ of villages near the rail line and the business parks south of Cambridge, could see some limited development. What housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces do you think this area should provide?

Opinion

Summary of issues raised:
Oppose with no reason given
Comments highlighting this issue:
30, 41, 51, 57, 64, 115, 185, 203, 332, 457, 491, 508

Summary of issues raised:
Oppose, with following reasons:

- Development should not sprawl onto the Greenbelt
- Issues of water
- Issues of biodiversity
- Issues of sustainability / carbon emissions from construction
- Area is overcrowded
- Issue of aesthetics
- Even with stations it is likely that many people will drive because parents in new developments will need to drop their children at school
- Infrastructure is already strained
- Using wrong land, i.e., land high in biodiversity rather than agricultural land that ranks lower in biodiversity value
- Countryside / agricultural land needed to grow food
- Council seems to have already planned a lot of houses
- EWR is actually a freight train, which will not serve the community
- EWR is a vanity project with limited benefits
- Concerned about Ninewells Natural Spring
- Undermines levelling up agenda
- Against due to road pressures
- Worried about additional traffic impact upon Stapleford / Shelford
- Lots of houses have been built in the area outside of the Local Plan
- Development should be limited to infill with development envelope
- Worries about additional impact upon traffic in Foxton

- Should Cambridge attract more jobs if it will worsen the north / south divide?
- Focus development on city and surrounding area
- Pressure on local schools / GPs is likely to increase
- Let the development at Foxton 'settle' in and see what impact they have before planning other changes
- Permission for A10 / M11 is already far in excess of what the area can cope with
- No need for the development
- It won't stop in South Cambs, therefore it provides harm with no benefits
- Nothing should be built near the villages if the trains are diesel
- Rail link is not needed or wanted
- Additional strain will be placed on local schools
- Highfields Caldecote has received far more than its share of development. People live in rural areas because they want to live in a rural landscape and there should therefore be no housing
- Plans will lead to the blurring of Shelford and Stapleford
- There is too much development in the north and west of Cambridge. There should be one large development in the south of the city, this would address overreliance on cars in South Cambridgeshire
- There is too much development in Cambridge, the spatial strategy should include building on the villages
- Council should put housing further out than Shelford because it is too easy to drive into Cambridge from Shelford which undermines the point of encouraging train use
- Democratic deficit in process and evidence base
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 18, 20, 27, 34, 50, 62, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 81, 83, 90, 95, 98, 101, 106, 107, 113, 117, 118, 126, 128, 131, 134, 135, 138, 141, 144, 147, 154, 165, 170, 171, 183, 187, 189, 196, 202, 224, 226, 236, 242, 267, 268, 273, 275, 283, 289, 290, 291, 295, 298, 304, 311, 319, 324, 329, 335, 339, 353, 359, 368, 370, 382, 387, 388, 392, 393, 403, 407, 418, 419, 431, 436, 439, 442, 456, 458, 460, 461, 473, 475, 479, 480, 482, 485, 486, 489, 494, 498, 504, 533, 538, 540, 544, 546, 549, 553, 555, 563, 587, 590, 597

Summary of issues raised:
No preference
Comments highlighting this issue:
397

Summary of issues raised:
Support
Comments highlighting this issue:
16, 96, 204, 205, 206, 229, 237, 244, 251, 261, 264, 280, 284, 286, 296, 318, 321, 323, 332, 340, 344, 346, 348, 356, 371, 375, 394, 417, 420, 444, 463, 474, 483, 492, 495, 496, 514, 518, 527, 534, 551, 564, 577, 582, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Support, but caveats include:

- There should be more development than a 'limited' amount to ensure there are affordable and not luxury housing
- Support depends on exactly where the locations are
- All development should focus on '15-minute neighbourhoods', so that all can live, work within a short walk or cycle ride. Therefore, there should be a mix of uses in any development
- Remote working should be encouraged, everyone will be working, and development should reflect this
- The Shelford's should be kept separate from Cambridge
- Development should only occur if it has good transport links which will not increase dependencies on cars
- Need to protect open spaces
- Enough development to support the facilities of existing villages including the church, the Post Office, and a shop to ensure they do not close down
- Need to increase hospital capacity before development
- Support but prioritise brownfield sites
- Support but growth should be limited to Campus
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  36, 89, 168, 175, 191, 299, 301, 315, 330, 350, 401, 410, 425, 468, 487, 490, 497, 545, 554, 560, 571, 572, 583

Summary of issues raised:
Mixed / Neutral comments including:

- The transport, education, leisure, and healthcare, shopping infrastructure has to be improved before anything else happens
- Should be limited to near railway
- Development should be limited in scope and only take place on brownfield sites
- Settlements should not merge with each other
- Some development, but not a developer's playground

- Need to consult with local residents to see what they want, especially in relation to design
- Limited development to preserve the character of villages
- Buildings over 100 years in age should be renovated not demolished
- Don’t add to Melbourn
- Supportive of the southern busway (from Babraham to CBC), but there needs to be a limited number of houses and plan of 3500 houses in Babraham needs to be stopped
- No development for smaller villages, but could Sawston develop more?
- Very little development is feasible as long as the rural nature of villages along the A10 corridor is preserved
- If the development is routed to the south, it is clear there will be a lot of development and lobbying from developers to cram as many houses in as possible
- All villages will be mass developed anyway because the Council wants to minimise car travel
- Why is the south so protected and all building is North and East?
- Less housing and more facilities, jobs to minimise travel
- Upfront money from developers should cover the costs of infrastructure
- Why not re-establish rail stations in Cherry Hinton, and extend railway connections to Teversham and Fulbourn
- Try to avoid ribbon developments
- Don’t swamp villages with too many people and turn them into dormitory towns of Cambridge. Have you considered the possibility of people working from home? How will you support this change?
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  10, 26, 40, 79, 101, 109, 139, 187, 190, 194, 213, 216, 225, 233, 247, 262, 263, 272, 289, 293, 294, 309, 328, 358, 367, 371, 374, 381, 383, 386, 389, 395, 406, 411, 415, 423, 424, 432, 438, 444, 493, 500, 505, 517, 520, 521, 522, 527, 531, 535, 537, 565, 566, 579, 590

Climate Change

Summary of issues raised:
Houses including sustainable measures, such as:

- Solar panels
- Eco-friendly housing

- Heat source pumps
- Fully insulated homes
- Net-zero
- Ventilation systems
- Built to the highest environmental standards as in Eddington
- Airtightness as standard
- Ensure building is done to Passivhaus standard
- Reduce the need for concrete
- Development should capture rain

Comments highlighting this issue:
29, 86, 109, 153, 158, 218, 248, 296, 348, 497

Summary of issues raised:
Replace all the oil with greener technologies in these villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
45

Summary of issues raised:
Need to ensure all developments are low or zero carbon emissions
Comments highlighting this issue:
497

Summary of issues raised:
Encourage community renewable energy projects with profits used for local good causes
Comments highlighting this issue:
89

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised:
There needs to be a new drainage and sewage system
Comments highlighting this issue:
260, 487

Summary of issues raised:
Green spaces, including:

- Keep small open spaces
- As much open space as possible
- Linked green spaces
- Increase access to open spaces

Comments highlighting this issue:
8, 9, 13, 127, 136, 143, 200, 206, 242, 251, 262, 275, 315, 330, 347, 367, 371, 379, 401, 410, 425, 444, 474, 477, 478, 483, 490, 492, 495, 508, 518, 545, 571, 572, 582, 583, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Protect open space, no more housing or other development
Comments highlighting this issue:
19, 128, 165, 179

Summary of issues raised:
Biodiversity planting / insect hotels / encourage wildlife / wildflowers / Hedgehog highways
Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 89, 143, 148, 166, 200, 242, 371, 408, 423, 478

Summary of issues raised:
Reforesting of wastewater treatment works
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Spaces for recycling and repair of broken goods, including workshops and shared tools
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Spaces for informal camping / outdoor camping and for the Traveller community to use as a transit stop
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Parkland, including:

- Trees
- Lakes
- Places for growing food
- Bee-friendly planting
- Areas of meadows
- Ponds
- ‘Pocket parks’ which allow people access to green spaces within 5 minutes of their house
- Should be linked up with safe cycle and walking routes

- Parks within built-up areas should be overlooked by houses and shops that encourage interaction by the community and which feel safe
- Every child should be able to access their local parks on foot and by cycle

Comments highlighting this issue:
23, 53, 158, 229, 272, 318, 321, 363, 366, 371, 375, 379, 508, 571, 572, 582

Summary of issues raised:
Tree planting
Comments highlighting this issue:
200, 231, 242, 401, 477

Summary of issues raised:
Places are needed for 'growing spaces', including:

- Allotments
- Community gardens
- Mini grow-farms
- Community fridges

Comments highlighting this issue:
363, 400, 508

Summary of issues raised:
Verges and roundabouts should be included as places where native trees and shrubs, herbs can grow so that wildlife can move from one place to the next / streets should be lined with meadow grassland
Comments highlighting this issue:
89, 363

Summary of issues raised:
Only farming land
Comments highlighting this issue:
409

Summary of issues raised:
It must avoid low-lying areas liable to flood, which should be kept as recreational space
Comments highlighting this issue:
410

Wellbeing and Social inclusion

Summary of issues raised:
All community buildings should offer space for cooking, food sharing and community kitchens

Comments highlighting this issue:
363, 400

Summary of issues raised:
Sports facilities including:

- Free outdoor exercise facilities
- Sports centre
- Outdoor pool
- A leisure centre
- Swimming pool
- Good cycling and running provision, busway is a good example of shared-use paths

Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 13, 58, 143, 229, 248, 375, 379, 416, 444, 463, 495, 508, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Community facilities, including:

- Community spaces
- Splash pools
- Libraries
- Allotments
- Playgrounds
- Recreation areas
- Community gardens
- Spaces that are free to access
- Public toilets

Comments highlighting this issue:
8, 12, 13, 46, 90, 143, 210, 229, 261, 330, 375, 416, 463, 488, 495, 508, 515, 518, 545, 571, 572, 590

Summary of issues raised:
Cemeteries
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Healthcare facilities, including:

- GP surgery
- Convalescent / Respite care

- Dentists
- Pharmacies

Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 13, 55, 73, 96, 104, 296, 330, 416, 487, 488, 505, 518, 545, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Educational facilities, including:

- Schools
- Special Education Needs schools

Comments highlighting this issue:
55, 73, 96, 248, 261, 296, 331, 361, 416, 488, 505, 518, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Hang-out spaces for young people, including youth clubs
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Skateboarding facilities, including indoor and outdoor facilities
Comments highlighting this issue:
413, 422, 502

Summary of issues raised:
Facilities for the elderly
Comments highlighting this issue:
488

Great Places

Summary of issues raised:
Public benches and picnic tables
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
These areas need some ‘soul’
Comments highlighting this issue:
275

Summary of issues raised:
A changing art space, with a 4th plinth style system that allows residents to choose artwork every 2–5 years
Comments highlighting this issue:
502

Summary of issues raised:
This needs to include public spaces and facilities to minimise the need to travel into the centre
Comments highlighting this issue:
410

Summary of issues raised:
Fundamentally, I think the 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
Comments highlighting this issue:
545

Jobs

Summary of issues raised:
Comments relating to jobs, including:

- More jobs are needed
- Local jobs needed
- Jobs within different sectors are needed
- Jobs to suit differing abilities and working times
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  206, 229, 508, 537, 551

Summary of issues raised:
Local services, such as garages performing MOTs
Comments highlighting this issue:
551

Summary of issues raised:
Clean jobs that produce less carbon
Comments highlighting this issue:
251, 583

Summary of issues raised:
Farming must be protected
Comments highlighting this issue:
251

Summary of issues raised:
Support for businesses, including:

- Office space for small businesses
- Small starter workshops for new businesses
- Support for local businesses

- Business clusters
- Support for local craft and farmer markets
- Business parks have potential if they are joined up with public transport
- Aim should be to revive local businesses
- Affordable rent for small businesses
- Small units with flexible terms, but long-term flexibility
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  12, 31, 109, 229, 261, 274, 340, 376, 432, 444, 502, 545

Summary of issues raised:
No more jobs as the only way to reduce housing prices is reducing the demand to move here
Comments highlighting this issue:
331, 248

Summary of issues raised:
Training resources / education for the jobs
Comments highlighting this issue:
127

Summary of issues raised:
Villages around Cambourne should be developed to provide local destinations for new residents. This could include speciality retail, local food growing projects, craftwork and heritage industry. This would provide local employment opportunities and diversify the villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
24, 148

Summary of issues raised:
More retail park shops
Comments highlighting this issue:
551

Summary of issues raised:
Jobs should be located closer to reduce the need to travel long distances
Comments highlighting this issue:
89, 96, 143, 148, 425, 490, 508, 545, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
No need for offices as a lot of office blocks have been vacant for several years
Comments highlighting this issue:
183

Summary of issues raised:
Commercial facilities including:

- Shops

- Post Office
- Drop-off and pick-up points for parcels
- Banking facilities
- Pub
- Restaurants
- Cafés
- Libraries

Comments highlighting this issue:
29, 73, 89, 90, 96, 127, 158, 143, 212, 255, 261, 264, 331, 350, 362, 375, 376, 432, 463, 505, 508, 515, 537, 551

Summary of issues raised:
A new regional shopping centre
Comments highlighting this issue:
58

Summary of issues raised:
Supermarket
Comments highlighting this issue:
46

Summary of issues raised:
Facilities for the elderly
Comments highlighting this issue:
488

Homes

Summary of issues raised:
Limited housing is needed, not too dense / spacious localities
Comments highlighting this issue:
120, 158, 294, 383, 583

Summary of issues raised:
More housing is needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
174, 206, 237, 247, 274, 287, 297, 331, 416, 468, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Affordable housing, including:

- More affordable housing generally
- More housing for young people
- Affordable housing in central locations

- Remove ‘tired areas’ and replace them with houses at a low price
- Co-housing schemes
- Homes for key workers
- Shared ownership schemes
- More social housing
- Less ‘executive housing’
- Starter homes
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  8, 29, 73, 109, 136, 146, 251, 278, 280, 323, 344, 346, 347, 348, 349, 375, 378, 401, 410, 420, 444, 474, 502, 515, 527, 575, 582

Summary of issues raised:
More housing to reduce the need to travel
Comments highlighting this issue:
287, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
No need to build houses around the business parks
Comments highlighting this issue:
34

Summary of issues raised:
Housing should be for local people, rather than commuters to London / beware of turning it into a commuter town
Comments highlighting this issue:
86, 112

Summary of issues raised:
Fully contained site where travel is kept to a minimum / less parking provision
Comments highlighting this issue:
163, 527

Summary of issues raised:
Small homes for those who want them / Smaller developments with adequate parking
Comments highlighting this issue:
76, 238

Summary of issues raised:
New houses should come with parking, especially in context of growing popularity of electric cars
Comments highlighting this issue:
474

Summary of issues raised:
Housing should be suitable for wheelchair users

Comments highlighting this issue:
86

Summary of issues raised:
Shelford / Stapleford would benefit from mixed / lower cost housing as access is good for the biomedical campus
Comments highlighting this issue:
46

Summary of issues raised:
Dense housing near the train line / high-density housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
159

Summary of issues raised:
No more housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
75, 210

Summary of issues raised:
More housing along the Cambridge–Royston Railway / along the railway lines
Comments highlighting this issue:
58, 66

Summary of issues raised:
Some infill housing, but no massive new town
Comments highlighting this issue:
160

Summary of issues raised:
No housing near rail lines
Comments highlighting this issue:
31

Summary of issues raised:
Low density so that residents can produce their own food
Comments highlighting this issue:
—

Summary of issues raised:
Villages should develop detached houses, whereas central urban locations should focus on larger blocks of flats / housing should be appropriate to location it is situated within
Comments highlighting this issue:
278, 286, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Homes should be built to a high architectural standard and be attractive

Comments highlighting this issue:
365

Summary of issues raised:
Homes should come with a garage / driveway
Comments highlighting this issue:
487

Summary of issues raised:
Houses with gardens, not blocks of flats
Comments highlighting this issue:
492, 575

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised:
Cycle improvements, including:

- Cycle paths
- Well-lit cycle network
- Segregated cycle paths to Cambridge
- Needs to be connected to the rest of the network
- Shared-use paths
- Off-road cycle paths, possibly into town centre or villages
- All buildings, parks and public spaces must be fully integrated with the cycling network
- All new and refreshed cycle infrastructure must be designed and built in line with Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20
- Cycle storage
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  12, 76, 89, 121, 142, 194, 218, 229, 248, 264, 367, 375, 379, 394, 420, 425, 468, 490, 497, 527, 545, 566, 571, 572, 582

Summary of issues raised:
Better public transport measures, including:

- Public transport links to the business parks
- Good links between villages
- Free transport
- More frequent bus services, including at weekends and evenings
- ‘Active’ transport network
- A train station

- Rapid transit connections to the centre of Cambridge
- Better transport between schools as this contributes to a lot of traffic
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  15, 33, 52, 89, 90, 96, 218, 228, 229, 248, 255, 291, 309, 323, 349, 350, 356, 362, 371, 375, 408, 416, 420, 468, 483, 487, 497, 508, 527, 530, 534, 564, 571, 572, 573, 582

Summary of issues raised:
A short-term electric bus-way should run along the A1307 which should eventually be replaced by a light railway.
Comments highlighting this issue:
40

Summary of issues raised:
Better transport links generally / a more integrated travel network
Comments highlighting this issue:
212, 228, 251, 264, 410, 420, 497

Summary of issues raised:
There should be proper travel hubs and not the terrible travel hub
Comments highlighting this issue:
194

Summary of issues raised:
An electric tram should run along the main railways / light railway
Comments highlighting this issue:
194, 566

Summary of issues raised:
Supportive of the southern busway (Babraham to CBC)
Comments highlighting this issue:
522

Summary of issues raised:
Roads should be less ‘wiggly’, the roads should be straightened, and the land should be used for housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
52

Summary of issues raised:
Reduce the need for cars, so within walking and cycling distances, all amenities are accessible
Comments highlighting this issue:
142, 218, 508, 571, 572

Summary of issues raised:
Should reinstall railway line between Haverhill and Cambridge to alleviate overuse of the A1307 / generally re-establish train stations on the rail line into Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue:
99, 254

Summary of issues raised:
A commuter ring-road has to be built to replace the use of narrow village streets by commuters and HGVs and this should be balanced by the pedestrianisation of some village centres, LTNs and the extension of the mobility schemes to cover the villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
40

Summary of issues raised:
Improvements to roads, including:

- Wider roads
- Multiple entrances to the site
- Roads should be built to a high architectural standard and not be 'soulless'
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  158, 229, 261, 420, 582

Summary of issues raised:
Area should be serviced 24/7, 7 days a week
Comments highlighting this issue:
582

Summary of issues raised:
Should reduce the amount of parking provision so that there is more space for greenery
Comments highlighting this issue:
490, 497

Summary of issues raised:
Why not re-establish railway stations in Cherry Hinton, and extend railway connections to Teversham and Fulbourn?
Comments highlighting this issue:
79

Summary of issues raised:
Trams / light railway should be used or new underground travel system
Comments highlighting this issue:
33, 40, 142, 260, 356

Summary of issues raised:
Transport should be prioritised above employment and housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
194

Summary of issues raised:
Better transport links that don't rely on cars

Comments highlighting this issue:
15

Summary of issues raised:
Better walking infrastructure, including:

- Circular walks
- Better paved walks for buggies and wheelchairs
- ‘World-class’ infrastructure
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  52, 142, 264, 367, 375, 425

Summary of issues raised:
Transport needs to be completed before building any houses or light factory units
Comments highlighting this issue:
260

Summary of issues raised:
Due to existing traffic problems, consider rail stops at bigger stations and integrated minibus links to the stations
Comments highlighting this issue:
543

Summary of issues raised:
Parking comments, including:

- Cheaper parking
- Parking for multiple cars
- Any new development should be exemplary with seriously high goals, such as car-free Vauban in Freiburg, Germany, or Cayala in Guatemala
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  261, 416, 545

Summary of issues raised:
It should be a car-free area and ban future conversion of front gardens to parking
Comments highlighting this issue:
208

Other Comments

Summary of issues raised:
Why is nothing being placed in the south-west of Cambridge. Is it because rich people live there?
Comments highlighting this issue:
277

Summary of issues raised:
Where is your analysis of the radical changes to Work-Life patterns/WFH/Travel needs etc. we have all seen with COVID19 pandemic?
Comments highlighting this issue:
395, 438

Summary of issues raised:
I hope EWR is not a 'Trojan Horse' to create a need for further development in this area. I hope that the Planning Department are concerned about maintaining a good quality of life for local citizens
Comments highlighting this issue:
399

Summary of issues raised:
Leading question
Comments highlighting this issue:
404

Summary of issues raised:
Young graduates struggle to stay in Cambridge, therefore transport and affordable housing improvements are needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
420

Summary of issues raised:
Why not build a plastic recycling centre and incinerator to poison Cambridge there?
Comments highlighting this issue:
469

Summary of issues raised:
The villages have already been developed significantly. You need to consider how this has impacted on their original purpose, as they originated from the rural economy. If they are now commuter dormitories, then their design needs to be reviewed in that context as this will shape the type of development in the area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
506

Summary of issues raised:
Where do you mean the cluster of the village is? If you mean the south of the A428, I agree
Comments highlighting this issue:
42

Q8. We think we should be very limited about the development we allow in villages, with only a few allocated sites in villages with good public transport connections and local services. Which villages do you think should see new development of any kind?

Opinion

Summary of issues raised:
No development with no reason given
Comments highlighting this issue:
9, 57, 126, 134, 147, 155, 162, 165, 179, 180, 185, 208, 226, 242, 249, 274, 275, 311, 332, 360, 366, 387, 389, 392, 436, 469, 488, 492, 505, 547, 550

Summary of issues raised:
No development for the following reasons:

- Impact on green belt
- Already more than limited in villages such as Waterbeach
- Impact on urban sprawl
- Impact on character of villages
- Biodiversity concerns
- Should help more deprived areas of region, i.e., Wisbech
- Impact in traffic
- Sustainability concerns
- Level-up other parts of country
- Making more jobs is not an excuse as there are already enough jobs for young people if they tried harder
- Concern about community facilities already being over-strained
- Too many people already
- Should focus on new communities not villages
- Poor transport infrastructure/public transport
- Landscape concerns
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  4, 18, 19, 23, 26, 29, 30, 49, 53, 62, 64, 67, 74, 81, 91, 95, 99, 106, 138, 153, 187, 203, 210, 247, 256, 283, 291, 310, 312, 333, 335, 356, 359, 368, 395,

397, 399, 419, 423, 433, 439, 442, 458, 460, 476, 480, 521, 535, 538, 539, 590, 594, 597

Summary of issues raised:
No development should take place until transport/water/infrastructure/amenities improvements first take place before building
Comments highlighting this issue:
2, 40, 68, 79, 83, 86, 89, 113, 115, 131, 141, 142, 178, 190, 212, 216, 424, 468, 486, 507, 554

Summary of issues raised:
Agree, limited development is needed, comments included:

- Only develop where necessary
- Take into consideration increased Working from home
- Limited development unless well-paid jobs also put in villages to prevent commuting
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  11, 69, 101, 103, 117, 130, 244, 263, 268, 270, 293, 296, 309, 350, 373, 376, 383, 385, 398, 416, 432, 461, 474, 494, 533, 543, 566, 568

Summary of issues raised:
No development on greenfield/greenbelt, brownfield only
Comments highlighting this issue:
50, 51, 96, 103, 133, 139, 205, 221, 225, 238, 263, 309, 379, 456, 475, 500, 588

Summary of issues raised:
Only develop where the water-table can sustain it
Comments highlighting this issue:
334

Summary of issues raised:
All villages should share the housing burden as long as building is within the village envelope
Comments highlighting this issue:
201

Summary of issues raised:
Should finish massive developments before building more
Comments highlighting this issue:
11

Summary of issues raised:
Villages that have not already significantly increased in size should have small developments
Comments highlighting this issue:
494

Summary of issues raised:
Less development should occur in more villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
80

Summary of issues raised:
Against the proposition, instead there should be more than limited development in villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
16, 24, 27, 87, 523

Summary of issues raised:
Development should be shared around the villages within the village envelopes
Comments highlighting this issue:
201, 282

Summary of issues raised:
Small infill sites in villages that were submitted in the call for sites and have not been accepted. These should be developed
Comments highlighting this issue:
441

Summary of issues raised:
Larger villages should be developed, but it should not lead to a merging of villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
298

Summary of issues raised:
Villages should be consulted on nature of development / it should be up to them to decide what gets built
Comments highlighting this issue:
20, 41, 90, 111, 200, 386, 431, 463

Summary of issues raised:
Agree, but don’t specify which villages should receive development
Comments highlighting this issue:
245, 279, 299, 346, 358, 378, 398, 520, 520

Summary of issues raised:
Smaller villages should see development along with improved public transport
Comments highlighting this issue:
297

Summary of issues raised:
There should also be a policy of allowing and encouraging more infill building which increases housing density on land already in residential use
Comments highlighting this issue:
475

Summary of issues raised:
Why not redevelop empty shops/sites in Cambridge and leave villages alone
Comments highlighting this issue:
383, 456

Summary of issues raised:
Gift the land to local people who can develop it
Comments highlighting this issue:
204

Summary of issues raised:
Housing should be affordable
Comments highlighting this issue:
204

Summary of issues raised:
Ensure that there remain gaps between villages to maintain identity
Comments highlighting this issue:
108

Which places should not be developed or receive limited development?

Summary of issues raised:
No development Highfield Caldecott
Comments highlighting this issue:
7

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Bourn Airfield
Comments highlighting this issue:
7

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Great Shelford/Stapleford
Comments highlighting this issue:
97, 122, 125, 140, 184, 252, 312, 333, 336, 357, 377, 565, 569

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Melbourn
Comments highlighting this issue:
43, 463, 531, 543, 549

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Babraham
Comments highlighting this issue:
295

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Meldreth
Comments highlighting this issue:
549

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Barrington
Comments highlighting this issue:
543

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Milton
Comments highlighting this issue:
13

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Longstanton
Comments highlighting this issue:
232

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Northstowe
Comments highlighting this issue:
232

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Cottenham
Comments highlighting this issue:
232

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Rampton
Comments highlighting this issue:
232

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Histon
Comments highlighting this issue:
250

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Oakington
Comments highlighting this issue:
383

Summary of issues raised:
No development in Impington
Comments highlighting this issue:
250

Summary of issues raised:
No infill in Bourn
Comments highlighting this issue:
171

Summary of issues raised:
Nothing too close to Cambridge / development shouldn't just be put into Cambridge which can also lead to negative impact
Comments highlighting this issue:
175, 573

Summary of issues raised:
No massive new town as proposed by Thakeham
Comments highlighting this issue:
160

Summary of issues raised:
Only infill on brownfield land in Stapleford/Shelford
Comments highlighting this issue:
189

Summary of issues raised:
Should only build 10's, not 100's of houses in:

- Babraham
- Sawston
- Stapleford
- Shelford

Comments highlighting this issue:
34

Summary of issues raised:
Only development should be an increase in jobs in Cambourne, but no increase in homes
Comments highlighting this issue:
134

Where should be developed?

Summary of issues raised:
All villages should receive development
Comments highlighting this issue:
11, 237, 254, 261, 289, 354, 483, 498, 514

Summary of issues raised:
Development in places with good transport connections. Comments included:

- Villages on train line
- Villages on busway
- Villages with good public transport connections
- Villages with good greenway routes
- Villages with good cycle lanes + pavements
- Villages where the above things will soon be provided
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  6, 10, 14, 16, 33, 143, 148, 190, 194, 224, 264, 315, 373, 376, 406, 407, 461, 485, 490, 497, 500, 510, 533, 551, 574, 578, 350

Summary of issues raised:
Development should be in areas with poor transport connections
Comments highlighting this issue:
163

Summary of issues raised:
Larger villages with Post Office / Café / Education / Medical / pre-existing amenities
Comments highlighting this issue:
47, 66, 73, 85, 449, 461, 561

Summary of issues raised:
Development should be situated in villages north and west of Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
583

Summary of issues raised:
Too much development in north and west of city / Large development needed in South Cambridgeshire / near Biomedical Campus. Transport connections should improve to enable development on this side
Comments highlighting this issue:
72, 191, 238, 254, 574

Summary of issues raised:
More development needed in south and west
Comments highlighting this issue:
286

Summary of issues raised:
In villages near to centre of Cambridgeshire
Comments highlighting this issue:
323

Summary of issues raised:
In villages with business parks
Comments highlighting this issue:
79, 287

Summary of issues raised:
Standalone villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
78

Summary of issues raised:
Development should be in new villages (e.g. Northstowe, Eddington, Waterbeach) and not old villages which should be limited to infill sites
Comments highlighting this issue:
170, 24, 482

Summary of issues raised:
Ely
Comments highlighting this issue:
323

Summary of issues raised:
Villages near A14
Comments highlighting this issue:
323

Summary of issues raised:
Foxton
Comments highlighting this issue:
6, 109, 160, 196, 315, 380, 420, 515, 528, 540, 543, 577

Summary of issues raised:
Fowlmere
Comments highlighting this issue:
543

Summary of issues raised:
Newtown
Comments highlighting this issue:
321

Summary of issues raised:
Coton
Comments highlighting this issue:
6

Summary of issues raised:
Stow-Cum-Quy
Comments highlighting this issue:
6

Summary of issues raised:
Girton

Comments highlighting this issue:
6, 276, 277, 361

Summary of issues raised:
Fulbourn
Comments highlighting this issue:
6, 33, 349, 374, 515

Summary of issues raised:
Barton
Comments highlighting this issue:
6, 286, 348

Summary of issues raised:
Duxford
Comments highlighting this issue:
16, 47, 183

Summary of issues raised:
Waterbeach
Comments highlighting this issue:
25, 159, 170, 321, 323, 328, 339, 388, 438

Summary of issues raised:
Cottenham
Comments highlighting this issue:
31, 70, 108, 159, 235, 349, 361, 362, 432

Summary of issues raised:
Willingham
Comments highlighting this issue:
31, 70, 362

Summary of issues raised:
Linton
Comments highlighting this issue:
33

Summary of issues raised:
Sawston
Comments highlighting this issue:
33, 84, 202, 273, 371, 475, 517, 565

Summary of issues raised:
Royston
Comments highlighting this issue:
42

Summary of issues raised:
Gamlingay

Comments highlighting this issue:
42, 47

Summary of issues raised:
Melbourn
Comments highlighting this issue:
42, 58, 109, 137, 160, 380, 420, 515, 540

Summary of issues raised:
Meldreth
Comments highlighting this issue:
42, 109, 420, 577

Summary of issues raised:
Bassingbourn
Comments highlighting this issue:
42, 543

Summary of issues raised:
March
Comments highlighting this issue:
90

Summary of issues raised:
Littleport
Comments highlighting this issue:
90

Summary of issues raised:
Chatteris
Comments highlighting this issue:
90

Summary of issues raised:
Shelford / Stapleford
Comments highlighting this issue:
84, 202, 251, 294, 466

Summary of issues raised:
Bourn
Comments highlighting this issue:
47

Summary of issues raised:
Shepreth
Comments highlighting this issue:
58, 420, 577

Summary of issues raised:
Dullingham

Comments highlighting this issue:
58

Summary of issues raised:
Whittlesford
Comments highlighting this issue:
58, 183

Summary of issues raised:
Hardwick
Comments highlighting this issue:
68, 251, 286

Summary of issues raised:
Bar Hill
Comments highlighting this issue:
70, 166, 206

Summary of issues raised:
Grantchester
Comments highlighting this issue:
71, 276, 277

Summary of issues raised:
Harston
Comments highlighting this issue:
109, 380

Summary of issues raised:
Histon
Comments highlighting this issue:
112, 284, 323, 349, 361, 374, 379, 422, 432

Summary of issues raised:
Impington
Comments highlighting this issue:
112, 349, 379, 422

Summary of issues raised:
Cambourne
Comments highlighting this issue:
146, 196, 321, 328, 438, 555

Summary of issues raised:
Landbeach
Comments highlighting this issue:
159

Summary of issues raised:
Airport site – unspecified

Comments highlighting this issue:
438

Summary of issues raised:
Eddington
Comments highlighting this issue:
170

Summary of issues raised:
Northstowe
Comments highlighting this issue:
170, 328, 388, 438, 509

Summary of issues raised:
Fowlmere
Comments highlighting this issue:
217, 543

Summary of issues raised:
Milton
Comments highlighting this issue:
235, 284, 323, 555, 563

Summary of issues raised:
Abington
Comments highlighting this issue:
254

Summary of issues raised:
Babraham
Comments highlighting this issue:
254, 294, 517

Summary of issues raised:
Oakington
Comments highlighting this issue:
235

Summary of issues raised:
Ramsey
Comments highlighting this issue:
272

Summary of issues raised:
Trumpington
Comments highlighting this issue:
277

Summary of issues raised:
Madingley

Comments highlighting this issue:
276, 374

Summary of issues raised:
Over
Comments highlighting this issue:
362

Summary of issues raised:
Comberton
Comments highlighting this issue:
286

Summary of issues raised:
Cherry Hinton
Comments highlighting this issue:
301, 349

Summary of issues raised:
Longstanton
Comments highlighting this issue:
362

Summary of issues raised:
Swavesey
Comments highlighting this issue:
362

Summary of issues raised:
Teversham
Comments highlighting this issue:
374, 515

Summary of issues raised:
Proposal by Trinity College to expand the Science Park would support growth of nearby housing developments + provide much needed open space + support local villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
222, 248

Summary of issues raised:
Council should build further out beyond Shelford to make housing more affordable and encourage public transport
Comments highlighting this issue:
207

Summary of issues raised:
Design a Garden Town/Village with lower density housing. Not blocks as in Eddington, that does not fit in with the landscape

Comments highlighting this issue:
339

Proposed requirements for developing in villages

Summary of issues raised:
Only develop if car-free
Comments highlighting this issue:
6

Summary of issues raised:
New developments must adhere to 15-minute neighbourhood principles and provide housing, employment, jobs, facilities etc. in 15-min radius
Comments highlighting this issue:
401, 571

Summary of issues raised:
Only develop if:

- Public transport is included
- Safe cycle links are included
- New villages have school, shop
- Travel is safe for children
- New developments adhere to 15-minute city philosophy which includes sustainable forms of transport
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  6, 52, 545, 571, 401

Summary of issues raised:
New development should have employment
Comments highlighting this issue:
24

Summary of issues raised:
Everything should be carbon net-zero
Comments highlighting this issue:
86, 133

Summary of issues raised:
Houses should be suitable for wheelchairs
Comments highlighting this issue:
86

Summary of issues raised:
Transport improvements are needed, including:

- Buses

- Congestion charge
- Speed cameras
- Cheaper public transport
- Cycle lanes
- Provide a new NE bypass from A10
- New developments on the fringes of villages must have footpath and cycle path connectivity to the village centre
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  63, 69, 83, 142, 181, 309, 331, 339, 404, 422, 530, 538, 543, 544, 566

Summary of issues raised:
Buildings should be sympathetic to character of villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
133, 151, 224, 261, 373, 470

Summary of issues raised:
Development needs to carefully think about floodplains
Comments highlighting this issue:
168, 216, 449

Summary of issues raised:
Leave natural spaces / protect green spaces / tree planting
Comments highlighting this issue:
181, 231, 422

Summary of issues raised:
Rural exception housing in the villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
194

Summary of issues raised:
Not expensive private development which local people cannot afford / social housing only
Comments highlighting this issue:
194, 545

Summary of issues raised:
Stick a busway alongside the villages and put stops alongside where the villages will come up
Comments highlighting this issue:
202

Other Comments

Summary of issues raised:
Please define what ‘good public transport connections’ are as very few villages have good connections
Comments highlighting this issue:
213

Summary of issues raised:
Why ‘limited’ in villages and not elsewhere
Comments highlighting this issue:
4

Summary of issues raised:
Public transport needs to improve in the villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
229

Summary of issues raised:
Laughable to hear you talk about good public transport and connections from villages when all Stagecoach has ever done is cut bus services to villages to save money.
Comments highlighting this issue:
236

Summary of issues raised:
Water authorities and developers should be held accountable and be kept to original plans on affordability and sustainability.
Comments highlighting this issue:
260

Summary of issues raised:
Let the free-market decide
Comments highlighting this issue:
268

Summary of issues raised:
Each village should have its own individual aspects and interests. Each village should have both commercial areas, retail areas and amenity activities in addition to residential development potential
Comments highlighting this issue:
289

Summary of issues raised:
If places like Cambourne and Northstowe are allowed to swallow smaller surrounding villages, what’s the point of limiting development
Comments highlighting this issue:
290

Summary of issues raised:
You get the impression that you first build automated routes to every village and then announce that as they all have good public transport they should be developed / don't use future transport links as an excuse to destroy green belt
Comments highlighting this issue:
295, 533, 538

Summary of issues raised:
Do not use the proposed new travel hub near Babraham as an excuse for over-development along the new busway in Babraham, Sawston, Stapleford and Shelfords.
Comments highlighting this issue:
533

Summary of issues raised:
Development should take place in villages that are already on the way to being ruined
Comments highlighting this issue:
304

Summary of issues raised:
I don't approve of singling out specific villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
311

Summary of issues raised:
No one seems to know about this consultation round here. The council needs to do better at telling people, as I don't know anyone who thinks these homes are a good idea.
Comments highlighting this issue:
312, 357

Summary of issues raised:
Villages are vital to the housing markets in the form of small integrated units which are not larger than the existing village. They are often cheaper than city in terms of housing but suffer from poor transport links and reduced services. Some people prefer this to the density of towns
Comments highlighting this issue:
319

Summary of issues raised:
If S106 was lifted, people would move freely and no more new builds would be needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
324

Summary of issues raised:
Where are the water supplies coming from these homes

Comments highlighting this issue:
328

Summary of issues raised:
I think the reasoning re public transport is sound. But what if you're living in village without public transport and you can't drive because you can't afford it and/or are unable to do so because of disability? The villages without public transport then become limited to the well well-off.
Comments highlighting this issue:
330

Summary of issues raised:
We should maintain and encourage local businesses not superstores
Comments highlighting this issue:
335

Summary of issues raised:
Co-housing schemes
Comments highlighting this issue:
344

Summary of issues raised:
Brownfield sites in Cambridge should be developed and no further development of hotels or student accommodation
Comments highlighting this issue:
359

Summary of issues raised:
Whatever’s done should be high-quality and enhance people’s lives
Comments highlighting this issue:
365

Summary of issues raised:
Avoid large developments in villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
367

Summary of issues raised:
Why? You’ve already ruined the three Cambourne villages. Why stop there?
Comments highlighting this issue:
370

Summary of issues raised:
I live in Fulbourn, which is already faced with two approved developments of over 300 dwellings, which I think is too much even though we are a larger village.
Comments highlighting this issue:
373

Summary of issues raised:
I feel there should be very little if any retail and office space provided. Instead, there should be open space, woodland plantations etc.
Comments highlighting this issue:
385

Summary of issues raised:
Where is your analysis of the Climate Change degradation on all this unnecessary new building? Also, where is your analysis of the radical changes to Work-Life patterns/WFH/Travel needs?
Comments highlighting this issue:
395, 470

Summary of issues raised:
What is “limited development”. Who controls it? The developers with the most money? Most people use their cars for convenience and would not use public transport. How can you shop on a bike or a train for a family?
Comments highlighting this issue:
418

Summary of issues raised:
Histon and Impington Skate park should be expanded
Comments highlighting this issue:
422

Summary of issues raised:
No more roadways should be developed
Comments highlighting this issue:
485

Summary of issues raised:
No more development in the A10 or A603 corridors
Comments highlighting this issue:
487

Summary of issues raised:
Please provide plans and costing and sustainability of the 'good public transport' model that is being proposed and also provide evidence that these proposals have worked in other regions either here or abroad. Same goes for the local services.
Comments highlighting this issue:
495

Summary of issues raised:
I agree with the principle but other proposals above break this principle
Comments highlighting this issue:
496

Summary of issues raised:
Limited building on brownfield sites should be allowed however building over 100

years in age should be renovated not demolished.

Comments highlighting this issue:

500

Summary of issues raised:

Didn’t you say in question 7 that you wanted to see more development in villages

Comments highlighting this issue:

506

Summary of issues raised:

This is hypocritical to not build in the villages, when the WWTP project will cause similar environmental harm to the Green Belt.

Comments highlighting this issue:

518

Summary of issues raised:

There should be no development with more than 10 units in any village bar exceptional cases, with in aggregate developments over the Plan period limited to 50 units per village except where there is infill which is not on open space.

Comments highlighting this issue:

568

Summary of issues raised:

Whatever villages are developed it should fall within the local guidelines and communication with local councils.

Comments highlighting this issue:

582

Summary of issues raised:

Playgrounds for the kids are needed

Comments highlighting this issue:

590

Summary of issues raised:

Hope this won’t be decided upon the basis of who shouts the loudest

Comments highlighting this issue:

592

Summary of issues raised:

New developments in all locations needs to be definitive and balanced

Comments highlighting this issue:

595

Summary of issues raised:

To answer this would require detailed knowledge of every village in South Cambs.

Comments highlighting this issue:

10

Q9: What housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces do you think should be provided in and around these villages?

Summary of issues raised:
None for reasons including:

- Not enough water / should not have development until more water is provided
- Land needed for farming
- City is already constrained
- Protect the green belt
- There is enough development in the plan already
- Hospital capacity needs to be increased before new developments
- Jobs are needed in the north of the country, not Cambridge
- People chose to live in a village for the 'village life', not the job opportunities or facilities
- Northstowe is creeping closer to Oakington and therefore village should not be built on
- Local plan should prevent urbanisation which would ruin character of villages
- Retain what is already there
- Building on greenfield land always reduces the amount of available open space
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  5, 11, 18, 41, 63, 95, 115, 117, 134, 141, 192, 216, 244, 247, 256, 359, 368, 392, 403, 418, 423, 456, 509, 521, 533, 535, 554, 565, 566, 584

Summary of issues raised:
None with no reason given
Comments highlighting this issue:
27, 30, 49, 57, 64, 106, 138, 163, 179, 183, 185, 187, 210, 331, 366, 442, 458, 469, 507

Summary of issues raised:
Amenities need to be within walking distance
Comments highlighting this issue:
83, 143

Summary of issues raised:
Limited development, including:

- No development in the Green Belt

- Sites should be placed in bigger villages where residents can see the benefits from housing in terms of more amenities
- Only build if transport infrastructure is in-place
- Retain spaces between the villages
- Small villages are suitable for small increases on brownfield sites
- All facilities should be provided within existing boundaries
- Enough development to support the infrastructure
- Strictly infill for housing / no development outside residential boundaries
- Avoidance of ribbon development
- Small expansion of villages can enhance the viability of village services

Comments highlighting this issue:
111, 200, 238, 248, 267, 272, 293, 304, 311, 358, 395, 432, 460, 461, 479, 485, 505, 511, 543, 544, 549, 561, 569, 571, 582, 590, 597

Summary of issues raised:
All new development should focus on the need to build true ’15-minute neighbourhoods’ so that those who live and work there do not have to be dependent on car use and can access the majority of their destinations including jobs, education, shops, services, open space and leisure amenities within a short walk or cycle ride. Therefore, any significant development must have a mix of uses to give people a chance to access everyday needs without travelling far.
Comments highlighting this issue:
24, 267, 425, 490, 544, 571

Deliverability

Summary of issues raised:
All villages should be developed to prevent them becoming dead dormitory towns.
Comments highlighting this issue:
24

Summary of issues raised:
The area south of Cambridge through to Royston has existing rail links and should be considered for more than limited development both housing and business/scientific.
Comments highlighting this issue:
577

Summary of issues raised:
North Cambridgeshire has seen a lot of development. The south should see some occur

Comments highlighting this issue:
72

Summary of issues raised:
Brownfield sites should be used not greenfield
Comments highlighting this issue:
86

Summary of issues raised:
In Histon, a new GP surgery is needed along with a public playground next to the new Park Primary school
Comments highlighting this issue:
155

Summary of issues raised:
No development should be allowed which merges villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
298

Summary of issues raised:
Adequate facilities should accompany housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
331

Climate change

Summary of issues raised:
All housing/development should be carbon net-zero/highest environmental standards, including:

- Solar panels
- Water harvesting
- Passive house
- Developments are low or zero-carbon emissions
- Homes are well-insulated

Comments highlighting this issue:
86, 109, 218, 296, 328, 388, 545, 497

Summary of issues raised:
Community renewable energy projects should be encouraged
Comments highlighting this issue:
89

Summary of issues raised:
Nearly all the growth suggested in the Draft Local Plan will lead to new building with an associated increase in the area of artificial surfaces. Of course the developers will

claim this can be off-set by the use of badly designed Sustainable Drainage Systems, SuDS. It is essential that safe and effective, design and implementation of SuDs is adequately enforced.
Comments highlighting this issue:
439

Summary of issues raised:
The local sewage system is currently inadequate. Currently, there are no plans to improve failing combined sewer overflows (CSOs), just promises to monitor them more accurately. To date there have been no upgrades at any of the smaller works in the area while more and more taps are still being connected. The Environment Agency has already warned at least one Cambridgeshire local planning authority, East Cambs District Council, that they must stop looking at the sewage requirements of single planning applications and instead look at the cumulative effects.
Comments highlighting this issue:
439

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised:
There are enough natural open spaces
Comments highlighting this issue:
34, 69

Summary of issues raised:
More open/green spaces generally
Comments highlighting this issue:
4, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 28, 62, 74, 86, 135, 137, 151, 153, 160, 180, 191, 194, 196, 206, 212, 226, 231, 237, 238, 242, 251, 267, 274, 293, 297, 319, 335, 349, 353, 374, 381, 393, 398, 425, 449, 460, 466, 474, 490, 509, 533, 543, 545, 562, 563, 569, 571, 574, 582, 583, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Green improvements, including:

- Borders between villages to be kept clear and defined perhaps by corridors of trees/woods so that new walkways can be established
- Reforesting
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  9, 62, 76, 143

Summary of issues raised:
Biodiversity planting, including:

- Insect hotels
- Encouragement of wildlife

- Wildlife spaces
- Tree planting
- Managed woodland involving native, not forestry pine
- Open meadow land
- Community orchards
- Wildflower meadows
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  12, 143, 166, 226, 231, 242, 334, 398, 478, 545

Summary of issues raised:
Spaces for informal camping/use by the Traveller community
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
At least 1 hectare of new nature reserve for every 10 new houses
Comments highlighting this issue:
562

Summary of issues raised:
Parks, including:

- Green spaces that are proper green areas and do not pretend to be parks
- Trees
- Which are safe to play in
- Lakes
- Places to walk dogs
- Local council pavilions
- Outdoor gyms
- Parks for kids
- Parks within the built-up area should be overlooked by houses and shops, with a welcoming design that encourages interaction with the surrounding community
- Should be accessible by children
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  24, 40, 61, 83, 180, 191, 194, 196, 202, 212, 293, 321, 323, 425, 490, 528, 531, 544, 545, 571, 574, 592

Summary of issues raised:
There should be the ‘right to roam’ on this land

Comments highlighting this issue:
190

Summary of issues raised:
Plan for greenways from a number of villages in Cambridge is a good idea
Comments highlighting this issue:
263

Summary of issues raised:
Food growing opportunities, including:

- Allotments
- Co-farming
- Community gardens
- Growing facilities at no expense to residents
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  349, 400, 478, 502

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised:
Facilities are already good in the villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
69

Summary of issues raised:
More community spaces, including:

- Libraries
- Village hall
- Community facilities designed for multipurpose usage
- Community centres
- Splash pools
- Playgrounds
- Places for recycling and the repair of broken goods
- Community centres with community kitchens and food sharing facilities
- Youth clubs
- Play facilities should mirror the village demographic
- Fenced-off areas for children's play

Comments highlighting this issue:
8, 12, 73, 83, 127, 135, 151 196, 202, 237, 264, 267, 275, 279, 286, 293, 301, 323, 324, 328, 331, 349, 367, 381, 400, 425 461, 463, 495, 508, 515, 538, 551, 555, 561, 562, 571, 590, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Cemeteries
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Sports facilities including:

- Free outdoor exercise facilities
- Sports centre
- Outdoor pool
- A leisure centre
- Swimming pool
- BMX park and track
- Dog walk areas
- Pump tracks
- Gym
- Skateboarding facilities

Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 40, 58, 83, 111, 113, 131, 135 151, 196, 212, 213, 227,237, 261, 264, 267, 275, 289, 290, 293, 301, 324, 331, 367, 381, 422, 463, 502, 508, 514, 519, 528, 531, 555, 561, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Healthcare institutions, including:

- GP surgeries
- Respite care
- Dentists
- Mental health support hub
- Pharmacy

Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 73, 85, 96, 126, 127, 151, 177, 190, 196, 212, 237, 251, 261, 264, 296, 331, 339, 367, 381, 425, 449, 461, 466, 478, 483, 485, 487, 490, 494, 508, 519, 538, 544, 549, 561, 565, 571, 592

Summary of issues raised:

Education facilities, including:

- Schools

Special needs school

Comments highlighting this issue:
126, 146, 151, 159, 196, 237, 261 264, 296, 315, 361, 381, 388, 425, 461, 485, 487, 490, 494, 508, 519, 538, 544, 561, 571, 592

Summary of issues raised:

Childcare, including:

- Nurseries

Comments highlighting this issue:
83, 190, 196, 229, 237, 425, 483, 487, 508, 571

Summary of issues raised:

Support for the elderly within the community

Comments highlighting this issue:
229, 237

Summary of issues raised:

Children's activities

Comments highlighting this issue:
463

Summary of issues raised:

At least one new community centre for every 500 new homes **Comments highlighting this issue:**
562

Great places

Summary of issues raised:
Lots of public benches and picnic tables
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Hang-out spaces for teenagers
Comments highlighting this issue:
12

Summary of issues raised:
Any development needs to reflect the village character and meet the needs of local residents
Comments highlighting this issue:
42, 151

Summary of issues raised:

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.

Comments highlighting this issue:
502

Summary of issues raised:

Creative features are needed to make it a destination to travel to
Comments highlighting this issue:
561

Jobs

Summary of issues raised:
No more jobs
Comments highlighting this issue:
69, 93, 175, 301, 505, 543

Summary of issues raised:
Generally, more local jobs
Comments highlighting this issue:
4, 24, 159, 206, 237, 293, 493, 577, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Help for local businesses, including:

- Space for small starter workshops
- Space for local craft and farmers markets
- Businesses that support the local community
- Facilitate local businesses to try and recruit locally
- Small units
- Affordable rents for small businesses
- Shared office spaces with bookable meeting rooms, small conference facilities
- Small units for long-term rental, with flexible terms, but long-term stability

Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 78, 112, 147, 194, 196, 229, 261, 323, 444, 489, 502, 508, 564, 577, 592

Summary of issues raised:
A mix of small employers and tradespeople
Comments highlighting this issue:
24

Summary of issues raised:
Hi-value jobs/ high-quality activity
Comments highlighting this issue:
137, 540, 577

Summary of issues raised:
Jobs need to be ‘green jobs’/ non-polluting
Comments highlighting this issue:
382, 583

Summary of issues raised:
Jobs should focus on smaller manufacturing and IT units/ Hi-tech-jobs
Comments highlighting this issue:
260, 568

Summary of issues raised:
Better commercial facilities including

- Shops
- Supermarket
- Post office
- Pub
- Cafes
- Local food shops
- restaurants
- Petrol station
- Country based businesses

Comments highlighting this issue:
25, 31, 58, 73, 83, 93, 127, 135, 146, 159, 190, 194, 196, 229, 245, 251, 261, 264, 267, 279, 282, 283, 286, 289, 315, 331, 349, 361, 367, 382, 461, 466, 483, 508, 515, 519, 538, 555, 561, 592

Summary of issues raised:
Home working should be encouraged

Comments highlighting this issue:
168

Summary of issues raised:
Jobs should be encouraged locally which accord with the ’15-minute’ neighbourhood idea

Comments highlighting this issue:
425

Summary of issues raised:
Small business parks/ small science parks

Comments highlighting this issue:
96, 170, 191, 194, 196

Summary of issues raised:
Business parks and innovation centres work well when on mainline rail links

Comments highlighting this issue:
500

Homes

Summary of issues raised:
No more housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
4, 247, 297, 367, 383

Summary of issues raised:
Generally, more housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
16, 206, 237, 293, 301, 315, 321, 331, 438, 505, 577, 592

Summary of issues raised:
More affordable housing, including:

- Housing for local people should be prioritised
- Affordable housing for first-time buyers and younger people
- Co-housing schemes
- More affordable housing in and around Melbourn
- Housing for key workers
- Social housing
- Housing should be targeted at the median consumer
- No luxury flats
- Council Housing
- Single-storey accommodation
- 1 – 3 bed homes

Comments highlighting this issue:
8, 31, 112, 251, 260, 323, 344, 349, 420, 432, 449, 474, 475, 478, 502, 519, 520, 545, 555, 575, 582

Summary of issues raised:
Family-sized homes
Comments highlighting this issue:
160, 251, 538

Summary of issues raised:
Bungalows
Comments highlighting this issue:
251

Summary of issues raised:
Denser housing, less student accommodation/ 15-minute neighbourhood principles should be implemented for new development
Comments highlighting this issue:
66, 491, 571

Summary of issues raised:
Less denser housing, with gardens
Comments highlighting this issue:
68, 349, 575

Summary of issues raised:
Any residential development of more than a couple of houses should be wheelchair friendly
Comments highlighting this issue:
86

Summary of issues raised:
New houses should be linked to new employment opportunities created
Comments highlighting this issue:
86

Summary of issues raised:
Housing for those who want to be close to work, but who do not need the social resources of the city
Comments highlighting this issue:
137

Summary of issues raised:
New housing should have good transport links to reduce the need to use a car
Comments highlighting this issue:
218, 425

Summary of issues raised:
Housing should be attractive and take into account the identity of villages
Comments highlighting this issue:
296

Summary of issues raised:
A limited number not exceeding 10-15 houses could be built
Comments highlighting this issue:
538

Summary of issues raised:
Affordable 3-bedroom housing is needed
Comments highlighting this issue:
407

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised:
Improved walking routes, including:

- Encouraging children to walk to school
- Well-lit footpaths with CCTV
- Pavements are in a poor state

Need a better set of footpaths for people to access the countryside/ country parks
Comments highlighting this issue:
142, 143, 151, 153, 190, 196, 237, 251, 264, 291, 328, 349, 367, 425, 459, 490, 497, 544, 561, 571, 573, 574, 582

Summary of issues raised:
Better transport links, including:

- Improved access between the villages

Other areas are required for active travel
Comments highlighting this issue:
51, 126, 151, 153, 190, 196, 212, 218, 237, 264, 349, 360, 361, 365, 367, 388, 404, 416, 420, 425, 490, 497, 508, 544, 561, 571, 573, 582

Summary of issues raised:
Improved public transport, including:

- Better connections to key hubs
- Better bus connections
- Better rail connections
- Regular bus and train services which are well-advertised
- Tram to city centre
- Buses should arrive at 10-minute intervals at peak times
- Guided busway
- Create such good transport that there is less need to travel by car
- A bus provided between villages to help with the school run.

Comments highlighting this issue:
6, 16, 58, 73, 85, 109, 131, 142, 143, 151, 190, 196, 212, 218, 237, 253, 264, 287, 291, 349, 356, 361, 365, 371, 376, 387, 388, 398, 404, 416, 420, 425, 486, 490, 497, 508, 519, 530, 544, 561, 571, 573, 582, 596

Summary of issues raised:
Improved cycling routes, including:

- Off-road cycle paths
- Better routes within and between the villages
- Path between Melbourn and Royston
- All buildings, parks and public spaces must be fully integrated with the cycling network and all new and refreshed cycle infrastructure must be designed and built in line with Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20
- Wilbrahams could do with a cycle link up to Newmarket Road
- Wide paths
- Safer cycle lanes
- Adjacent footways
- Separated from the road
- Suitable to use at night
- Cycleway as much as possible from villages into Cambridge town centre

Comments highlighting this issue:
6, 12, 50, 113, 142, 143, 151, 153, 156, 190, 191, 196, 212, 213, 237, 264, 274, 276, 328, 346, 349, 394, 425, 431, 459, 490, 497, 544, 545, 561, 562, 571, 573, 582

Summary of issues raised:
Secure bike storage
Comments highlighting this issue:
153

Summary of issues raised:
Better parking
Comments highlighting this issue:
31, 261

Summary of issues raised:
New estates should only have room for one car/ a minimum amount of cars/ Reducing the amount of road and parking space needed for cars will provide more space for greenery and green corridors in proposed developments.
Comments highlighting this issue:
328, 425, 490, 544, 571

Summary of issues raised:
New houses should have more than one car parking space
Comments highlighting this issue:
474

Summary of issues raised:
Electric charging points
Comments highlighting this issue:
474

Summary of issues raised:
New bridleway
Comments highlighting this issue:
40, 190

Summary of issues raised:
Better roads, including:

- Road bypasses
- Direct route to useful shops such as B&Q, not just to Cambridge city centre
- Multiple entrances and exits
- More houses would put a great strain on the roads, so they need investment
- Traffic is travelling at excess speed
- Roads are in a poor state

Comments highlighting this issue:
51, 71, 93, 109, 151, 190, 196, 261, 356, 361, 367

Summary of issues raised:
Broadband needs to improve
Comments highlighting this issue:
99, 147, 330, 353

Other comments

Summary of issues raised:
We have residents willing to invest £300k in reforesting, yet can't engage the local landowners. Would you be able to provide some pressure?
Comments highlighting this issue:
76

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge industrial estate shops should offer a service to transport goods without using a car
Comments highlighting this issue:
93

Summary of issues raised:
Strategic support needs to be clearly defined and committed to avoid damage to traditional village facilities (post offices, butchers, village shops...). How are you going to balance the tensions with the greed for the big anchor tenant supermarkets etc?

Comments highlighting this issue:
171

Summary of issues raised:
The overall new development in all locations needs to be definitive and balanced
Comments highlighting this issue:
595

Summary of issues raised:
Ask local residents/ those living in the villages should be consulted
Comments highlighting this issue:
200, 236, 386, 431, 436

Summary of issues raised:
Should people choose to live in a village, they no doubt will have transport to their place of work. Also they would have chosen a village because they enjoy the peace and green space of the countryside.
Comments highlighting this issue:
482

Summary of issues raised:
The guided bus has been a success and capacity at peak times is a problem as buses arrive full at places like Histon
Comments highlighting this issue:
284

Summary of issues raised:
Foxton needs parking for the train to Addenbrookes
Comments highlighting this issue:
203

Summary of issues raised:
Villages should be expanded wherever possible because they are popular places to live
Comments highlighting this issue:
592

Summary of issues raised:
Trinity College Proposal for Science Park North is a notable omission from the current round of the Local Plan, but it would provide a significant amount of new hi-tech jobs and provide additional green space.
Comments highlighting this issue:
222

Summary of issues raised:
The level of development around Addenbrookes is awful with three story house crammed to gather or the concrete wasteland that is Eddington.
Comments highlighting this issue:
353

Summary of issues raised:
Do you really think they'll be able to function as self-contained communities?

Perhaps that's not what you mean. The economy of the villages is disrupted by the presence of a wealthy city within commuting distance. They are now functionally detached from the environment. And house prices perpetuate this so that seasonal agricultural employment has to be accommodated on farms in temporary facilities where the skills cannot be replaced with technology.

Comments highlighting this issue:
506

Summary of issues raised:
Exactly what development occurs needs to be decided on a village-by-village basis

Comments highlighting this issue:
350

Summary of issues raised:
Villages still need their own facilities so they need to be kept alive and operational

Comments highlighting this issue:
508

Summary of issues raised:
There needs to be a lot of development, villages can’t preserve their life in aspic. If they want to pretend they live in the 1950s countryside, then they shouldn't live on the border of the world's premier biomedical city.

Comments highlighting this issue:
237

Summary of issues raised:
Babraham Research Institute and Cheveley Farms are working together to deliver in terms of delivering a village of 130 houses

Comments highlighting this issue:
295

Summary of issues raised:
We have a lot of employment in Fulbourn but many people still travel into the village by car to work and many people from here travel across country to work by car, as such journeys are not serviced by public transport.

Comments highlighting this issue:
373

Summary of issues raised:
Once you grow a village too much you can never get back that village feel.

Comments highlighting this issue:
383

Summary of issues raised:
Where is your analysis of the Climate Change degradation on all this unnecessary new building? (concrete/diesel powered trucks & machinery … etc.)?

Comments highlighting this issue:
395

Summary of issues raised:
Often service such as healthcare and education are not being increased along with house numbers, meaning service are stretched

Comments highlighting this issue:
494

Summary of issues raised:
Where is your analysis of the radical changes to Work-Life patterns/WFH/Travel needs etc. we have all seen with COVID19 pandemic?

Comments highlighting this issue:
395

Summary of issues raised:
I'm unsure what proportion of village home-owners of working age actually work 'locally'

Comments highlighting this issue:
419

Summary of issues raised:
The most important issue is that our councillors should represent the interests of residents, not property developers. They should be working for genuinely-affordable housing, and not accepting the current weak standards that mean that new developments do not offer genuinely affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue:
475

Summary of issues raised:
To answer this would require detailed knowledge of every village in South Cambs. Any village picked for some of these allocated sites should be sustainable.

Comments highlighting this issue:
10

Summary of issues raised:
This is a terrible questionnaire which is clearly designed to prompt an uncritical response to the local plan. The local plan is fraudulent and invalid without mentioning the proposed re-location of the WWTP on which it fully depends.

Comments highlighting this issue:
518

Q10. Are there any sites which you think should be developed for housing or business use, which we haven't got on our map so far?

Opinion

Summary of issues raised:
No
Comments highlighting this issue:
2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 18, 19, 29, 30, 36, 42, 50, 51, 53, 57, 62, 64, 68, 73, 85, 86, 89, 95, 96, 99, 109, 115, 126, 127, 131, 135, 138, 139, 143, 147, 158, 160, 163, 170, 171, 175, 177, 179, 185, 196, 200, 205, 208, 213, 216, 226, 229, 231, 242, 244, 249, 251, 261, 262, 270, 273, 274, 290, 291, 293, 296, 297, 299, 304, 309, 311, 321, 324, 332, 345, 350, 356, 360, 366, 371, 374, 376, 387, 389, 392, 393, 403, 405, 423, 431, 449, 450, 454, 458, 463, 479, 482, 484, 485, 487, 489, 493, 500, 503, 505, 507, 528, 529, 533, 537, 540, 547, 549, 563, 564, 568, 590, 594, 597

Summary of issues raised:
Don’t know
Comments highlighting this issue:
12, 13, 74, 212, 263, 275, 280, 294, 328, 411, 567

Summary of issues raised:
Stop / limit development – no more development is needed.
Comments highlighting this issue:
18, 20, 27, 30, 62, 70, 81, 134, 139, 175, 210, 223, 242, 257, 290, 318, 359, 378, 386, 393, 395, 397, 442, 474, 521, 538, 548, 590

Summary of issues raised:
Too much development already.
Comments highlighting this issue:
41, 63, 168, 171, 291, 365, 533, 548, 565

Summary of issues raised:
Proposals suggest a need for 30,000 new homes – how has this figure been calculated? How many homes are required according to Government?
Comments highlighting this issue:
419

Summary of issues raised:
There are sites shown that shouldn't be included – should be no development in the Green Belt.
Comments highlighting this issue:
45

Summary of issues raised:
If Green Belt is to be lost at Honey Hill, it should be for housing not waste water treatment works, with the waste water treatment works retained on its existing site.
Comments highlighting this issue:
518

Summary of issues raised:
Too much growth in north Cambridge e.g. Northstowe, Waterbeach
Comments highlighting this issue:
434, 578

Summary of issues raised:
Proposed development and infrastructure in the Local Plan breaches obligations for sustainable development. Embodied carbon emissions are ignored.
Comments highlighting this issue:
439

Summary of issues raised:
Climate change should be considered when deciding on further development.
Comments highlighting this issue:
136, 223, 291, 395

Summary of issues raised:
No development until new water infrastructure built.
Comments highlighting this issue:
141, 436

Summary of issues raised:
No development until increased hospital / health service capacity.
Comments highlighting this issue:
168, 554

Summary of issues raised:
Amount of growth should be determined by water and power availability rather than employment targets.
Comments highlighting this issue:
190

Summary of issues raised:
More small business and office units are needed in villages – planning should allow for businesses to locate close to their employees. Large employment sites create transport problems.

Comments highlighting this issue:
289

Summary of issues raised:
Brownfield sites should be prioritised.
Comments highlighting this issue:
187, 225, 280, 309, 319, 439, 535, 11, 436, 588, 491, 553, 89, 485, 533, 547

Summary of issues raised:
Development should be concentrated in towns / existing population centres.
Comments highlighting this issue:
190, 568, 571

Summary of issues raised:
Legacy villages should be developed as semi-autonomous hubs.
Comments highlighting this issue:
24

Discussion of sites

Summary of issues raised:
S/C/R5 Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot, Ditton Walk – should be changed to mixed use development, with cafe/restaurant to encourage more use of the green space along the river and provide a local meeting point for the new and existing housing in the area.
Comments highlighting this issue:
364

Summary of issues raised:
Newmarket Road / Beehive Centre etc – develop for housing, pubs and other uses.
Comments highlighting this issue:
16, 66, 236

Summary of issues raised:
Grafton Centre – convert back to housing, less demand for retail
Comments highlighting this issue:
66, 101, 283

Summary of issues raised:
Car parks on Riverside, underneath Elizabeth Way Bridge – replace with housing
Comments highlighting this issue:
552

Summary of issues raised:
Orchard Road, off Hinton Way – fenced off site with some dwellings on it, could be used for affordable housing

Comments highlighting this issue:
475

Summary of issues raised:
Rifle range
Comments highlighting this issue:
317

Summary of issues raised:
College grounds / under used college sports grounds
Comments highlighting this issue:
180, 221

Summary of issues raised:
BT building, Long Road
Comments highlighting this issue:
483

Summary of issues raised:
Coldham’s Common
Comments highlighting this issue:
414

Summary of issues raised:
Gog Magog areas
Comments highlighting this issue:
237

Summary of issues raised:
Regenerate areas to increase quality of life
Comments highlighting this issue:
20, 106

Summary of issues raised:
Newnham
Comments highlighting this issue:
71, 277

Summary of issues raised:
Trumpington
Comments highlighting this issue:
237, 277, 281

Summary of issues raised:
Orchard Park
Comments highlighting this issue:
422

Summary of issues raised:
North of Barton Road - South of M11
Comments highlighting this issue:
6

Summary of issues raised:
South of West Cambridge Campus (e.g. Laundry Farm) – good location for mixed use neighbourhood
Comments highlighting this issue:
121

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge airport
Comments highlighting this issue:
146, 438

Summary of issues raised:
New town close to A11/A14 junction
Comments highlighting this issue:
260

Summary of issues raised:
Land between Girton, Arbury and south of A14 (already encircled)
Comments highlighting this issue:
498

Summary of issues raised:
Alongside the A1307 between Huntingdon and Swavesey (as a result of development of A14)
Comments highlighting this issue:
56

Summary of issues raised:
Along the A428
Comments highlighting this issue:
520

Summary of issues raised:
West of Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
276, 286, 531

Summary of issues raised:
St Neots / Cambourne / Northstowe arc needs to be developed as a manufacturing / business area – to balance Cambridge's reliance on biotech industries.
Comments highlighting this issue:
40

Summary of issues raised:
South of Cambridge
Comments highlighting this issue:
247, 286, 434

Summary of issues raised:
Along the A505
Comments highlighting this issue:
120

Summary of issues raised:
Along existing Kings Cross and Liverpool Street railway lines e.g. Meldreth, Ashwell & Morden
Comments highlighting this issue:
72, 104

Summary of issues raised:
Along new railway lines e.g. along East-West Rail from Cambourne to Cambridge Biomedical Campus.
Comments highlighting this issue:
72

Summary of issues raised:
Bassingbourn airfield / barracks
Comments highlighting this issue:
543, 577

Summary of issues raised:
Cambridge Science Park North in Impington
Comments highlighting this issue:
112, 191, 222, 444

Summary of issues raised:
Milton Road, Impington – housing and open space
Comments highlighting this issue:
112

Summary of issues raised:
North of Science Park, in Impington – land owned by Chivers Farms
Comments highlighting this issue:
206

Summary of issues raised:
Land by railway bridge and industrial estate, south of Meldreth. Bridge is unsafe, development could include new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway.
Comments highlighting this issue:
52

Summary of issues raised:
Heydon golf course – could include new homes
Comments highlighting this issue:
52

Summary of issues raised:
Barton
Comments highlighting this issue:
47, 71

Summary of issues raised:
Comberton
Comments highlighting this issue:
490

Summary of issues raised:
Coton
Comments highlighting this issue:
281, 578

Summary of issues raised:
Duxford
Comments highlighting this issue:
120, 461, 598

Summary of issues raised:
Foxton
Comments highlighting this issue:
315, 514

Summary of issues raised:
Fulbourn
Comments highlighting this issue:
290

Summary of issues raised:
Grantchester
Comments highlighting this issue:
277, 281

Summary of issues raised:
Madingley
Comments highlighting this issue:
276, 281

Summary of issues raised:
Melbourn

Comments highlighting this issue:
420

Summary of issues raised:
Meldreth
Comments highlighting this issue:
104, 159

Summary of issues raised:
Milton
Comments highlighting this issue:
383

Summary of issues raised:
Pampisford
Comments highlighting this issue:
461

Summary of issues raised:
Sawston
Comments highlighting this issue:
202, 486, 598

Summary of issues raised:
Shelford
Comments highlighting this issue:
237

Summary of issues raised:
Shepreth
Comments highlighting this issue:
159

Summary of issues raised:
Whittlesford
Comments highlighting this issue:
—

Summary of issues raised:
Some areas suggested outside of Greater Cambridge:

- Ramsey
- March / Chatteris / Wisbech
- To the east in the Fens / closer to Newmarket / around Ely / Littleport
- Further north where they need development e.g. Spalding, Boston
- New town between Huntingdon and Peterborough

- Felixstowe
- South west of the country
  Comments highlighting this issue:
  58, 90, 183, 260, 272, 339, 388, 432, 469

Summary of issues raised:
Revitalise villages by allowing them to take on a small amount of development, rather than focussing all development in Cambridge.
Comments highlighting this issue:
20, 80, 90

Summary of issues raised:
Concentrate development in Cambridge where people can use public transport, walk or cycle.
Comments highlighting this issue:
34, 535

Summary of issues raised:
Fen End Road could be improved.
Comments highlighting this issue:
45

Summary of issues raised:
Re-open old alignment of Fitzroy Street with retail pared back to scale of Mill Road
Comments highlighting this issue:
66

Other comments

Summary of issues raised in comments

There should be no development in Trumpington

Comments highlighting this issue

4

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support for Thakenham proposals not being included in the Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue

376

Summary of issues raised in comments

Agricultural fields should be considered first – used in monoculture for years, so less threats to loss of wildlife.

Comments highlighting this issue

166

Summary of issues raised in comments

Meadows, woodland, hedgerows and ponds should be protected from development.

Comments highlighting this issue

166

Summary of issues raised in comments

Green spaces should be protected from further housing development.

Comments highlighting this issue

168, 223

Summary of issues raised in comments

Office space should be turned into housing.

Comments highlighting this issue

488, 496

Summary of issues raised in comments

Empty shops should be converted to truly affordable housing.

Comments highlighting this issue

382

Summary of issues raised in comments

Reuse existing buildings, rather than build new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue

395

Summary of issues raised in comments

Local Plan should encourage Cambridge businesses to move north where there are empty homes and brownfield sites that could be redeveloped for housing.

Comments highlighting this issue

439

Summary of issues raised in comments

Scrap the unelected Greater Cambridge Partnership.

Comments highlighting this issue

19

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need improved infrastructure e.g. public transport, broadband

Comments highlighting this issue

365, 474

Summary of issues raised in comments

Sawston and Whittlesford need stations. Whittlesford Parkway should be moved to Duxford.

Comments highlighting this issue

203

Summary of issues raised in comments

Neglects strong economic influence of London

Comments highlighting this issue

506

Summary of issues raised in comments

Development needs to be balanced across communities.

Comments highlighting this issue

26, 595

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need a step change in transport infrastructure, that does not rely on cars and buses.

Comments highlighting this issue

142

Summary of issues raised in comments

All sites should be considered if they include co-housing schemes

Comments highlighting this issue

344

Summary of issues raised in comments

All developments should include reasonable percentage of Council housing.

Comments highlighting this issue

386

Summary of issues raised in comments

Large development proposals should not be allowed to bypass local planning and go straight to Government.

Comments highlighting this issue

113

Summary of issues raised in comments

Running the process backwards – you are deciding on sites before finding companies to use them.

Comments highlighting this issue

33

Summary of issues raised in comments

Stop planning, reduce Council Tax and let the market decide.

Comments highlighting this issue

268

Summary of issues raised in comments

Encourage people to downsize to allow existing family homes to become available.

Comments highlighting this issue

20

Summary of issues raised in comments

Develop a net zero approach to built up areas – new areas are allowed, if old areas are returned to green spaces.

Comments highlighting this issue

566

Summary of issues raised in comments

Encouragement of sustainable farming and restoration of peatland.

Comments highlighting this issue

330

Q11. What kinds of home do you think you will need in the next 20 years? Choose as many as you think may apply to you.

Responses	Yes / percentage	No / percentage
11.1 Family Home	325 / 54%	273 / 46%

11.2 Home for one or two people	323 / 54%	275 / 46%
11.3 Student Housing	46 / 8%	552 / 92%
11.4 Co-housing	65 / 11%	533 / 89%
11.5 Sheltered Housing	150 / 25%	448 / 75%
11.6 Retirement Home	205 / 34%	393 / 66*
11.7 Wheelchair adapted home	110 / 18%	488 / 82%
11.8 On a Gypsy or Traveller site	35 / 6%	563 / 94%
11.9 Affordable rent home	155 / 26%	443 / 74%
11.10 Shared ownership home	83 / 14%	515 / 86%
11.11 Market rent home	45 / 8%	553 / 92%
11.12 Market sale home	76 / 13%	522 / 87%

Responses	Yes / percentage	No / percentage
12.1. Energy and water efficiency	510 / 85%	88 / 15%
12.2. Compact development that uses less land	211 / 35%	387 / 65%
12.3. Private gardens	294 / 49%	304 / 51%
12.4. Balconies and shared gardens	146 / 24%	452 / 76%
12.5. Secure cycle parking	305 / 51%	293 / 49%
12.6. Private car parking	185 / 31%	413 / 69%
12.7. Accessibility and adaptability for wheelchair users	182 / 30%	416 / 70%
12.8. Safe streets where children can play outside	383 / 64%	215 / 36%

Q12. What should we prioritise when planning homes for the future? Choose 4 from the following:

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

The broad aims, vision + sites in the Plan is correct/ appreciate its attempt to balance competing impulses

Comments highlighting this issue

16, 85, 196, 245, 249, 270, 497, 503, 581

Summary of issues raised in comments

Wants to see GC as a world leading centre of technical excellence, with homes and environment to match

Comments highlighting this issue

58

Summary of issues raised in comments

Villagers must accept that the villages need to expand and also allow others to move to them without making it so difficult.

Comments highlighting this issue

31

Summary of issues raised in comments

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

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

A densified, compact Cambridge is needed

Comments highlighting this issue

2, 106

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

132, 163 171, 174, 188, 247, 328, 354, 385, 498, 515, 521, 564

Summary of issues raised in comments

New developments need to have character

Comments highlighting this issue

91

Summary of issues raised in comments

Council is destroying Greater Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue

7, 255

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

287

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

309, 479, 522

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

259, 265

Summary of issues raised in comments

The Greater Cambridge area in 2041 should be dynamic and prosperous

Comments highlighting this issue

66

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need to encourage employment opportunities outside of city of Cambridge

Comments highlighting this issue

68

Summary of issues raised in comments

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
- 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
- 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?

Comments highlighting this issue

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

Same as now, but without the unelected Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership

Comments highlighting this issue

19

Summary of issues raised in comments

Local farmland can be used to provide local food for local people.

Comments highlighting this issue

11

Summary of issues raised in comments

A greener and friendlier city - working together well as a community and growing more of their own food with vibrant markets selling them.

Comments highlighting this issue

148

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

95

Summary of issues raised in comments

Embrace Doughnut economic ideas and principles

Comments highlighting this issue

89

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

245

Summary of issues raised in comments

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?

Comments highlighting this issue

27

Summary of issues raised in comments

Services should be spread equally, small villages like Fowlmere are usually forgotten

Comments highlighting this issue

217

Summary of issues raised in comments

Provide new development over infill and there should be no infill of overdeveloped Bourn

Comments highlighting this issue

171

Summary of issues raised in comments

Understand need for affordable houses, but sites need to be chosen which will not exacerbate environmental and infrastructure pressures

Comments highlighting this issue

412

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambridge should be the world leading Environmental, social, and corporate governance city by then

Comments highlighting this issue

483

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

191

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

128

Summary of issues raised in comments

I fully appreciate the inevitability of development and need to reduce personal car use in support of global climate change

Comments highlighting this issue

202

Summary of issues raised in comments

Stop assuming growth should be maximised

Comments highlighting this issue

119

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

41

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

36, 87

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 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?

Comments highlighting this issue

506

Summary of issues raised in comments

No

Comments highlighting this issue

62, 77, 493

Climate Change

Summary of issues raised in comments

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
- 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.
- 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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

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

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

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

Sustainable water supply should be a priority

Comments highlighting this issue

475

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

132

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

447

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

593

Biodiversity and green spaces

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

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

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
- 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
- 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.
- A new country park in Longstanton or Northstowe

Comments highlighting this issue

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

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

Comments highlighting this issue

166

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

593

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

9, 262, 363, 371, 400

Summary of issues raised in comments

A safer/ inclusive area, including:

- Open and visible new streets
- Safer streets where children can play
- Better lighting

New development should be well-maintained

Comments highlighting this issue

106, 202, 251, 354, 466. 468, 497, 510, 529, 540, 582, 490

Summary of issues raised in comments

Healthier communities, comments included:

- Tackling mental and physical health issues. And for health care a more long term and preventative system 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

Comments highlighting this issue

121, 134, 148, 206, 265, 373, 385 398, 407, 421, 439, 468

Summary of issues raised in comments

Another hospital.

Comments highlighting this issue

521

Summary of issues raised in comments

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
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

8, 119, 262, 369, 378, 410, 422, 466, 487, 542, 551, 553, 575, 579

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

48, 52, 81, 239, 246, 408, 410. 413, 466, 514, 516

Summary of issues raised in comments

Sports facilities

Comments highlighting this issue

81, 466

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

148, 151, 169, 339, 509

Summary of issues raised in comments

School improvements, including:

- There should be schools for people of all ages
- There should be more SEN schools

Schools should never be on major roads.

Comments highlighting this issue

135, 361, 490, 511, 548

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

171

Great places

Summary of issues raised in comments

Identity considerations, including:

- Protect old buildings
- Maintaining differentiation between city and villages
- Too much traffic currently in Cambridge, don't spoil it more.
- Maintain the beauty + identity of villages
- No urban sprawl

- Less isolating
- Cambridge should not become a dormitory town for London

Comments highlighting this issue

46, 69, 70, 71, 105, 106, 249, 286, 296, 356, 386, 390, 407, 418, 480, 492, 494, 540, 548, 574

Summary of issues raised in comments

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?

Comments highlighting this issue

171

Jobs

Summary of issues raised in comments

More commercial facilities are needed to improve the lives of citizens, including:

- Pubs
- Shops
- Cafes
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

31, 262, 362, 408, 470, 471, 490, 510, 511, 526, 548, 575, 598

Summary of issues raised in comments

Out of town shopping areas are needed

Comments highlighting this issue

47

Summary of issues raised in comments

More businesses are needed

Comments highlighting this issue

31

Homes

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

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

Affordability suggestions including:

- Affordable housing
- More small homes, closer together
- Homes for essential workers
- Housing needed for biotech industry
- Much lower house prices
- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

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

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

> 289

Summary of issues raised in comments

> Need to ensure that the Local Plan allocates enough houses so that uncontrolled development isn't taking place in unsustainable village locations

Comments highlighting this issue

> 213

Summary of issues raised in comments

Do more to change people owning multiple homes/ stop wealthy landlords owning multiple homes

Comments highlighting this issue

> 64, 210

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

> 45, 49, 106, 283, 286, 334, 337

Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.
- 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
- 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

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

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

- 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
- 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
- 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

- 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

Comments highlighting this issue

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

Forget guided bus, tram and metro schemes as too expensive for returns.

Comments highlighting this issue

263

Summary of issues raised in comments

Congestion charging is not the answer. Congestion occurs mildly at two peak times each weekday.

Comments highlighting this issue

325

Summary of issues raised in comments

Private electric cars are not sustainable transport

Comments highlighting this issue

571

Summary of issues raised in comments

Prioritise train/ light-rail/ tram network and reduce some bus services.

Comments highlighting this issue

265

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 with poor access to Cambridge while the elites can cycle and walk to work.

Comments highlighting this issue

131

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

38, 46, 324, 468, 477, 509, 526, 547, 564, 575, 582

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

72, 87, 112, 215, 243, 306, 554, 577

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambridge has one of the largest proportions of the classic car market (£10bpa) in the UK. By reducing car access and bringing in emission's charges, many small businesses will have to close or move and the £10b will reduce and with it tax.

Comments highlighting this issue

261

Summary of issues raised in comments

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?

Comments highlighting this issue

24

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

171

Summary of issues raised in comments

More affordable parking

Comments highlighting this issue

47, 81

Summary of issues raised in comments

No parking facilities in new development / should be a rare exception on new developments.

Comments highlighting this issue

102, 552

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

533, 538, 597

Other comments

Summary of issues raised in comments

It would be nice if the planners were honest instead of asking for input on a deal, they have already agreed behind closed doors.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 74

Summary of issues raised in comments

Colleges should free up land to sell for building on, so much of their land is unused and central.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 81

Summary of issues raised in comments

Better than Carbon neutral; restoring nature, drawing down Carbon and with a vibrant blooming natural environment.

Comments highlighting this issue

- **89**

Summary of issues raised in comments

Can we honestly say the last local plan is improving Cambridge?

Comments highlighting this issue

- **90**

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 12, 265

Summary of issues raised in comments

Support Policy 23, of the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 12, 265

Summary of issues raised in comments

Cambridge should be cleaner

Comments highlighting this issue

- 323

Summary of issues raised in comments

My home area is green but overrun by those who do not live here to use it for anti-social behaviour

Comments highlighting this issue

- 308

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

- 424

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 60, 100, 146, 150, 385, 395, 438, 461, 518, 594.

Summary of issues raised in comments

Want it to be a place people want to live and will look after.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 133

Summary of issues raised in comments

Copy the Netherlands

Comments highlighting this issue

- 15

Summary of issues raised in comments

As it is now rural and happy.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 30

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 63

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 101

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 190

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 134

Summary of issues raised in comments

Works shall be done to Newmarket Road.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 157

Summary of issues raised in comments

Needs to take account of how things have changed post-Covid and working in coastal towns should be prioritised.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 175

Summary of issues raised in comments

Be bold and use all space, don’t restrict to certain areas.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 204

Summary of issues raised in comments

Avoid Thakeham new town/ Should not be accepted just because they give money to government/ Thakeham tried to bypass democracy

Comments highlighting this issue

- 164, 233, 270, 293, 595

Summary of issues raised in comments

It depends if the railway to the West gets built or not.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 177

Summary of issues raised in comments

It was a bad idea to move the Council offices to Alconbury, as public transport access is terrible.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 113

Summary of issues raised in comments

It should be like it was in 1991 - a nice place to live.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 268

Summary of issues raised in comments

Thankfully I will no longer be here to see my beloved Cambridge transformed into an urban new town.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 273

Summary of issues raised in comments

I should like if there are planning conditions attached to a planning application that these are carried through and checked.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 275

Summary of issues raised in comments

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

Comments highlighting this issue

- 386

Summary of issues raised in comments

Need to advertise Local Plan initiatives

Comments highlighting this issue

- 437

Summary of issues raised in comments

To Question 11, I would like to add: housing that cannot be used as buy-to-let or second homes - must be primary 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 168

Summary of issues raised in comments

No more cheap flights or foreign packaged holidays

Comments highlighting this issue

- **508**

Summary of issues raised in comments

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 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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 441

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 236

Summary of issues raised in comments

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.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 171

Summary of issues raised in comments

Plan is so dependent on EWR, but unclear what will happen with this.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 595

Summary of issues raised in comments

EWR Southern approach should be rejected

Comments highlighting this issue

- **593**

Summary of issues raised in comments

Wording of Plan suggests EWR is approved, but the business case is flawed

Comments highlighting this issue

- 171

Summary of issues raised in comments

Yes, the results of this questionnaire be published.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 482

Summary of issues raised in comments

Change its name, housing already decided.

Comments highlighting this issue

- 409

Errata to Summaries of Representations and Responses – Development Strategy Published October 2022

Key

- Text to add is formatted in **bold underlined.**

.

Page 39

Add additional row to the table:

Summary of issues raised in comments

The emerging Local Plan needs to consider updated evidence and to subsequently increase the employment supply across Greater Cambridge by allocating additional storage and distribution employment land of between 55.0 ha and 71.5 ha which is suitable, available and deliverable across the Plan period to 2041.

Comments highlighting this issue

59045 (Lolworth Development Limited)*

Page 62 (under policy S/JH)

Add additional row to table: Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments

Land at Slate Hall Farm, Bar Hill (J25 Bar Hill site) (HELAA site 40248)

Comments highlighting this issue

59034 (Lolworth Development Limited)

Page 159 (under policy S/DS)

Amend the following to read:

Summary of issues raised in comments

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
- Policy S/DS should support further development in this location.

Comments highlighting this issue

59053 (Lolworth Developments Limited)

Appendix F: Responses to First Proposals Representations

Overview and Summary of Representations Received at the First Proposals Stage

The First Proposals continued the development of the seven themes and developed more specific policies under each theme. The First Proposals presented the seven themes in a theme tree with climate change, wellbeing & social inclusion, biodiversity and green spaces, and great places coming out of the foundations and roots of homes, jobs and infrastructure. It is proposed to carry the theme tree through this

draft stage of consultation as the overarching themes remain the focus of the plan policies, and the tree is a main element of the storytelling for communications and engagement with residents and stakeholders.

These seven themes were:

- Development and Strategy
- Climate Change
- Biodiversity and Green Spaces
- Wellbeing and Social Inclusion
- Great Places
- Jobs
- Homes
- Infrastructure

The below sets out a summary of the representations received and the councils' responses to the representations for each policy chapter to provide an overview. For more detailed representations and responses on individual sites and policies, see appendices of this report.

The policies that have been introduced as new at the Draft Local Plan stage, and therefore do not have representations as these policies have not previously been consulted on are:

- Monitoring
- Specialist accommodation for looked after children
- Specialist accommodation for students
- Other caravan dwellers

Development Strategy

The development strategy covers the following topics and policies:

- Plan vision and strategic priorities
- Policy S/JH: New jobs and homes
- Policy S/DS: Development strategy
- Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy
- Policy S/DE: Defined development extents
- Policy SS/GB: The Cambridge Green Belt
- Policy S/MO: Monitoring
- Strategic policies for the purposes of Neighbourhood Planning

S/DS: Development Strategy

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.

Plan Vision and Strategic Priorities

Summary of Responses:

Broad support for the vision and aims was expressed within the representations. Specific elements praised by respondents include the aspiration to locate development in the most environmentally friendly locations, the prioritisation of climate mitigation and adaption, the vision for villages and significance placed upon infrastructure and water. Respondents suggested improvements to the vision such as including references to Cambridge as a centre of educational excellence, tightening up language to avoid ambiguity and placing greater emphasis upon landscape, heritage, and nature.

Criticisms of the vision included a perception that it was too Cambridge-centric and rural settlements needed to be included. Other respondents were concerned that the level of development in the Plan could undermine environmental goals. One respondent noted that a greater emphasis on placemaking was needed, and several argued that the Plan would not sufficiently address inequality. Other issues which respondents felt should gain prominence include water efficiency, the issue of the water supply, sustainable transportation. Cambridgeshire County Council also noted that it may be difficult to achieve the required significant infrastructure in a sustainable way. Other public bodies stressed how the Plan needs to protect sports facilities, promote healthier lifestyles, and safeguard biodiversity. Some developers

stressed the importance of using the Plan to deliver ambitious housing targets, but also noted that the environmental aims of the plan should not have a detrimental impact upon the other elements of delivering sustainable development.

Councils' Response

Broad support for the Vision and Aims is noted.

Suggested improvements to the Vision and Aims have been taken into consideration. As a result, amendments have been made, including additional references to education, reducing environmental impacts, and safeguarding locally distinctive heritage and landscapes.

Concerns regarding potential impacts arising from the Vision and Aims have also been considered. Amendments have been made to address these concerns, including a greater emphasis on reducing environmental impacts and improving equality of access and opportunities for people.

Some representations suggested that the Vision and Aims should give greater prominence to certain issues. However, the issues raised are already addressed within the Vision and Aims (now strategic priorities), and no further changes are considered necessary.

Public bodies have commented that the Plan needs to do more to protect sports facilities, promote healthier lifestyles, and safeguard biodiversity. These issues are already addressed in other the policies of the Plan.

Some developers stressed the importance of delivering ambitious housing targets. This point is noted, and the issues raised are already addressed in the Development Strategy; no further changes are necessary.

S/JH: New Jobs and Homes

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 Covid19 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, COVID19 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.

Policy S/JH New Jobs and Homes also covers a range of issues including:

- Jobs and Homes
- Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
- Residential moorings for boat dwellers
- Other caravan dwellers
- Specialist accommodation for looked after children
- Specialist accommodation for older people and disabled people
- Specialist accommodation for students
- Housing requirements for Neighbourhood Areas

This section provides a summary of the responses received on these issues.

Jobs and Homes

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals responses:

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 of 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 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 pandemic and higher levels of homeworking. Reference was also made to the importance of taking account of the 2021 Census.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

In relation to identifying needs, there were suggestions that the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople should be identified by following the London Gypsies & Travellers 'Best practice for assessing the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers' and based on genuine consultation with the communities affected.

Residential moorings for boat dwellers

The issue of need for residential moorings was not covered in the First Proposals version of the Local Plan, and therefore there are no representations on this issue. Representations on the proposed policy for residential moorings (Policy H/RM) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).

Other caravan dwellers

The issue of need for residential caravan sites was not covered in the First Proposals version of the Local Plan, and therefore there are no representations on this issue. Representations on the proposed policy for residential caravan sites (Policy H/RC) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).

Specialist accommodation for older people and disabled people

Comments from developers that the plan fails to respond to NPPF as does not set a target for specialist housing for older people to be met within the plan period, and also does not identify how this need will be met. Suggestions that consideration should be given to allocating sites in sustainable locations, and that the proposed allocations will not deliver the types of housing required to meet the needs of specialist groups. Representations on the proposed policy for specialist housing (Policy H/SH) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).

Housing requirements for Neighbourhood Areas

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. Comments suggested that the proposed approach to Neighbourhood Plan housing targets does not comply with the NPPF.

Response to issues raised in representations

Jobs and Homes

The EHEU 2025 provides an up to date robust evidence base informing the identification of objectively assessed needs for the most likely forecast for jobs and the homes figure that would support this. Consideration of the most likely jobs forecast included review of latest historic employment data both from ONS and Centre for Business Research, as well as an in depth look at Greater Cambridge's key sectors, including stakeholder engagement, as reported in the Growth Sector and Industrial and Warehousing studies. The EHEU 2025 gives careful consideration of the data which now presents a clear understanding of the impact of and bounce-back from COVID, and accounts for Census 2021 data where it is considered to be

robust. Identification of the most likely jobs forecast in the report is informed by consideration of growth rates across the local sectors, and is considered to be robust. It relies on much of the future period seeing strong growth of around 4,000 additional jobs per annum or more, but also builds in an assumption that there will be slower or contracting periods and unforeseen shocks, which is likely in most economies.

Identification of the jobs supported by Standard Method, and the homes required by the most likely jobs forecast, is completed using an approach that is consistent with that taken in the ELEDS 2020 and EHEU 2023, using assumptions accounting for the latest and most robust datasets.

Consideration of the impacts of the area's objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs, and the plan as a whole on climate, water supply and quality, and infrastructure, is included in relation to Policy S/DS, as informed by relevant evidence bases.

The objectively assessed housing need figure forms a starting point for the plan and is used as a minimum to be provided for. Policy S/DS identifies the amount of homes being planned for which substantively exceeds this figure.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

There were suggestions that the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople should be identified by following the London Gypsies & Travellers 'Best practice for assessing the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers' and based on genuine consultation with the communities affected. The Accommodation Needs Assessment (ANA) undertaken by Arc4 (on behalf of the Councils) has been prepared: taking account of national guidance set out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and draft guidance on the review of housing needs for caravan dwellers, using methods established by Arc4 in the preparation of previous accommodation needs assessments, and reflecting practical experience that Arc4 have gained through planning decisions and appeals. The ANA calculates Gypsy and Traveller pitch and Travelling Showpeople plot requirements in Greater Cambridge, based on a review of existing data and by undertaking household surveys with residents or owners of existing pitches and plots.

Residential moorings for boat dwellers

The issue of need for residential moorings was not covered in the First Proposals version of the Local Plan, and therefore there are no representations on this issue. Responses to the representations on the proposed policy for residential moorings (Policy H/RM) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).

Other caravan dwellers

The issue of need for residential caravan sites was not covered in the First Proposals version of the Local Plan, and therefore there are no representations on this issue. Responses to the representations on the proposed policy for residential caravan sites (Policy H/RC) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).

Specialist accommodation for older people and disabled people

There were suggestions that the Local Plan fails to respond to the NPPF as it does not set a target for specialist housing for older people to be met within the plan period, and also does not identify how this need will be met. The Housing Needs of Specific Groups Update for Greater Cambridge (2025) identifies the needs for different forms of specialist accommodation for older people and disabled people within the plan period, and these needs are set out within Policy S/JH: New jobs and homes. An explanation as to how these needs will be met is set out in within Policy S/DS: Development Strategy, but it is anticipated that a mix of types, tenures and sizes of homes or bedspaces for older people and disabled people will be delivered on the strategic sites allocations and through windfall developments that come forwards in accordance with the specific policy for specialist housing (Policy H/SH) and the suite of policies that allow for windfall residential developments within Cambridge, and our towns and villages.

Specialist accommodation for students

The issue of need for student accommodation was not covered in the First Proposals version of the Local Plan, and therefore there are no representations on this issue. Responses to the representations on the proposed policy for student accommodation (Policy H/SA) are included in the Homes Topic Paper (2025).

Housing requirements for Neighbourhood Areas

National planning policy requires Local Plans to include housing requirements for designated neighbourhood areas within their strategic policies, and outlines that the requirement should reflect the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of

development and any relevant allocations. Policy S/JH therefore includes housing requirements for the designated neighbourhood areas within Greater Cambridge, with the individual housing requirements calculated taking account of the overall housing requirement, the development strategy, existing supply and the proposed additional allocations, and the population of the neighbourhood area.

National Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that where a Local Plan sets out a housing requirement for a designated neighbourhood area, that this requirement is not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.

Therefore, the inclusion within the Local Plan of specific housing requirements for designated neighbourhood areas does not mean that these designated neighbourhood areas are required to consider housing needs or allocate sites to accommodate the housing requirement. Any made (adopted) Neighbourhood Plans do not automatically need to be reviewed to take account of the identified housing requirement.

As part of the evidence base to support a Neighbourhood Plan, neighbourhood planning bodies may commission additional housing needs evidence to understand their particular needs, including for affordable housing, homes for older people, or housing mix.

Climate Change

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the climate change theme:

There was strong support for the general direction of the climate change policies in representations submitted from individuals, parish councils and developers. Some representations asked the councils to ensure that new housing will use up-to-date heating technology and the representations emphasised the need to constantly review the policy in the context of new technologies and government targets. Some respondents felt that the First Proposals omitted important things, such as a retrofitting policy and the provision of gardens or allotments which could store carbon. Several representations also objected to policies on the grounds that the level of development in the Local Plan would exacerbate pre-existing water issues, thereby negating the climate change policies. Other representations, including one by the Cambridge Doughnut Economic Action Group also objected, arguing that growth and sustainability are incompatible. Some developers and landowners supported the policies and often explained how their site could fulfil these policies. Other developers, such as Southern and Regional Developments Ltd, objected to the policies because they thought that the proposed standards were too high which would make the policies undeliverable.

Strong support for this overarching theme and that the location and design of development will play a key part in the transition to net zero carbon. However, given the climate crisis some representations question whether the policies go far enough, whether they will be successfully implemented in new developments, and the need for retrofit in existing properties.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters include:

- The Councils will operate proactively on the matters of water supply and water efficiency in new developments. Policies are proposed which will seek high levels of water efficiency.
- Acknowledging that best practice standards can change over the lifetime of the Local Plan policies will be drafted to ensure that innovative solutions are not unduly disregarded.
- An integrated approach to renewable and low-carbon energy infrastructure will be needed if it is to operate effectively in our homes and places of work
- The role of green infrastructure and new habitats in new developments can make important contributions to carbon sequestration, and this is addressed by proposed policies.
- In a number of cases the policies proposed in the plan do go above typical standards, but they respond to our evidence of what is needed to respond to climate change in Greater Cambridge. They have been tested through evidence and are considered to be viable.

The following proposed policies areas are addressed in this topic paper:

- CC/SD: Sustainable development and the climate emergency
- CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate
- CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings
- CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments
- CC/IW: Integrated water management, sustainable drainage and water quality
- CC/FM: Flood risk management
- CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure
- CC/CE: Supporting a circular economy and sustainable resource use
- CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration and carbon sinks
- Policy CC/SD: Sustainable Development and the Climate Emergency

CC/SD: Sustainable development and the climate emergency

.1 Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

.2 During the First Proposals consultation, general comments in relation to the Climate Change Chapter requested the Local Plan's climate change vision to advocate a more holistic approach to carbon offsetting (Marshall Group Properties) and sustainable development through considerations of the natural environment (Natural England). Comments also suggested that policies in the Climate Change Chapter needed to clarify what details applicants would be

expected to submit for Local Plan policies to be effective. There were requests for clarity on how information will be secured in terms of design-led solutions and the limits set within the policy were received in relation to Policy CC/DC. Also, for policy to clarify how applicants should demonstrate water efficiency were received in relation to Policy CC/WE. Requests for the Local Plan to incorporate a more holistic approach to securing multi-functional benefits for climate change, flood management, water resources and water quality through the protection and enhancement of the natural environment were received in relation to Policy CC/FM.

.3 Response to the main issues raised in representations

.4 The councils acknowledge that sustainable development is multifaceted and involves various aspects of the built and natural environment. To integrate a more holistic approach to sustainable development within the Local Plan, Policy CC/SD has been drafted to guide the way in which applicants should present how their proposal will deliver places that are adapted to and mitigate the effects of climate change. This approach to Sustainability Statements is a progression of Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and Policy CC/1 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

.5 The councils also acknowledge that some solutions can entail a variety of environmental benefits and that these interconnected solutions need to be explored thoroughly when designing places. Therefore, Local Plan policies have been drafted in such a way that solutions with the capacity to deliver interrelated benefits are explicitly supported (e.g. SuDS and their potential to facilitate a combination of flood risk improvements, water quality improvements, biodiversity enhancements and amenity uplifts). Determining an appropriate design-led solution to climate change mitigation and adaptation will need to be conducted on a case-by-case basis, accounting for the various development opportunities and constraints. Policy CC/SD has been drafted to ensure that applicants will provide details of the sustainability benefits their proposals will bring and justification for the approaches to design and construction being proposed.

.6 International Leadership and Collaboration

.7 With the support of the regional Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Climate Action Plan (2022–2025), this reaffirms the UK's climate leadership role through the UNFCCC climate agenda and associated commitments made at the 2024 UN General Assembly. This includes contributing to global climate finance goals and addressing climate-driven international risks, such as conflict and

displacement. These commitments reinforce the importance of domestic policy alignment with global climate action.

Policy CC/DC: Designing for a Changing Climate

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Support for the policy was expressed within representations from a variety of respondents; several proposed additional elements to include in the policy such as site-wide adaptive measures, green walls and sustainable drainage systems. Other respondents, such as Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, questioned the applicability of some of the policy's technical stipulations which could require rephrasing elements of the policy's wording. Respondents also disagreed about the scope of the policy. Some, such as the Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group, thought it should go further and provide targets for developers to meet. Contrastingly, some respondents, including the Home Builders Federation, felt that the councils had not adequately considered how the policy would affect the viability of housebuilding. Several respondents, such as Countryside Properties, also asserted that this was not a matter for planning but should be left to Building Regulations.

Response to the main issues raised in representations

At the time of writing, Paragraph 1A of Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states, '[development] plan documents must (taken as a whole) include policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change'. The introduction of this paragraph was made by Section 182 of the Planning Act (2008). Moreover, Paragraph 164 of the NPPF (December 2024) states that new development should be planned for in ways that 'avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change' and 'help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions'. Therefore, opting to remove this policy on climate change adaption and relying solely on Building Regulations would conflict with both national policy requirements and the Local Planning Authority's legal duty.

The councils acknowledge comments in relation to the various design solutions that could be integrated or encouraged as part of development to ensure it is resilient to the impacts of climate change. Policy CC/DC now requires applicants to consider a series of placemaking measures that can help to make a development resilient to climate change, as well as highlighting the linkages with other policies in the Local Plan. Policy CC/SD has also been drafted, requiring applicants to demonstrate the sustainable design solutions integrated as part of the proposal.

The councils acknowledge comments regarding the need for policies on sustainable development to be applicable to all types of development, where reasonable and necessary. The policy direction to Policy CC/DC has been clarified to ensure that climate resilience is also an explicit consideration for commercial, infrastructural and mixed-use developments, as well as residential proposals. The preferred policy approach has also sought to simplify the design and overheating priority order, with the policy's supporting text providing clarification on how the cooling hierarchy should be followed. Absolute targets and standards for the adaptability of new buildings was considered by the councils during the drafting of the policy, but it was considered that this would be better navigated using the UK Net Zero Carbon Buildings Standard, which includes standards for climate adaptability.

It is acknowledged that planning policies on sustainable development should also consider the sustainability benefits that can be delivered as part of change of use proposals or refurbishment projects that require planning permission. In ensuring that existing buildings can be considered, Policy CC/SD has also included projects involving existing buildings within the scope for Sustainability Statement requirements.

Policy CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

The general thrust of the policy received a significant level of support from parish councils, organisations such as Carbon Neutral Cambridge, CPPF and the Wildlife Trusts, members of the public and some of the area's developers and landowners including the University of Cambridge and the Marshalls Group. There were calls for specific targets to be set around embodied carbon associated with demolition and remediation of sites.

A number of organisations, including the University of Cambridge, while supportive of the policy, felt there is a need for some flexibility in the application of specific targets, to take account of different building types where a more nuanced approach may be needed, for example R&D buildings.

Those objecting to the policy, primarily developers and the Home Builders Federation, were concerned that the delivery of net zero carbon policy is not a matter for planning but should be left to Building Regulations and the emerging Future Homes Standard. They raised concerns around the technical feasibility of the policy, impact on viability and implementation of the policy. The issue of policy implementation was also raised by some Parish Councils. It was also argued by developers that policy should only consider regulated energy and not unregulated

energy (energy used by plugged-in appliances) as these are outside of the control of developers. Many considered that the delivery of net zero carbon was best left for national standards and that the role of the decarbonisation of the grid also needed to be recognised. Concerns were also raised that the policy referenced no new gas connections.

Some raised concerns that the policy does not contain targets for existing buildings and did not recognise the importance of reusing rather than demolishing existing buildings. There were requests for the policy to more explicitly include refurbishments/reuse of existing floorspace within its scope and to factor material circularity.

Response to main issues raised in representations

With regards to the calls to set specific targets for embodied carbon, while there are a number of 'best practice' approaches to embodied carbon, including the RICS Whole Life Carbon Assessment, the pilot UK Net Zero Carbon Buildings Standard, and the LETI and RIBA 2030 targets for embodied carbon, there are no nationally defined 'targets' for reducing the embodied carbon associated with constructing new developments. A further challenge faced by industry is a lack of consistent measurement, leading to mis-aligned benchmarks, project targets and claims. Targets set via planning policy will only be useful once measurement is consistent. However, there is a consensus best practice accepted approach to assessing whole life carbon including embodied carbon: the RICS Whole Life Carbon Assessment (WLCA). RICS WLCA expresses how to implement the relevant British Standard (EN15978). RICS WLCA splits up the whole life carbon into 'modules' from A0 to C4. The 'A' modules are upfront embodied carbon (up to completion of the building), 'B' modules are in-use, and 'C' modules are end of life. Recommended best practice targets to be achieved in the 'A'-modules have been proposed within the newly released UK Net Zero Carbon Buildings Standard (developed by a coalition of effectively all the relevant standard-setting bodies in the UK built environment industry, released in pilot form in Autumn 2024). These UKNZCBS targets are available for new build and retrofit, for a wide range of building types. The UKNZCBS pilot states intent to also provide equivalent targets for life-cycle embodied carbon (which would include all modules from A to C except the parts of the B-modules that relate to operational energy and water use).

In relation to objections that the setting of targets related to net zero carbon should be left to Building Regulations, the Planning and Energy Act enables LPA's to set targets in advance of Building Regulations. The 2023 WMS does not rule out local planning authorities being able to set local energy efficiency targets that go beyond current or future Building Regulations but notes that to be found sound these must have a well-reasoned and robustly costed rationale, as detailed above. And while the WMS does suggest that metrics should be expressed as a percentage uplift on Target Emission Rate (TER), legal advice procured by Essex County Council and

Etude notes that while the WMS is policy guidance to which regard must be had, deviation from its guidance can be justified as long as there is clear evidence which provides the reason for doing so, and which demonstrates the viability of policies. The Council's net zero carbon evidence base provides evidence to demonstrate that achievement of the policy requirements is both technically feasible and viable. Furthermore, similar energy metric based policies have been considered at examination and found sound, most recently in the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Development Plan document.

With regards to the need to consider the decarbonisation of the grid, this has been considered in the development of the policy. It was deemed necessary for new developments to contribute to total energy use due to the significant expansion of renewable energy that will be required nationally to support grid decarbonisation. Reliance on the Future Homes Standard would only require new homes to be 'zero carbon ready', leaving further carbon reduction to achieve net zero carbon to home owners and the decarbonisation of the grid, further adding to the retrofit burden and the 28 million homes in the UK already needing retrofit to achieve net zero carbon by 2050. Such an approach would also exceed the housing sector carbon budget for Greater Cambridge, required to ensure that the area plays its fair share in achieving the legislated national carbon budgets. Work is currently underway to develop a Local Area Energy Plan for Cambridgeshire, which will consider the infrastructure required to achieve net zero carbon by 2050 and the costs of this infrastructure. This will help to set out the scale of the challenge in meeting net zero carbon and the importance of ensuring that all of the energy requirements of new development are kept at an absolute minimum. A report carried out by the Aldersgate Group has already highlighted that that without significant investment, the UK's electricity grid will become significantly constrained from 2030 as the economy electrifies. While the Aldersgate report is focussed on industrial electrification, it highlights the need to ensure that new development utilises new energy metrics to deliver low energy buildings, helping to reduce peak demands on the grid.

While the Objections related to the need for targets to be set for existing buildings are noted, policy in the local plan is focused on new development, with many of the areas required to retrofit or refurbish existing homes being covered by permitted development rights. Planning can also only be concerned with the proposals for which planning permission are sought, so for example, if planning permission for an extension is sought, it is not possible to use planning conditions to require improvements to be made to the rest of the property in order for a net zero carbon target to be achieved. The UK Net Zero Carbon Buildings Standard does include energy use intensity targets for retrofits, becoming more challenging over time, the use of which could be encouraged via local plan policy. But the standard does not

yet include space heating demand targets for retrofit, which are to be added over time as the standard develops beyond the initial pilot phase. As such the setting of specific targets for retrofit would be a complex task requiring significant modelling of different housing architypes to determine what could be considered technically feasible and viable targets to reflect the variety of typologies of existing buildings. A better solution would be for Building Regulations to be updated to require Consequential Improvements for the existing building stock given that most retrofit measures are covered by Building Regulations requirements. The issue of the need to promote the adaptive reuse instead of the demolition of existing buildings has been incorporated into policy CC/CE (Supporting a Circular Economy and Sustainable Resource Use).

With regards to representations suggesting that the space heating demand should be amended to 15 kWh per m^2 instead of 15-20, the levels set in the policy is in line with the recommendations of the Committee on Climate Change. In addition, it allows for some flexibility for those house types where achievement of a strict space heating demand of 15 kWh per m2 could be more challenging, for example bungalows and detached dwellings.

Some representations called for flexibility in the application of targets for specific building types, notably research and development buildings. It was decided that all non-residential building types (except schools) should align with the UKNZCBS 2030 EUI targets. Current Greater Cambridge policy already includes a “where feasible” clause for non-residential targets (excluding schools). It has also been suggested that a “where viable” clause should be added in as a further caveat, to account for the fact that there is limited evidence to demonstrate whether there will be a cost uplift to meet these targets that could impact viability. Reference to viability has now been added to the policy wording, alongside the existing reference to technical viability.

Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was strong support for the policy direction from a range of public bodies and individuals. Many representations expressed concern about the level of water stress in the area and damage to chalk streams and stated that there should be a limit on growth if there is insufficient water or until further water supply is available. The Environment Agency and Natural England identified that the Water Cycle Strategy will need to demonstrate how water to meet growth needs will be supplied sustainably. Other comments related to the need for collaborative working, and that

there will be more detail about this future supply in the Water Resources Management Plans being produced by the water companies.

There was support for the proposal to require high water efficiency standards, noting the potential of rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling to achieve these. However, there were also representations from developers saying that 80 litres per person per day is unrealistic and would have an impact on the viability of developments, and that the Building Regulations level of 110 litres should be used. Some representations from developers and landowners highlighted some of the potential problems with rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling such as maintenance issues, where there is limited roof collection (such as flats) and that rainwater is limited in this part of the country. There were some suggestions on the policy wording. For example, whether the standard would apply to all sizes of developments, if BREEAM is the right tool to use for non-housing developments and is the term “unless demonstrated impracticable” too weak, giving developers a let-out. The Environment Agency stated that to ensure the policy is effective, further guidance would be needed regarding the evidence applicants would be expected to submit to demonstrate that this standard has been achieved and how this would be monitored.

Response to main issues raised in representations

Support for the policy direction was noted. There were concerns about growth and the impact it is having on the environment. Housing and employment growth targets are based on the standard method, as set out as a requirement by Chapter 5 of the NPPF (December 2024). The councils acknowledge that significant growth in the area raises serious considerations with regards to sustainable water supply and water infrastructure. The councils agree that partnership working with Government bodies, local water authorities and landowners will be integral in ensuring sustainable water supply for both existing and future communities. This issue and how it is being addressed in the overall Local Plan strategy is addressed in the Strategy Topic Paper.

The standards proposed are achievable and viable. The approach reflects evidence that the cost effectiveness of such measures can improve with the scale of the project. This cost effectiveness of community scale measures, particularly for rainwater harvesting, was also shown in the CIWEM’s ‘Water Reuse in New Housing’ report. As a result the policy includes a more stringent water efficiency level for larger developments where community scale measures for water recycling could be implemented in addition to water efficient fixtures and fittings.

Cost of implementing the propose standard has been accounted for the in Local Plan Viability Assessment.

BREEAM is an industry standard certification scheme to assess the environmental performance of buildings. This standard is in the current adopted Local Plan policies and has been practical to use and it is also used in the Shared Standards. As such it seems an appropriate tool. The wording 'unless demonstrated impracticable' allows for some flexibility depending upon the exact circumstances, but the onus is on the developer to demonstrate within the Sustainability Statement the reasons why the full BREEAM credits required in the policy would not be achievable.

It is agreed that the Local Plan should be clear as to how the Councils wish to see water efficiency details presented as part of a planning application. The policy is clear that details about how the water efficiency levels have been achieved should be submitted as part of a Sustainability Statement.

Policy CC/IW: Integrated Water Management, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy. Several respondents, including Cambridgeshire County Council and the Environment Agency, showed support for managing water on site at source. There was also support for incorporating brown/green roofs where practical, use of permeable surfaces and use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) as ways to reduce flooding in new development. Many comments highlighted the impacts of climate change and the effects on weather and flooding and that this would need to be considered. There were comments from Anglian Water on the benefits of sustainable drainage systems for improving water quality and reducing the amount of water entering the wastewater system. Organisations including Historic England argued that the policy needed to ensure that the design of SuDS would not harm other aspects of the built or natural environment. Wates Development argued that sites of all scales and not just large sites can adopt ambitious water use targets and implement water recycling systems. Anglian Water requested that the policy recognise the capability for pollution control to be introduced as part of SuDS systems.

Response to main issues raised in representations

The Councils acknowledge that best-practice guidance and standards for all aspects of development can change over the duration of a plan period. Therefore, the Local Plan policies will be drafted to ensure that innovative solutions to contemporary problems, including sustainable drainage and water quality control, are not unduly disregarded by the planning system. The matters of flood risk management and Integrated Water Management systems have been separated into two policies: Policy CC/IWM and Policy CC/FM. This approach has been adopted to allow the councils to more clearly establish their support for measures designed to enhance water quality, mitigate against water pollution, and introduce natural forms of drainage. Requirements in relation to site-wide considerations of IWM systems and surface-water drainage strategies have been included. In addition, provisions have been included in relation to the long-term management and maintenance of surface-water drainage infrastructure.

Comments made by individuals highlighted that drainage requirements should account for the impermeable clay ground in Cambridgeshire and ensure that drainage requirements do not rely solely on ground infiltration. The policy recognises the various ways that surface-water flooding can be sustainably drained, adhering to national guidance and former approaches to surface-water drainage. Reference has also been made to supplementary planning guidance prepared by the LLFA, which provides applicants with additional technical guidance on alternative drainage solutions that can be used where infiltration to the ground may be unfeasible due to a site's geology or topography.

The policy has also been constructed to include references to allowances for climate change; references to the drainage priority order and the addition of grey water recycling systems; inclusion of provisions on pollution control; and inclusion of provisions regarding the long-term management of the drainage and pollution control infrastructure.

Below-ground heritage assets are protected by both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Paragraphs 207 and 213) and the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and Policy GP/AR:Archaeology of the draft Local Plan. Therefore, it was not considered necessary to repeat this within this policy.

Policy CC/FM: Flood Risk Management

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Consultees expressed support for policy requirements in relation to flood risk management. Various Parish Councils requested that the policy should include provisions for the delivery and long-term management of flood defences, and that these details should be agreed prior to the occupation of development. The Cam Valley Forum proposed including areas for storage of flood waters. Cambridgeshire County Council requested that Local Plan policies relating to flood risk and drainage accounted for the impact of climate change and requested that the Local Plan acknowledged the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2016).

Individual respondents commented that efforts to manage flood risk and integrate drainage strategies should be wary not to cause any harm to the integrity of aquatic ecosystems or cause damage to water bodies up or downstream of a development. The Environment Agency thought that the scope of the policy needed to be widened to reduce flood risk in a more holistic manner including securing both mitigation and betterment through growth. The Environment Agency also highlighted that the Local Plan should be supported by robust evidence, including a Water Cycle Study, a more obviously demonstrated sequential test and a Level 2 SFRA.

Response to issues raised in representations

Policy CC/FM has been prepared to outline how flood risk and flood risk management will be considered when determining planning applications for new development, adding evidence-based local requirements to extant national planning policy requirements related to flooding. Policy CC/FM highlights that development proposals will be supported where development will not pose an undue risk to both the forthcoming development and communities elsewhere (both within Greater Cambridge and beyond), having regard to flood risk predictions that factor climate change. To assist applicants with the preparation of flood risk assessments and arrangements regarding flood defences and flood mitigation strategies, references to the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2016) or successor documents adopted by the Lead Local Flood Authority have been included within the supporting text of the policy.

The Councils appreciate that flood mitigation measures and new development should not worsen issues up or downstream from a development site. Flood management requirements will be read alongside the Local Plan's requirements for integrated water management systems, which actively seek to ensure that solutions that introduce a range of integrated water management benefits (e.g. biodiversity improvements, water quality improvements using natural drainage systems, and efficient water reuse systems, alongside flood risk management) are taken, wherever possible.

The Councils have sought to ensure that the Local Plan is based upon a robust evidence base. A Level 1 and Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) have been prepared, which identifies areas in Greater Cambridge that are at risk of flooding from all sources and looks at the anticipated impact of climate change. In line with comments received from the Environment Agency, a separate stand-alone Sequential Test report has been produced to show the Council's process in the selection of sites for allocation for development by following a sequential approach and avoiding high risk areas using the information in the SFRAs.

Policy CC/RE: Renewable and Energy Projects and Infrastructure

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy. There were several suggestions to improve the policy, including: more explicit support for the delivery of an accessible anaerobic digestion plant; clearer requirements for the incorporation of community power projects into new settlements; and support for the installation of solar panels onto the roof of houses.

Some respondents argued that the policy needed to emphasise a holistic, district-wide strategy to renewable energy production, whereas others focussed upon how individual buildings could contribute. One respondent questioned whether the electric cables in South Cambridgeshire's villages have capacity to support electric cars or heat pumps. A range of respondents suggested that the policy should set out clearer criteria around the potential impact of developments on the character of the surrounding landscape, biodiversity, and the historic environment. Some suggested that the policy should explicitly restrict development that would interfere with military aviation activities. Several respondents, including the Campaign to Protect Rural England, objected to the policy on the grounds that it would not halt the removal of farmland.

Response to issues raised in representations

The councils recognise that an integrated approach to renewable and low-carbon energy infrastructure will be needed if it is to operate effectively in our homes and

places of work. While policy CC/RE forms part of this integrated approach, work has recently started on a Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan, which will consider the infrastructure needed to support the delivery of net zero carbon across the county. As part of this work, consideration will be given to the decarbonisation of heating systems and transport alongside an uplift in renewable energy generation. The work will also provide information in relation to the costs of such infrastructure and will enable the development of business plans to help deliver that infrastructure. Policy CC/RE will provide policy support for the introduction of low-carbon energy generation and energy infrastructure, which will function alongside other local planning policy requirements regarding the assessment of grid capacity and the introduction of ancillary systems, such as battery storage systems, that will facilitate an integrated approach to renewable energy delivery in Greater Cambridge (e.g. Policy I/EI).

In response to those respondents who objected to the loss of farmland as a result of renewable energy projects, in particular solar farms, the councils agree that the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land should be avoided. This has therefore been reflected in the criteria-based approach in this policy, as well as a stipulation that proposals should also include plans for their end-of-life treatment, including the decommissioning of any infrastructure and measures to return the site to its former condition. Policy CC/RE will also be read alongside Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land, which generally guards against the irreversible loss of Grades 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land. It is important to note that many renewable energy projects can be designed and delivered to support the continued use of agricultural land in tandem with new infrastructure, for example land around solar panels can be used for livestock, and wind turbines are usually spaced to the extent that crops can continue to be farmed.

In response to feedback, the policy has also been designed to encompass criteria relating to a wider range of impacts arising from renewable energy projects, following the hierarchy of avoidance and then minimisation and/or mitigation of impacts. In response to the representations, specific criteria have been added to address concerns around biodiversity, impacts on heritage assets, including their setting, and the safe operation of aviation. In relation to landscape impacts, specific reference has also been made to part 2 of the Greater Cambridge Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (2021), which provides a clear framework to support applicants in understanding the suitability of their site for renewable energy development in landscape terms. Additionally, policy wording has also been introduced to ensure that, where cross-boundary impacts could arise from the proposed development, decisions will be considerate of neighbouring local authority requirements.

Policy CC/CE: Supporting a Circular Economy and Sustainable Resource Use

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy. Respondents, such as Cambridgeshire County Council, included suggestions to make the policy more legible to members of the public. Some organisations, including Croydon PC, suggested ideas to improve the policy, such as ensuring that new settlements have community bins similar to ones implemented in Eddington. Respondents differed in their reactions to the scope of the policy; the Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group for example, argued that targets were needed to ensure developers deliver the policy. Contrastingly, some respondents, such as the Metro Property Unit Trust, sought to narrow the policy's scope, suggesting that the policy should only be applied to major developments. The Home Builders Federation asserted that these requirements should be dealt with via national regulation as opposed to local planning policy. Some developers, such as Martin Grant Homes, used their representations to explain how their proposed site accords with the policy's requirements.

Response to main issues raised in representations

There is a national commitment to achieving net zero carbon by 2050; reductions in waste generation and unnecessary demolition activity will play critical roles in achieving this target through the facilitation of reductions in embodied carbon. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states clearly that "minimising waste" and supporting movements towards a "low carbon economy" are core components of the environmental objective of the planning system, whilst Paragraph 161 of the NPPF is clear that plans should "encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings". Notwithstanding the above, Paragraph 27 of the NPPF requires strategic policymakers to take consistent approaches with other strategic bodies, particularly on matters such as waste. Therefore, it was not considered appropriate for the Local Plan to omit requirements for sustainable resource use and waste management.

Feedback received during the First Proposals consultation was broadly positive, providing support for local planning policy on sustainable waste management and the integration of circular economy principles in the Local Plan. It is recognised that effective resource and waste management needs to be considered when a development is operational, as well as during the construction process. This will need to include the consideration of material reuse, recycling or other material recovery as part of development. Moreover, innovative waste management solutions have been implemented in new development across Greater Cambridge, such as the underground bin system introduced in Eddington; the councils agree that innovative solutions that facilitate sustainable waste management and operational resource use

should be encouraged by local planning policy. Therefore, support for innovative waste management solutions has been built into the policy, in addition to requirements for waste sorting and storage facilities to align with or exceed guidance contained within Cambridgeshire County Council's RECAP Guidance (or successor documents).

The councils agree that where possible existing buildings should be reused or repurposed, unless a clearly evidenced more sustainable outcome, can be delivered through their demolition and replacement. However, it is also acknowledged that details submitted as part of a planning application should be proportionate to the scale and nature of a proposed development in line with the NPPF. A standalone Circular Economy Statement will be required for large-scale development (i.e. development of 150 dwellings or more, 15,000 square metres or more, or where the site area is 2 hectares or more) or development that involves the demolition of existing buildings. Smaller scale developments will also be expected to integrate circular economy principles, but this can be sufficiently demonstrated as part of a Sustainability Statement for the proposed development. The supporting text has clarified the details expected as part of the Circular Economy Statement – as waste output and material requirements can vary considerably from project to project, targets for waste outputs and material circularity are not proposed to be included within policy and will instead need to be established on a case-by-case basis as appropriate to the development in question. In a similar vein, targets for whole life carbon are not proposed at this stage as this will vary depending on the type of development being proposed. It is noted that for the UK Net Zero Carbon Buildings Standard, metrics related to whole life or life cycle carbon are expected to evolve over time.

To maintain the policy's focus on circular economy principles and sustainable resource use, the policy title has been altered in line with the suggestion made by Cambridgeshire County Council. Requirements for Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs), which cover aspects of construction management and pollution control beyond waste and resource management, were also moved to a separate, complementary policy within the Local Plan (Policy I/CM) to maintain Policy CC/CE's focus on the circular economy and sustainable resource use.

Policy CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration and carbon sinks

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

As part of the First Proposals consultation, there was general support for a policy related to land-based carbon sequestration. Some suggested that for developments over a certain threshold, soil management plans should be required to demonstrate

that carbon sequestration would be maintained into the future. A number of developers also supported the policy, noting the potential that the landscape strategies for new developments offered in relation to enhancing carbon sequestration through new habitat creation and requesting that this be acknowledged by the policy.

Response to main issues raised in representations

The role that the provision of green infrastructure and new habitats as part of new developments can play in carbon sequestration has been added to the policy in response to representations calling for the policy to recognise and support this approach.

Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Many respondents generally supported the policy direction.

Some suggestions were made to the policy wording including requests for more clarity to identify what makes green gaps 'important'. Some respondents identified areas of particular landscape value that should be protected such as the green corridors around the River Cam, River Great Ouse, Hobson's Brook and West Cambridge and the landscape south of Cambridge Biomedical Centre around White Hill. A few developers and landowners wanted the policy to allow for the consideration of development on its own merits and asked that the policy recognised the positive impact that development can have upon the character of landscapes. There were also requests for new developments to retain and enhance landscape features that have particular value, rather than retain all landscape features.

Cambridge Past, Present and Future argued that similar Local Plan policies had not been effective at protecting the setting of Cambridge from the cumulative impact of development and that the policy should require the planting of trees early to improve the screening of the city. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) also expressed a wish that the policy would prevent visually intrusive developments occurring. Contrastingly, Metro Property Unit Trust argued that the policy needed to ensure that the protection of trees is measured against other elements of the proposal. North Newnham Residents Association provided a number of comments relating to how the policy should protect and enhance hedges.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Many comments were received in relation to the protection of specific areas of landscape value. A 'character-based approach' has been followed for the policy based upon the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment (GC LCA) (2021). This approach has been followed as it recognises the character, diversity

and natural beauty of all landscapes across the whole of Greater Cambridge rather than a ‘local landscape designations approach’ which identifies and focuses on specific areas of greater landscape value.

As explained above, the reference to important green gaps made at First Proposals was in response to continuing Policy NH/1 in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) which protects the areas of countryside between Longstanton village and the new town of Northstowe. It was considered that there are no other specific green gaps that are important from a landscape point of view and that it is unnecessary to include this as part of the policy. The continuation of the protection of the gap between Longstanton and Northstowe is included within the Northstowe policy.

The policy seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the landscape and recognises that development can provide opportunities for this. It has been drafted to recognise that landscape features that positively contribute to the quality and character of the area should be protected, conserved and enhanced, responding to a comment that not all landscape features have value.

The policy has a clause relating to the cumulative effects of development to avoid incremental harm to local landscape character. Policy BG/TC: Tree Canopy Cover and the Tree Population requires additional tree planting and the protection of trees and hedgerows.

The GC LCA looked in detail at the physical and human/cultural influences to identify the Landscape Character Areas including the consideration of historic landscape character. This is therefore an intrinsic part of the description of each Landscape Character Area and the landscape sensitivities and landscape guidelines provided in the GC LCA, and which should be considered in new development proposals. With regards to Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), the methodology for carrying out HIAs in Greater Cambridge recognises the importance of all strategic views across and within the city. Through the Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, the viewpoints are being updated in consultation with Historic England, including dynamic views.

With regards to criticism of existing development proposals, all applications are subject to landscape character policies in the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (2018). These policies refer to older studies and the more recent 2021 GC LCA is also used in the consideration of development proposals as an updated piece of evidence that covers the whole of Greater Cambridge . The identification of sites within the Local Plan has followed a rigorous approach to site assessment, set out in the Greater Cambridge Housing and

Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The sites were assessed against a wide range of criteria including landscape and townscape, carried out by landscape architects.

Responses to representations regarding Important Countryside Frontages are included in the Protected Open Space study, which is an appendix to the Biodiversity and Green Spaces Topic Paper.

Historic England (HE) commented that views from the south and east of the city are being underplayed as a characteristic of the city and suggested that Heritage Impact Assessment should look at this issue. HE also argued that the policy should ensure that new development positively responds to Cambridge's historic landscape. Natural England stated that locally designated landscapes should be identified within the plan and given policy protection.

Some respondents argued that specific site proposals in the First Proposals would not be in line with this policy, in particular sites at Babraham, Sawston, and there was reference to Anglian Water's proposal at Honey Hill. Developers such as TOWN, argued that the policy will need to recognise the strategic objectives of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and avoid imposing conditions that could unreasonably restrict development.

Some respondents including some Parish Councils argued that Important Countryside Frontages (ICFs) are an important policy tool for protecting villages, whereas other respondents saying they were an unnecessary additional layer of constraint to development. Some respondents asked for additional ICFs , whereas other respondents asked for ICFs to be removed.

In terms of the additional survey questions, there were a high number of representations in response to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East) which supported the protection of existing natural and landscapes, or provision of new green spaces. In response to Q.7 (southern rural cluster), Q.8 (villages), Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge), there were some representations which expressed support for protecting Greater Cambridge's landscape and there were concerns that new development could harm existing landscapes.

Biodiversity and green spaces

Introduction sentence

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the biodiversity and green infrastructure theme:

The majority of comments provide broad support for the objectives and priorities for improved biodiversity was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, with comments that policies must be as strong as can be to protect and enhance existing green spaces and networks. Comments included that the area has good green spaces which add to the rural character, are a huge asset and should be protected from development, but that there is pressure on green spaces, often conflict between recreational use of green spaces and biodiversity, and that sufficient land should be provided for both. It was suggested the Objectives should include the 'Doubling Nature' ambition. A small number of comments raised concern about the environmental capacity of the area, suggesting that the aims of this theme would be challenging to deliver, and suggesting that the development strategy did not accord with those aims.

There was support for this being a key theme for the plan, and lots of ideas about how biodiversity and green space could be enhanced. Comments raised issues about how designated sites should be recognised in the plan, and how impacts should be considered. A range of specific issues were identified, including the importance of protecting chalk streams.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters include:

- Comments supporting the broad approach to the theme are noted.
- The plan seeks to address the needs of places for wildlife, and places for people, and reflecting the importance of requiring appropriate quantity and quality of green infrastructure. Jobs

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the jobs theme:

Some developers, private-sector organisations and councils expressed support for the aims of the policies in this section. A few parish councils argued the statistics forecasting jobs growth need to be reconsidered after Covid-19 and three respondents argued that the figures were too high.

A few landowners argued that the policies do not promote the needs of Cambridge's high technology clusters or life sciences sectors. Some landowners also emphasised the need for the Local Plan to be flexible in its approach to commercial, retail and leisure uses. Contrastingly Histon and Impington Parish Council argued that new

jobs should not be limited to high-tech jobs but cover a range of employment types. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that the Local Plan must effectively tackle poverty and inequality in Greater Cambridgeshire and that growth in high-tech clusters will not address these problems. Great Shelford Parish Council argued that the policies in the Jobs Chapter needed to place a greater emphasis upon protecting the rural economy. There were a few comments relating to sites, with developers arguing that their site could deliver the aims of the policies.

Some question whether the plan is doing enough to support high technology clusters, and others whether it is doing enough to promote a mix of uses (for example logistics). Others are concerned by the impact of economic growth on housing needs and the environment.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters includes:

- The evidence informing the needs identified in the plan has been updated to inform this draft local plan. Further information on this can be found in the strategy topic paper.
- Updated evidence has also been prepared to examine employment land supply needs, including for specific sectors.
- Policies have been included which seek to share the benefits of growth and development. Policies in this chapter propose to require an element of large scale proposals to provide affordable employment space. A policy requiring employment and skills plans as part of proposals is included in the wellbeing chapter.
- Policies are included to support the rural economy.

The following proposed policies areas are addressed in this topic paper:

- BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity
- BG/GI: Green infrastructure
- BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population
- BG/RC: River corridors
- BG/PO: Protecting open spaces
- BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces

Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Broad support for the policy principles was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, with comments including that preserving and enhancing biodiversity was important for health and wellbeing, carbon sequestration, place making, and benefits the economy. Comments suggested that the policy and objectives should be strengthened to guide development away from sensitive areas and refuse development that has adverse effects, and that buffer zones are needed to protect wildlife beyond sites and create green corridors. Comments noted that the policy only relates to controlling the impact of developments not improving existing sites (which was considered a missed opportunity).

Many comments, particularly from related organisations, supported the proposal for 20% biodiversity net gain. Concerns were raised by some developers that the minimum 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) target was double the Environment Bill's proposed level of 10%, that it was not justified, too onerous and not achievable in all cases, and that there needs to be further consideration of viability and deliverability and flexibility to avoid stifling development. Some comments considered that the BNG approach can fail to deliver benefits if new ecosystems are substituted, and green networks interrupted. Comments were received from developers promoting sites with the opportunity to deliver BNG. Other comments suggested that the 20% was not high enough, and a higher requirement should be included if doubling nature was to be achieved.

Concerns were raised by some individuals and community groups about how BNG will be calculated. Comments suggested a need for professionally accredited independent reports, and that the assessment should consider all important species, local and special characteristics, and adjoining nature sites.

Comments were expressed about off-site provision of biodiversity, that the creation of larger networks will be beneficial to wildlife and support ecological resilience, that clear delivery mechanisms were required which could include purchasing credits, the need to ensure developers deliver before occupation, and encouraging collaborative working with developers. Others commented that off-site provision might not provide benefits to local residents.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Support for, as well as concerns about, the policy exceeding 10% national mandatory BNG were received. National Planning Practice Guidance on BNG sets out that plan-makers may seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% BNG on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development where this is supported by local evidence. Greater Cambridge has a relatively low level of designated sites and priority habitats compared with other English districts; this deficiency means there is a greater need to repair that loss and restore biodiversity across the area, where possible, through the planning and development process.

The draft policy approach aims to increase the provision for nature, to help address biodiversity losses due to development and to create additional opportunities for people to interact with nature. The Councils have sought to provide robust justification for the amended draft Policy approach for 20% net gain for major development and 10% for minor development in Greater Cambridge, through evidence, analysis of local data and reasoned justification of the implementation of the policy on practice. It may be viable for some major developments to deliver higher targets and there are examples of proposals achieving greater than 20% BNG in Greater Cambridge. However, 20% BNG has been demonstrated to be deliverable for major development in the context of the Greater Cambridge Area through whole plan viability testing and example in practice, and the policy makes clear that viability will be considered as set out in national planning policy and guidance.

Concerns about how BNG will be calculated were acknowledged. The assessed measurement of BNG (over the pre-development biodiversity value) will be measured using the statutory version of the biodiversity metric tool which enables baseline units for a site (forecast for when the proposed development is in place) to be compared with its post intervention situation. Scoring biodiversity mitigation through this metric gives weight for local mitigation but also for siting BNG at strategically important sites across wider geographies; the balancing of both aiding in the most appropriate outcome for BNG from the development proposal. The Councils will verify the accuracy of the biodiversity value calculations and consider the merits of any off-site net gain measures with reference to strategic locations identified within the Cambridge Nature Network, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Nature Recovery Strategy, or Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Strategic Initiative Area. Evidence supporting the draft plan highlighted that due to the way biodiversity net gain is calculated, there are anecdotal concerns that there may sometimes be a margin of error that falls within the 10% threshold for BNG. As such, a key concern is that a 10% biodiversity net gain may not deliver net gain, but possibly result in meeting an older metric of ‘no net loss’ for biodiversity onsite. As such a biodiversity net gain requirement of 20% for major development safeguards against that margin of error to deliver more credible outcomes for BNG in Greater Cambridge.

Regarding off-site provision of biodiversity: BNG can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of both measures; the policy sets out that the Councils will seek to achieved BNG on-site wherever this is feasible and effective and only secure BNG off-site when on-site options have been exhausted. However, it is recognised that on some sites practical, sustainable ecological enhancement may not be viable.

Representations proposed that the policy and objectives should be strengthened to guide development away from sensitive areas and refuse development that has adverse effects. This is aspect is covered by the policy, ensuring that development proposals which have a direct or indirect adverse effect on sites of biodiversity or geological importance will not be permitted, and that exceptions will only be made where the public benefits significantly outweigh any adverse impacts.

Concerns that the policy only relates to controlling the impact of development not improving existing sites were considered. The draft plan takes an integrated strategic planning approach to biodiversity in the local plan, seeking to protect and enhances biodiversity in many ways; for example, creating new habitat, supporting the restoration of degraded areas, encouraging the delivery of offsite BNG within areas identified within the LNRS priority areas and, supporting the development of green infrastructure providing a range of benefits to the environment and local communities (see also policy GI/GI). The BNG system itself is a mandatory approach to development and/or land management (under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021), that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand; developers can achieve BNG through onsite enhancements, offsite biodiversity units, or statutory biodiversity credits, with legal agreements ensuring long-term compliance.

Finally**,** the Councils are committed to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and will work with partners to ensure a proactive approach to protection, enhancement and management of biodiversity when considering development proposals; supporting sustainable development and ensuring delivery of the minimum requirements for BNG as set by the policy (unless development proposal is exempt). No Change to policy approach.

Policy BG/GI: Green Infrastructure

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Broad support for the policy intention was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, with comments that multi-functional, connected, green infrastructure is a key part of a successful spatial strategy.

Comments also included that the policy direction was good but ambiguous and needed clarification, including how it relates to other Aims and policies within the Plan and to Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards. Comments that green infrastructure doesn't respect boundaries, encouraging partnership working, and the need for clear funding mechanisms for delivery.

Some developers commented that the policy should be a recommendation not a requirement, should recognise some sites may not be able to deliver due to locational constraints, site size and viability, that development should not be opposed where reasonable steps have been taken to protect and incorporate GI. Some comments from individuals expressed concern how the policy would be delivered via the planning process to ensure contributions will invest in strategic initiatives, and that the policy approach did not include a standard for measurement or achieved performance of developments.

There was widespread support for the green infrastructure initiatives, with many comments about specific initiatives including suggested amendments to their boundaries, joining up with other initiatives such as National Trust's Wicken Fen Vision, and proposing other ecological measures for inclusion.

Comments suggested the policy should consider the additional recreational pressure arising from developments, encourage increased access to green spaces through joining up spaces, and that all homes without gardens must have easy access. Comments included that the policy lacked specific proposals for improving public access and connectivity, including for horse riding.

Response to main issues raised in representations

Comments relating to specific green infrastructure initiatives suggested alteration to the boundaries of the strategic green infrastructure initiatives as shown on the map were considered. However, the strategic green infrastructure initiatives relate to general strategic initiatives for a given area and were not intended to be spatially specific or function as a policy boundary to protect existing green infrastructure. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to alter these boundaries to include/exclude specific parcels of land.

Representations, particularly those from developers, proposed that the policy should function as a recommendation and not a requirement. This suggestion has not been implemented, as the aim is to provide the strongest support for green infrastructure. Therefore, the draft policy has been drafted in a manner so that the policy requirements are not recommendations.

Comments regarding recreational pressure, and specific recommendations regarding access to green space are addressed in policy BG/BG and BG/EO respectively. Requests for specific mentions of horse riding are considered to be too detailed within the scope of this high-level policy.

Finally concerns regarding the need for the policy to consider additional recreational pressure arising from new developments were acknowledged. This aspect will be covered in the policy through the implementation of Green Infrastructure Standards

which will include quantity standards for green infrastructure. Once the evidence base in finalised, the requirement to adhere to these standards and requirements will be incorporated into this policy.

Policy BG/TC: Improving Tree Canopy Cover and the Tree Population

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was broad support for the objectives and priorities for improving tree canopy cover and tree population was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations and developers, noting the existing low level of tree cover in Cambridgeshire, with comments that policies must be robust to protect trees and to deliver enhancements through development. Comments were made proposing specific tree canopy cover requirements on all new development, with the inclusion of ongoing maintenance, and replacement of trees when felled. Comments noted the importance of planting the right tree species in the right location. Comments were expressed by one parish that a community forest or strategic plan is needed with allocated sites within the district, linking existing ancient woodland habitats, providing wildlife corridors.

Concerns from some developers on the wording stated the policy was contradictory stating both that “all trees should be protected” and “only trees of value should be protected”, and that policy detail is vague and did not provide details on when its applied. Additionally, there were requests for policy flexibility on tree removal due to disease, age or safety concerns.

Further responses requested a more flexible approach applied to the policy, balancing priority for tree planting with provision of sustainable development, suggesting an explicit policy direction toward “trees of value” rather than blanket protection and balancing tree removal against the benefits of bringing development forward.

Response to main issues raised in representations

Comments suggested that the policy propose specific tree canopy cover requirements on all new development, with the inclusion of ongoing maintenance and replacement of trees when felled. The draft policy considered this suggestion along with updated evidence and the policy draft now requires major development to demonstrate, via a Tree Canopy Cover Assessment, how development will achieve a minimum future canopy cover of 30% on site, along with requiring the long term maintenance of any newly planted trees (via planning conditions and/or obligations as appropriate). The First Proposals policy direction indicated that the policy would require development proposals to provide appropriate replacement tree or hedgerow planting, where felling is proved necessary. Extant policy 71: Trees (Cambridge

Local Plan) has been carried forward to ensure the draft policy requires appropriate tree/hedgerow species to be planted in the vicinity where felling is approved.

Comments suggested that a community forest or strategic plan is needed with allocated sites within the district, linking existing ancient woodland habitats, providing wildlife corridors. The development of all allocations in the plan has taken account of existing biodiversity features including trees, alongside consideration of opportunities to enhance and expand the green infrastructure network, drawing on our identified Green Infrastructure initiatives. We have now done a further check of the draft LNRS to consider the overlap with the emerging plan. The Councils aim to include clear green infrastructure ambitions for within strategic allocations at the Proposed Submission stage, which may include woodland proposals where appropriate.

Developers raised concern that the policy was contradictory stating both that “all trees should be protected” and “only trees of value should be protected”, and that policy detail is vague and did not provide details on when its applied: The councils will protect trees of current and future amenity value. Trees, groups of trees and woodland will be assessed by the Councils in accordance with the amenity assessment (Policy P2) Cambridge City Councils tree strategy (2016-2026) or successor document.

In relation to requests for policy flexibility on tree removal due to disease, age or safety concerns, the councils recognise that in some specific instances felling of existing trees or hedgerows may be necessary to meet wider placemaking objectives. In order to determine whether felling or significant surgery to trees or hedgerows is acceptable, the amenity value of the tree(s) and/or hedgerows, condition and potential lifespan will be weighed against the safety from removal, the protection of other important site features or any more general benefits of a new development.

Policy BG/RC: River Corridors

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

General support for the policy direction was expressed by a range of individuals, organisations and environmental bodies, particularly for the protection and restoration of river corridors, including chalk streams and floodplains, due to their importance for biodiversity, flood management, and landscape character.

Comments on applying the policy to development included support for ensuring proposals protect the setting, views and historic significance of river corridors, with specific calls for appropriate building setbacks to allow for natural processes and

flood resilience. Concerns were raised about the impact of high-rise buildings on biodiversity and visual amenity, particularly from lighting and overshadowing. While improved public access was welcomed, several respondents highlighted risks of overuse and habitat degradation, recommending impact assessments and collaboration with landowners to balance recreation and environmental protection.

Suggestions to strengthen the policy included expanding its coverage to additional watercourses such as the Ivel tributary, Hobson's Brook, Wilbraham River and River Great Ouse. There was support for recognising aquifer-fed brooks and for including Riverscape Opportunity Areas to encourage habitat creation. Re-naturalisation projects, such as those at Logan's Meadow, were widely supported for their environmental and flood management benefits. Respondents also called for greater provision for equestrian access, alignment with green infrastructure policies and a mapped nature recovery network with restoration targets.

Broader concerns included pressures from tourism and commercial river uses, the environmental impact of large infrastructure projects such as the wastewater treatment plant relocation, and the need for clearer policy wording to ensure effectiveness. Anglian Water proposed a Memorandum of Understanding to support water resource projects benefiting the Cam.

Response to issues raised in representations

Comments raised on the protection of river corridors have been addressed through clearer and more detailed policy wording. The final policy now requires development to assess and respond to views, protect biodiversity and character and support the re-naturalisation of rivers and restoration of natural floodplains.

In particular, the policy scope has been broadened to address all river corridors within Greater Cambridge.

Concerns about environmental impacts, including from lighting, high-rise development and recreational pressure, have been reflected through strengthened requirements to balance access with habitat protection. The policy also supports improved walking and cycling routes, including the Cam Valley Trail, where appropriate.

Suggestions for greater clarity and alignment with wider strategies have informed the inclusion of references to the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

Policy BG/PO: Protecting Open Spaces

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Broad support for the policy intention was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, organisations, and public bodies. Comments were received that the policy needs to be considered against competing policy requirements, that it needs to address the future stewardship of open space and recognise its value in reducing recreational pressures on vulnerable sites and the heritage value of sites. Comments were made that the policy should recognise that open spaces are historic and part of the historic environment (not just viewed in terms of green infrastructure). A number of comments were made by individuals and parish councils regarding the impacts of development on landscape and open space in specific locations.

Response to main issues raised in representations

There were suggestions to strengthen this policy to reflect environmental aspects. However, it is considered that the environmental aspects of any development involving open space would be adequately covered by polices within the Biodiversity and Green Spaces chapter.

In response to comments highlighting the need for assessment on appropriate basis within the policy, the draft policy seeks to provide a clear and unambiguous guidance on how to treat proposals within differing contexts. Caveats have been included within the policy that allow for exceptions where adequate reprovision is provided and where there is an educational need.

While it is acknowledged that many open spaces form part of the historic environment, it is considered that the historic environment aspects of any development involving open space would be adequately covered by other policies within the Great Places chapter.

Finally, objections were raised that highlighted the policy is contrary to Green Belt losses arising from recent and proposed development. Representations on this topic are not pertinent to this emerging policy and should be considered against policy GP/GB.

Policy BG/EO: Providing and Enhancing Open Spaces

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

General support for the policy direction from a range of individuals, organisations, developers, and public bodies, with new provision of open spaces widely supported.

Comments regarding the application of this policy for new development included those suggesting that: the policy should be applied on a site-by-site basis; smaller developments should ensure provision of open space; onsite provision not off-site financial contributions should be required; new dwellings should have provision for food growing space (this point was also supported in response to the quick questions); open space should be provided within reasonable walking distance of residents' homes; standards should continue to differentiate between Cambridge

City and South Cambridgeshire to reflect the differences between the two areas; SUDs should not be treated as open space; and open space should include provision for biodiversity. A few developer comments wanted more clarity regarding the specific policy requirements.

Broader comments about open spaces included suggestions that the policy direction under BG/GI should also be applied to BG/EO, and that multifunctionality should not reduce amount of overall public space; comments highlighted how open spaces can form an important part of the setting of heritage assets; support for provision of allotments, concern relating to multi-storey buildings which risk dominating open space and affecting the character of Cambridge; requests for provision of new skateparks and growing spaces; and requests that open space was provided to meet the needs of equestrians. A few developers identified that their site would provide open space to meet needs.

Response to main issues raised in representations

Comments raised relating to the accessibility of open space have been addressed through the open space standards used by the policy which aim to ensure that any open space provision is accessible for the intended users.

Representations, particularly those from developers, proposed that the open space standards used should continue to differ between Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This suggestion has not been fully implemented as one of the reasons for making a joint local plan for Greater Cambridge is to ensure that there is a consistent approach to planning across both areas. However, the open space standards used allow for site-specific local constraints and opportunities associated with the nature of the proposed development to be taken into consideration.

Representations, particularly those from developers, also raised concerns about the lack of clarity relating to the open space standards. The Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Strategy and Greater Cambridge Interim Sports Strategy have now been implemented within the policy to provide additional clarity about the open space provision requirements for new development which was missing at First Proposals. Further work will be completed prior to Proposed Submission to provide a full set of open space and green infrastructure standards.

Wellbeing and Social Inclusion

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the wellbeing and social inclusion theme:

There was good general support for the overarching aims of the proposed wellbeing and inclusion policies from site promoters, the University of Cambridge, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group, Cambourne TC and Central Bedfordshire Council. Huntingdonshire District Council had no comment on this policy area. Two site promoters expressed the need for a more balanced provision of affordable housing and sustainable travel across Greater Cambridge, in

order to achieve the Local Plan's identified wellbeing and social inclusion aspirations. Fen Ditton PC was broadly supportive of aspiration but concerned with the ambiguity in some of the detail.

One member of the public expressed a need for new residential development to be no more than 4 storeys high, inclusive and provide open spaces with a balanced approach to cycling. Existing sporting facilities must be maintained and improved to safe, modern requirements. One member of the public suggested the Local Plan should include policies to protect cultural significance, specifically to support cultural activities and to provide for, and safeguard public and private spaces for arts and other activities.

In terms of social & transport infrastructure provision, comments from two members of the public and three PCs: Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Great Shelford; and Teversham were received. They cited concerns over the need: to consider the impact of high growth strategy on existing residents; for access to GPs and other primary care services and the retention of those services in villages; for active travel to be a feasible choice; and to invest in sports and leisure facilities, swimming pools, across the city and especially near large new developments. There was little evidence of detailed plans regarding infrastructure to support well-being and inclusion, communities need green community spaces, public parks, policing, schools, shops. They noted transport to any services and social support are essential to achieving wellbeing along with lower housing densities, increased dwelling space standards and access to private amenity space. Histon & Impington PC stated water efficiency must be compulsory.

DB Group Holdings raised the matter of the Local Plan ensuring a variety of employment opportunities are available across the District for all members of the community. Cambridge Past, Present & Future noted the protection and enhancement of the Historic Environment is not just key to creating and providing Great Places but also a vital part of Wellbeing.

One member of the public cited the North East Cambridge proposal, with the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP).will have a negative impact on residents and users of the surrounding area. Another member of the public suggested policies should acknowledge both the health and amenity benefits of visible green open space even if not publicly accessible. A different member of the public noted the need to balance climate change mitigation and adaptations with provision of a good standard of amenity. There was also no mention of people with disabilities. Linton PC highlighted the need to consider needs of elderly people.

The Environment Agency, while supportive of the opportunity to level-up communities, tackling this green inequality at scale and improving the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the GC area, caveated that for this to be achieved this needs to be balanced with the need to protect the environment, by providing appropriate wildlife refuges from human disruption and interference.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties considered the Local Plan will only worsen environmental damage and fail to serve Cambridge citizens who are disadvantaged, and the planned growth will only serve our significantly privileged citizens.

Many comments were submitted by site promoters indicating that their sites, if allocated for development would support the Local Plan's aspiration for creating healthy developments. Stapleford PC advised against 100-dwelling add-on developments rather the provision of infill brownfield sites with affordable housing would support inclusivity and develop wellbeing.

Several groups and individual members of the public highlighted the negative impact the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill would have on local amenity in terms of noise, odour and vibration pollution.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters includes:

- General support for the policy approach under this theme is noted.
- Protecting and enhancing community and cultural infrastructure is a goal of this local plan. Policies address a range of infrastructure issues, and have been informed by evidence to ensure that needs are appropriately responded to.
- Making places accessible has been addressed by a number of policies in the draft plan. The needs for different groups are also addressed, including in the housing chapter which responds to the need for accessible and specialist housing.
- Policies address environmental issues, including how green infrastructure can be protected and enhanced.

The following proposed policies areas are addressed in this topic paper:

- WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments
- WS/NC: Meeting the needs of new and growing communities
- WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities
- WS/CH: Cultural and Creative Hubs
- WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments
- WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments
- WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety
- WS/PH: Protecting Public Houses

WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was general support for the approach towards the WS/HD Creating healthy new developments policy from a range of organisations including Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Groups, Cambourne Town Council, Great and Little Chishill Parish Council, Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties, two members of the public and three developers; one of which suggested the policy should go further with other measures which maximise wellbeing benefits. There were also many comments from individuals and site promoters stating the application of Health Impact Assessments should only relate to major developments with one site promoter requesting the threshold be outlined.

Suggested policies requirements included integrating transport and cycling infrastructure which supports all types of uses and users into developments, and include links to the importance of adequate levels and qualities of accessible green infrastructure. One developer and another site promoter, while supportive of the application of health principles to new development, stated the ten Healthy New Towns principles were onerous and development should apply these flexibly where possible.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties supported the idea of “high quality people-focused spaces” but requested more details on these. They suggested the Local Plan should support interventions like those set out in the ‘Encouraging Healthier Takeaways in Low Income Communities’, for example providing incentives for local businesses who already produce healthy food to have a presence in local shops in areas such as Chesterton, Arbury, Abbey and Kings Hedges.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Responses received from the First Proposals Consultation suggest that the policy should consider the size of development which will be liable to the policy implications, this has been addressed within the policy to show which developments will need to provide a Health Impact Assessment and which developments will need to demonstrate they are working towards Healthy New Towns principles. Responses expressed support for hot food takeaway restrictions. This has been addressed by a hot food takeaway buffer area around secondary schools, FE colleges and youth centres.

WS/NC: Meeting the Needs of New and Growing Communities

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

In general. respondents to the First Proposals consultation supported the approach to Policy WS/CF, but suggested that the policy could be clearer about what provision of community facilities would be deemed ‘appropriate’ for new development. Two site promoters suggested that the policy should set out how new community, sports and leisure facilities will be provided and sustained through new development, and that type and scale of facilities should be commensurate to the size of the development proposed.

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd and Countryside Properties requested that planning policy clarified what thresholds will be set for on-site or off-site contributions to the delivery of facilities. Their comments also asked that planning policy clarified what would constitute “large-scale development” for the purposes of the policy, and whether this would be based on NPPF definitions or a locally set measure.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlighted the social impact of access to a good standard of education. Cambridgeshire County Council (Education) raised associated safeguarding concerns where facilities are used by the school and the wider community. Separate access arrangements are needed and expected to be fully funded by the developer to mitigate the level of risk.

Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted that early engagement is needed to mutually agree the basis on which access to educational facilities will be managed. One developer highlighted that the capacity of existing facilities and capacity offered by educational establishments needs consideration to ensure that provision is not sought where capacity exists elsewhere.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group requested that planning policies actively support the strategic plans of local health commissioners, and new health facilities to meet the needs of the population should be supported.

Trumpington Residents Association commented that there is a need to provide for the long-term support for community, sports and leisure facilities, continuing beyond the early stages of a development.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Support for general policy approach though more details of new provision required: The recently published evidence documents including the South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study (2024), the Greater Cambridge Cultural Infrastructure Strategy (2025) & accompanying map, the Greater Cambridge Interim Sports Report and the Greater Cambridge Retail and Leisure (2025) provide a comprehensive body of evidence to inform the provision of local and regional facilities across Greater Cambridge. These can also be used to support the need for commensurate S106 contributions, where applicable. The plan has sought to provide thresholds regarding the scale of development when contributions may be required where appropriate.

Regarding education and Concerns raised over access of school facilities and cost to mitigate: the policy approach encourages the early consideration of design solutions, such as separate access routes or shared-use layouts, that enable appropriate community use of school facilities. Where such provision is feasible, it is expected that the necessary design and infrastructure costs would be incorporated into the overall development proposal, typically through developer contributions.

WS/CF: Community, Sports, and Leisure Facilities

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was general support for the proposed approach to Policy WS/CF during the First Proposals consultation. Those indicating their support included Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, Steeple Morden PC, Guilden Morden PC, Great and Little Chishill PC and Marshall Group Properties.

Cambourne Town Council supported the policy but stated the local planning policy should not rely on community hubs providing facilities as they do not meet all the diverse age and cultural needs. Croydon Parish Council and Trumpington Residents Association, while both supportive of the policy, noted the need for transport for outlying villages to access facilities and for long-term support for community, sports and leisure facilities beyond the early stages in a development, respectively.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties noted that the growing inaccessibility to social care and services mean many families miss out on help, entrenching patterns of inequality throughout lives. They requested better accessibility to community, sports and leisure facilities, and recreational green open spaces.

In relation to sports facilities, responding parties highlighted that subscription-based sports facilities should be discouraged to enable their use by all. Sport England also requested their 'Active Design' guidance be referenced in the policy for the development of new facilities that encourage people to take part in sport and physical activity. A series of comments were raised regarding specific community facility needs, including needs for regional-scale facilities:

- The Cambridge Futsal Club, with the support of Cambridge Handball Club, indicated the lack of a venue in the whole of Cambridgeshire large enough to host national-level indoor sports events watched by seated spectators.
- One member of the public highlighted that Cambridge skateparks are not suitable for year-round use; to be suitable in winter these require lighting and rain covers.
- One member of the public requested the prioritisation of a new swimming pool for public access in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, citing a lack of provision and capacity in South Cambridgeshire, and capacity issues at Cambridge's swimming pool facilities. The response highlighted that this should consider both existing and future demand for swimming pool facilities, especially from students and South Cambridgeshire population into Cambridge.
- Histon and Impington Parish Council stated the need to aim for a swimming pool within cycling distance of every community.

Barrington Parish Council requested a much stronger policy definition for community healthcare facilities which should be prioritised given their poor provision under the current Local Plan. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group requested planning policies actively support the strategic plans of local health commissioners, and that new health facilities to meet the needs of the population should be supported. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group requested that planning policy supports the principle of NHS land and property being used for alternative uses as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation programmes where the existing facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use.

The Education and Skills Funding Agency (Department for Education) requested the policy makes clear that education facilities serving a wider catchment area will not be considered a town centre use requiring sequential approach to be applied, but that any such facilities must be in sustainable, accessible locations.

One member of the public requested further information about preventing landlords from evicting Clubs operating on their land or charging a rent so high the Club is forced to leave.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Regarding community/leisure/sports facilities: Support for policy approach though more details of new regional provision required: The recently published evidence documents including the South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study (2024), the Greater Cambridge Cultural Infrastructure Strategy (2025) & accompanying map, the Greater Cambridge Interim Sports Report and the Greater Cambridge Retail and Leisure (2025) provide a comprehensive body of evidence to inform the provision of local and regional facilities across Greater Cambridge. These can also be used to support the need for commensurate S106 contributions, where applicable.

Flexibility of location of regional education facilities. The sequential approach provides a logical approach to ensure all sustainable, accessible town centre locations are first considered. With the planned improvements to the local transport network and the emerging new centres, it is important that these centre locations are given priority in the determination of a suitable site. The sequential test, subject to an impact assessment not raising any concerns that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, allows for development on sites, outside a designated centre.

Regarding healthcare: Support for approach with more detailed definition, greater prioritisation of healthcare facilities and a more flexible approach towards NHS estate reorganisation: With acknowledgment of the changing format of NHS healthcare provision, the policy approach towards the loss of an NHS healthcare facility has been amended to provide greater flexibility. The justification for the loss would be permissible where it is clearly demonstrable that the site/facility forms part of an approved NHS reorganisation strategy. Ad hoc facility losses would not be acceptable. Policy approach amended.

Policy WS/CH: Cultural and Creative Hubs

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Representations were made during the First Proposals consultation in relation to other local planning policies, which are considered to be directly relevant to cultural and creative hubs in the sub-region.

In response to the proposed approach to WS/CF, Cambourne Town Council warned about the limitations of community hubs not being able to meet the needs of diverse ages and cultural needs.

In relation to the proposed approach to Policy J/VA, Great and Little Chishill Parish Council noted that Cambridgeshire is an important tourist destination and so the

visitor economy should be supported. Moreover, commenting parties, including Abrdn, the Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial, the Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail and the Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College highlighted that visitor attractions can complement other planning uses, which help to create particular destination or cultural hubs. However, Cambridge Past, Present & Future and the National Trust highlighted that some visitor attractions are operating close to their limits and that expansion of visitation or services at certain sites will need to be carefully balanced with the need to manage demand pressures on existing facilities.

Response to main issues raised in representations

The recently published evidence documents including the South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study (2024), the Greater Cambridge Cultural Infrastructure Strategy (2025) & accompanying map, the Greater Cambridge Interim Sports Report and the Greater Cambridge Retail and Leisure (2025) provide a comprehensive body of evidence to inform the provision of local and regional facilities across Greater Cambridge. These can also be used to support the need for commensurate S106 contributions, where applicable.

WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

A wide variety of organisations, citizens, landowners, and developers expressed support for this policy. Persimmon Homes East Midlands were supportive of the policy but asked that it not be mandatory. A few respondents asked for the policy's scope to be amended to include different uses: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG for example asked for developers to provide short-term solutions for the NHS to deliver services for new residents whilst development was taking place, Cam-Skate asked for skateboard facilities to be included in the policy and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties recommended that temporary spaces be used to assist with unaffordable housing via property guardianship. Several respondents objected to 'meanwhile uses' being implemented in the Green Belt.

Response to main issues raised in representations

Responses received from the First Proposals Consultation suggest that the policy should specify the type of uses permitted under meanwhile uses. That approach may be unnecessarily restrictive, where the policy can instead manage the potential impacts of uses rather than the type of use. The draft policy takes a flexible approach to encouraging meanwhile uses which will be beneficial for the local community and local businesses.

WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was some support for the aims of policy from a mix for parish councils, private developers and other agencies. A number of developers discussed how the development of their site would support the policy. Several suggestions were made for the detailed policy wording including:

- its application only to strategic development over a certain scale;
- flexibility where it is not possible meet the policy due to local circumstances or the availability of labour;
- the inclusion of text that supports employment related development that would generate high skilled jobs locally;
- requiring developers to offer apprenticeship scheme linked to Further Education opportunities.

There were also a number of objections to the proposed policy direction with the Home Builders Federation suggesting that it is not justified against the tests set out in the NPPF and the CIL regulations with work already taking place to improve skills and opportunities through the CITB.

Questions were asked around how expansive the definition of “inclusive” would be and how it would address socio-economic exclusion. There was also a request for support for more opportunities for young people to develop in the science and tech sectors and within Cambridge University.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Comments in general support of the approach are noted. One comment questioned whether this requirement met CIL regulations. Similar requirements have been included in many local plans elsewhere in the country. The policy requirements are related to the development in scale and kind. They are directly related as they focus on opportunities provided the site. The requirement is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, as it addresses some of the externalities caused by the development in terms of wellbeing and social inclusion. Some comments mentioned the needs for requirements to be flexible, and the scale to be appropriate. The draft policy is considered to have stuck the right balance on when the requirements are applied.

WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

A wide variety of respondents expressed support for this policy. The Environmental Agency supported the policy but argued that its scope needed to be widened to

protect Cambridge's aquifer. The Environmental Agency also noted that hazardous facilities have the potential to pollute the environment, but strategic planning of waste and resources can address this issue. The University of Cambridge also asked for the policy's scope to be widened so that it will protect Cambridge's research environment; specific requests included adding mitigation against electromagnetic interference into the policy and protecting research undertaken by the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory. Croydon PC asked for the policy to be reviewed in the context of major transport infrastructure and Linton PC asked for exclusion zones around key infrastructure cables and sites.

Some parish councils argued that pollution levels were unacceptable, so the monitoring of existing high-density areas is required, and mitigation measures should be implemented in areas of new development. Similarly, the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties included numerous recommendations to address pollution in existing city-centres and new settlements. Trumpington Resident Association argued that reducing light pollution should not be used to justify not lighting pedestrian desire lines. Several developers objected to the policy, arguing that it fails to recognise that potential negative impacts from development can be mitigated against.

Response to main issues raised in representations

Protection of Cambridge's aquifer: this policy seeks prevention of any impacts to controlled waters due to land contamination, including to the underlying aquifer. No Change in policy approach (however, please also see policies CC/WE and CC/WQ in climate change chapter of the plan in regard to the protection of Cambridge's aquifer).

Mitigating electromagnetic interference: The policy also references other sources of environmental pollution should specific issues arise. Please also see Policy I/DT: Digital and Telecommunications Infrastructure, which requires telecommunications and digital infrastructure development to demonstrate that there will be no significant and irremediable electromagnetic interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services, instrumentation operated in the national interest, or other operations and equipment that are sensitive to electromagnetic pollution). No Change in policy approach.

Strategic waste and resources planning regarding hazardous facilities: Policy applies appropriate protection to and from hazardous installations. Planning applications for the development of hazardous installations/ pipelines and development close to hazardous sites or pipelines will be referred to the Health and

Safety Executive, Natural England, the Environment Agency and/or other expert statutory bodies as required. No change in policy approach.

Policy WS/PH: Protecting Public Houses

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

The majority of respondents expressed support for the policy and the approach to protecting public houses. Comments broadly supported the policy approach, however comments were raised that although public houses should be protected, in some circumstances it may not be viable so the policy should allow for their loss. Similarly, one comment suggested the policy should be realistic in its approach if the local community cannot support a public house. However, Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggested the policy could safeguard public houses by nominating them as assets of community value. This was also reflected in other comments regarding the importance of public houses in providing positive impacts and employment opportunities for communities. Other comments were made regarding that the policy focuses entirely on public houses, not reflecting the other types of community assets that need safeguarding.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Comments in support of the policy approach are noted. In terms of not protecting pubs which are not viable, the policy includes appropriate criteria that can be applied to ensure that every effort is made to protect pubs, but this is balanced with the need to being buildings back into use if demonstrated this is not possible.

Great Places

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the great places theme:

Many individuals, public bodies, third sector organisations and developers expressed support for the aims of the Great Places policies.

A number of respondents emphasised the importance of including policies which will protect Cambridge's historic environment. Cambridge Past, Present and Future commented that the Local Plan needs to not only focus upon historic assets, but also recognise the historic significance of the whole of Cambridge and ensure that its historic setting is protected from cumulative impacts. Historic England (HE) provided a detailed representation, in which they expressed concerns about the density and height of some of the site proposals and the need for Heritage Impact Assessment to be carried out to inform the next stage. HE also noted the need to have policies covering designated and non-designated historic assets, heritage at risk, historic shopfronts, and tall buildings. Comments also noted that Great Places are more than just about the design of buildings but creating communities with access to services, facilities, nature and open spaces.

Some comments considered that development proposed would impact negatively on the delivery of the goals set out in this chapter. A few developers commented that the sites that they were proposing would fulfil the aims of the policies. Several commentators emphasised the importance of delivering facilities and infrastructure to ensure that new development results in great places.

In terms of the additional survey questions which were attached to this round of consultation, in the responses to Q.13 (which relates to the aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge) there was a strong aspiration to preserve Greater Cambridge's historic buildings and wider heritage and a critical comment of GCSP's approach to urban design of new settlements. The need to protect the qualities of the area was highlighted, raising issues of landscape, heritage, and character.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters includes:

- Acknowledging support for policies which address great places themes.
- Policies have been developed to ensure the historic environment is considered in planning decisions. Heritage impact assessments have been prepared to inform proposed site allocations.
- Agree that delivering great places is more than just the design of buildings. The plan as a whole seeks to address the full range of issues that will be needed to create successful communities. Wellbeing and social inclusion

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the wellbeing and social inclusion theme:

There was good general support for the overarching aims of the proposed wellbeing and inclusion policies from site promoters, the University of Cambridge, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group, Cambourne TC and Central Bedfordshire Council. Huntingdonshire District Council had no comment on this policy area. Two site promoters expressed the need for a more balanced provision of affordable housing and sustainable travel across Greater Cambridge, in order to achieve the Local Plan's identified wellbeing and social inclusion aspirations. Fen Ditton PC was broadly supportive of aspiration but concerned with the ambiguity in some of the detail.

One member of the public expressed a need for new residential development to be no more than 4 storeys high, inclusive and provide open spaces with a balanced approach to cycling. Existing sporting facilities must be maintained and improved to safe, modern requirements. One member of the public suggested the Local Plan

should include policies to protect cultural significance, specifically to support cultural activities and to provide for, and safeguard public and private spaces for arts and other activities.

In terms of social & transport infrastructure provision, comments from two members of the public and three PCs: Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Great Shelford; and Teversham were received. They cited concerns over the need: to consider the impact of high growth strategy on existing residents; for access to GPs and other primary care services and the retention of those services in villages; for active travel to be a feasible choice; and to invest in sports and leisure facilities, swimming pools, across the city and especially near large new developments. There was little evidence of detailed plans regarding infrastructure to support well-being and inclusion, communities need green community spaces, public parks, policing, schools, shops. They noted transport to any services and social support are essential to achieving wellbeing along with lower housing densities, increased dwelling space standards and access to private amenity space. Histon & Impington PC stated water efficiency must be compulsory.

DB Group Holdings raised the matter of the Local Plan ensuring a variety of employment opportunities are available across the District for all members of the community. Cambridge Past, Present & Future noted the protection and enhancement of the Historic Environment is not just key to creating and providing Great Places but also a vital part of Wellbeing.

One member of the public cited the North East Cambridge proposal, with the relocation of Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP).will have a negative impact on residents and users of the surrounding area. Another member of the public suggested policies should acknowledge both the health and amenity benefits of visible green open space even if not publicly accessible. A different member of the public noted the need to balance climate change mitigation and adaptations with provision of a good standard of amenity. There was also no mention of people with disabilities. Linton PC highlighted the need to consider needs of elderly people.

The Environment Agency, while supportive of the opportunity to level-up communities, tackling this green inequality at scale and improving the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the GC area, caveated that for this to be achieved this needs to be balanced with the need to protect the environment, by providing appropriate wildlife refuges from human disruption and interference.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties considered the Local Plan will only worsen environmental damage and fail to serve Cambridge citizens who are disadvantaged, and the planned growth will only serve our significantly privileged citizens.

Many comments were submitted by site promoters indicating that their sites, if allocated for development would support the Local Plan's aspiration for creating

healthy developments. Stapleford PC advised against 100-dwelling add-on developments rather the provision of infill brownfield sites with affordable housing would support inclusivity and develop wellbeing.

Several groups and individual members of the public highlighted the negative impact the relocation of CWWTP to Honey Hill would have on local amenity in terms of noise, odour and vibration pollution.

Wellbeing and social inclusion was highlighted as an important theme, particularly in light of the pandemic. Issues raised crossed a number of the other themes.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters includes:

- General support for the policy approach under this theme is noted.
- Protecting and enhancing community and cultural infrastructure is a goal of this local plan. Policies address a range of infrastructure issues, and have been informed by evidence to ensure that needs are appropriately responded to.
- Making places accessible has been addressed by a number of policies in the draft plan. The needs for different groups are also addressed, including in the housing chapter which responds to the need for accessible and specialist housing.
- Policies address environmental issues, including how green infrastructure can be protected and enhanced.

The following proposed policies areas are addressed in this topic paper:

- GP/PP: People and place responsive design
- GP/QD: Achieving high quality development
- GP/HD: Housing density
- GP/ST: Skyline and tall buildings
- GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm
- GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character
- GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change
- GP/HE Historic Environment
- GP/HA Designated Heritage Assets
- GP/ND Non-Designated Heritage Assets
- GP/AR Archaeology

- GP/CC: Adapting Heritage Assets to Climate Change
- GP/SF: Shopfronts

The Green Belt policy has been moved to the strategy theme:

- GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt

Policy GP/PP People and place responsive design

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Many individuals, public bodies and developers expressed general support for policy GP/PP.

Some respondents argued that policies need to avoid creating repetitive buildings such by as requiring varied height and massing, and that a policy that is applicable to Greater Cambridge shouldn't dilute the details relating to the special character of Cambridge. A few landowners suggested that developments which demonstrated a high standard of design should be fast-tracked through the planning application process.

There were different perceptions about what the scope of the policy should be; a few of landowners argued that design codes should not be imposed on smaller developments where other mechanisms could achieve similar outcomes. Similarly, a few developers argued that the phrasing of the policy should be altered so that new development only needed to respond to local design contexts rather than the architecture of the Greater Cambridge area. On the other hand, the Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group argued that the policy was too narrowly focussed upon aesthetics, when actually a more holistic approach was required to promote things such as connected, participatory collective spaces.

Historic England questioned whether one policy relating to design would be sufficient, whereas a few respondents queried whether having two policies was necessary. Developers such as Abrdn argued that the policy needed to include sufficient flexibility for well-designed and high-quality buildings even if they are taller than the surrounding townscape. Contrastingly, Historic England and others argued that great care needs to be taken to protect Cambridge's skyline, views, and approaches and that the Local Plan should be informed by a Tall Building and Skyline study.

Many commentators noted the need to engage with local communities to improve the design of developments and when creating design codes. The British Horse Society argued that greater attention needs to be paid to designing for non-motorised forms of transport and developments should maximise opportunities to link and enhance with existing Public Rights of Way. Some developers commented that their sites could fulfil the policy and one respondent argued that the relocation of the waste water treatment plant to Honey Hill would contravene this policy.

In terms of the additional survey questions which were attached to this round of consultation, in response to Q.7 (southern rural cluster) and Q.9 (villages) respondents suggested including more public benches and picnic tables, a changing art space, and creative features to make new development attractive places. There was also an expressed desire for new development to designed for children and for new development to reflect village character. For Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), many comments emphasised the need for North-East Cambridge to have a good centre with amenities, for it to be a 'micro-city' within the city, or to incorporate a 'new' architectural style. Similar comments were expressed for Q.3 (Cambridge East) with some respondents requesting that the design uses a precedent of 'Garden City' design or include architecture which celebrates its aviation heritage.

Policy GP/QD Achieving High Quality Development

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Many respondents expressed support for the policy.

A few developers specifically welcomed the policy's encouragement of mixed-use proposals. Croydon Parish Council expressed their desire to keep the landscape rural and the Trumpington Residents Association stressed the importance of delivering high quality buildings and enforcing planning conditions.

Some comments highlighted the need for planning to avoid creating bland developments. There were many suggestions to improve the policy, some included introducing additional architectural design standards, on-street parking provision, Passivhaus standards, crime prevention measures. Some respondents stated that design codes should reflect local building typologies, topography and that the policy should ensure that the use of previously developed or underutilised sites in the urban area can be maximised. Some comments stated that design guides shouldn't be imposed on small developments where other mechanisms could achieve similar outcomes. One developer stated that if a development meets the policy's objectives, the policy should ensure that this carries significant weight in the determination of the proposal.

Some respondents questioned whether it is unusual to have two design policies in the Local Plan and whether it could be covered in one policy. The Wildlife Trust also asked that the Building with Nature standards referred to in policy BG/GI are formally incorporated as a requirement into this policy or GP/QP. Historic England asked for a separate policy relating to tall buildings. Other respondents noticed that parking is referenced twice in the policy under 'climate-positive' and 'local character' and it does not need to be repeated. Some respondents asked for clarification to be provided within the policy as to what is regarded as 'significantly taller' to understand when additional assessment will be required.

Some developers supported the policy and asserted that their sites could deliver the policy's objectives. Other comments highlighted specific sites or proposals that they considered would not meet the policy objectives.

In terms of the additional survey questions, there were a high number of representations which emphasised the importance delivering high quality development. Such representations can be found in response to Q.3 (Cambridge East), Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), Q.5 (Addenbrookes), Q.6 (Cambourne), Q.7 (southern rural cluster), Q.9 (kinds of housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces in villages) and Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). In answer to Q.12 (what should we prioritise when planning homes for the future?), 64% of respondents expressed a desire for safe streets where children can play outside, 30% expressed a desire for accessibility and adaptability for wheelchair users and 51% expressed a desire for secure cycle parking.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

The Councils acknowledge the critical importance of delivering high quality, inclusive, and sustainable development across Greater Cambridge. This ambition underpins the vision for the area and informs the objectives of Policy GP/QD. Achieving high quality development is not limited to aesthetics or individual buildings; it encompasses a wide range of considerations including placemaking, functionality, local character, climate resilience, biodiversity, accessibility, and the relationships between built form and open space. Support from policy 2018 local plan and of the adopted South Cambridgeshire local plan 2018.

There was particular support for the policy's focus on creating active, attractive and well-integrated places that reflect the identity of Greater Cambridge. Developers also expressed support for the policy's encouragement of mixed-use development, recognising the value of combining different functions in a way that enhances vibrancy and supports resilient communities. This aligns with the policy's aim to ensure proposals are designed with communities in mind and integrate successfully with surrounding uses.

A key theme raised was the need to avoid bland, generic development. Respondents called for a stronger design-led approach and highlighted the value of incorporating high-quality architectural detail, contextual materials, and sensitive street design. In response, Policy GP/QD draws upon the principles of the National Model Design Code (MHCLG, 2021), which provides a nationally recognised framework for securing design quality through a place-based approach. This includes guidance on layout, street hierarchy, façade quality, environmental performance, landscape integration (including tree-lined streets), and use of local materials. These principles are supported in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024, paragraph 133), which reinforces the importance of design accountability and consistency in achieving high-quality development.

The Councils recognise the need for a proportionate and flexible approach. Therefore, Policy GP/QD provides an overarching framework, but allows for tailored design responses depending on the scale, skyline, context, and nature of the development. These expectations are supported by Appendix F of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018): Tall Buildings and the Skyline, which remains a key reference for

evaluating proposals that may affect the character of Cambridge's skyline. Determining an appropriate design-led solution to high quality building development will need to be conducted on a case-by-case basis, accounting for the various growth opportunities and constraints. Policy GP/QD has been drafted to ensure that applicants will provide details and benefits of the clarity, proportionality, and integration with other standards and guidance their proposals will bring and justification for the approaches to design and construction being proposed. This will be a key tool in delivering places that are sustainable, inclusive, distinctive, and enduring.

Policy GP/HD: Housing density

Summary of Issues Arising from First Proposals Representations

General support for the policy, with developers supporting that there is no specific density figure being required, seeking to make the most of sustainable sites, and noting that the policy adheres to NPPF.

It should be a design-led approach, appropriate to local circumstances, and that the drive for higher density should not override consideration of landscape, townscape and heritage impacts from inappropriately tall buildings.

Parish councils were concerned that rural and non-rural areas should not be the same density.

Lockdowns underscored the crucial role of green spaces and corridors for the mental and physical health, especially for those living in high density housing, and that the policy should ensure accessible green space provision and provide opportunities for food growing where private gardens are not provided.

Policy should be amended to require smaller units on higher density sites in town centres and close to transport interchanges and on small, constrained sites, as these are less suited to families.

Policy should allow room for extensions to help families adapt and remain within their homes and communities. Also, to address concerns that at higher densities parking and hard landscaping areas increase the risk of surface water flooding, that the policy should require use of permeable materials.

Wide ranging concerns included that there is a need for proper family homes with gardens, higher densities will create the 'slums of tomorrow' leading to anti-social behaviour, crime, anxiety and mental ill-health, that a lack of parking impacts on community cohesion, and that there have been poor schemes in the past, with the Cambridge Station area mentioned.

Concern that if densities are increased too much it might decrease the quality of life, and might impact the quality of the city, including its economic prospects as companies will not want to move here.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

General support for the policy – noted

The policy includes a design led approach, which can respond to local circumstances but also the need to uplift density in appropriate locations.

Concern that rural and non-rural areas should not be the same density has been addressed by ensuring appropriate issues are considered when determining density.

Crucial role of green spaces – policies elsewhere in the draft plan seek to ensure development is accompanied by greenspace.

Policy should be amended to require smaller units on higher density sites – the draft plan also has policies on housing mix to ensure that needs are met overall but there will be locations where a greater mix of smaller units are more appropriate.

Policy should allow room for extensions to help families adapt and remain within their homes and communities – this has to be balanced against using land efficiently and providing homes where there is good access to public transport.

Higher densities parking and hard landscaping areas increase the risk of surface water flooding – the drat local plan includes polices to ensure flood risk is properly considered, managed and mitigated.

Wide ranging concerns included that there is a need for proper family homes with gardens, higher densities will create the ‘slums of tomorrow’. Concern that if densities are increased too much it might decrease the quality of life – Higher density developments in the right places can be delivered at a high quality, and the plan includes a range of policies to ensure sites are well designed and accompanied by the right services and facilities.

Policy GP/ST: Skyline and tall buildings

Summary of Issues Arising from First Proposals Representations

A standalone policy was not proposed in the First Proposals.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

A standalone policy was not proposed in the First Proposals.

Policy GP/QP Establishing high quality landscape and public realm

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Many respondents expressed general support for the policy.

There were various suggestions to improve the policy. Many comments focussed upon improving the quality and experience of public spaces through the introduction of Home Zones, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and the principles of the 15-Minute City. Trumpington Residents Association (TRA) and others commented on the quality of the existing streetscape, the capacity of the streets and spaces within the

city and their overall maintenance. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that footways need to be more porous for pedestrians but also protect them from motorised vehicles. The same respondent asked how the Local Plan will treat anti-terror architecture.

Metro Property Unit Trust suggested narrowing the policy's scope to ensure that developments should just be landscape-led, but also respond to other design, land-use and landscape considerations. Contrastingly, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Cambridgeshire/ Bedfordshire/ Hertfordshire Area suggested expanding the scope of the policy to include local landscape and habitats and the need to prevent the introduction of new, or expansion of existing invasive species. The Wildlife Trust considered that the Building with Nature standards referred to in Policy BG/GI should be formally incorporated as a requirement into this policy or another appropriate policy such as GP/QD. A few developers questioned how the last bullet point of the policy, 'appropriate types of open space' will be tested, measured, and applied.

In terms of the additional survey questions, in relation to Q.7 (southern rural cluster) and Q.9 (kinds of housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces to include in villages) there were a number of suggestions, including an expressed desire for new development to be designed for children and a wish to make new development reflect village character. In relation to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), a high number of respondents expressed a desire for green spaces, tree, etc. to be included in the design of the site. Similar aspirations were expressed in response to Q.5 (Addenbrookes), Q.6 (Cambourne), Q.7 (southern rural cluster), Q.9 (kinds of housing, jobs, facilities, or open spaces to include in villages) and Q.13 (the broad aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). In terms of enhancing connectivity, respondents expressed support in relation to Q.3 (Cambridge East), Q.4 (Cambridge North-East), Q.6 (Cambourne), Q.7 (the southern rural cluster), Q.9 (the villages) and Q.13 (the broad aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge). There were particularly detailed representations expressing a desire to improve connectivity in Addenbrookes which was linked to Q.5 (Addenbrookes).

Specific comments in relation to public art were not made during the first stages of this consultation process.

Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

8.4 Many respondents generally supported the policy direction.

8.5 Some suggestions were made to the policy wording including requests for more clarity to identify what makes green gaps 'important'. Some respondents

identified areas of particular landscape value that should be protected such as the green corridors around the River Cam, River Great Ouse, Hobson's Brook and West Cambridge and the landscape south of Cambridge Biomedical Centre around White Hill. A few developers and landowners wanted the policy to allow for the consideration of development on its own merits and asked that the policy recognised the positive impact that development can have upon the character of landscapes. There were also requests for new developments to retain and enhance landscape features that have particular value, rather than retain all landscape features.

8.6 Cambridge Past, Present and Future argued that similar Local Plan policies had not been effective at protecting the setting of Cambridge from the cumulative impact of development and that the policy should require the planting of trees early to improve the screening of the city. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) also expressed a wish that the policy would prevent visually intrusive developments occurring. Contrastingly, Metro Property Unit Trust argued that the policy needed to ensure that the protection of trees is measured against other elements of the proposal. North Newnham Residents Association provided a number of comments relating to how the policy should protect and enhance hedges.

8.7 Historic England (HE) commented that views from the south and east of the city are being underplayed as a characteristic of the city and suggested that Heritage Impact Assessment should look at this issue. HE also argued that the policy should ensure that new development positively responds to Cambridge's historic landscape. Natural England stated that locally designated landscapes should be identified within the plan and given policy protection.

8.8 Some respondents argued that specific site proposals in the First Proposals would not be in line with this policy, in particular sites at Babraham, Sawston, and there was reference to Anglian Water's proposal at Honey Hill. Developers such as TOWN, argued that the policy will need to recognise the strategic objectives of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and avoid imposing conditions that could unreasonably restrict development.

8.9 Some respondents including some Parish Councils argued that Important Countryside Frontages (ICFs) are an important policy tool for protecting villages, whereas other respondents saying they were an unnecessary additional layer of constraint to development. Some respondents asked for additional ICFs , whereas other respondents asked for ICFs to be removed.

8.10 In terms of the additional survey questions, there were a high number of representations in response to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East) which supported

the protection of existing natural and landscapes, or provision of new green spaces. In response to Q.7 (southern rural cluster), Q.8 (villages), Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge), there were some representations which expressed support for protecting Greater Cambridge's landscape and there were concerns that new development could harm existing landscapes.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

8.24 Many comments were received in relation to the protection of specific areas of landscape value. A 'character-based approach' has been followed for the policy based upon the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment (GC LCA) (2021). This approach has been followed as it recognises the character, diversity and natural beauty of all landscapes across the whole of Greater Cambridge rather than a 'local landscape designations approach' which identifies and focuses on specific areas of greater landscape value.

8.25 As explained above, the reference to important green gaps made at First Proposals was in response to continuing Policy NH/1 in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) which protects the areas of countryside between Longstanton village and the new town of Northstowe. It was considered that there are no other specific green gaps that are important from a landscape point of view and that it is unnecessary to include this as part of the policy. The continuation of the protection of the gap between Longstanton and Northstowe is included within the Northstowe policy.

8.26 The policy seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the landscape and recognises that development can provide opportunities for this. It has been drafted to recognise that landscape features that positively contribute to the quality and character of the area should be protected, conserved and enhanced, responding to a comment that not all landscape features have value.

8.27 The policy has a clause relating to the cumulative effects of development to avoid incremental harm to local landscape character. Policy BG/TC: Tree Canopy Cover and the Tree Population requires additional tree planting and the protection of trees and hedgerows.

8.28 The GC LCA looked in detail at the physical and human/cultural influences to identify the Landscape Character Areas including the consideration of historic landscape character. This is therefore an intrinsic part of the description of each Landscape Character Area and the landscape sensitivities and landscape guidelines provided in the GC LCA, and which should be

considered in new development proposals. With regards to Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), the methodology for carrying out HIAs in Greater Cambridge recognises the importance of all strategic views across and within the city. Through the Skyline and Tall Buildings Strategy, the viewpoints are being updated in consultation with Historic England, including dynamic views.

8.29 With regards to criticism of existing development proposals, all applications are subject to landscape character policies in the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (2018). These policies refer to older studies and the more recent 2021 GC LCA is also used in the consideration of development proposals as an updated piece of evidence that covers the whole of Greater Cambridge . The identification of sites within the Local Plan has followed a rigorous approach to site assessment, set out in the Greater Cambridge Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The sites were assessed against a wide range of criteria including landscape and townscape, carried out by landscape architects.

8.30 Responses to representations regarding Important Countryside Frontages are included in the Protected Open Space study, which is an appendix to the Biodiversity and Green Spaces Topic Paper.

Policy GP/HE Historic Environment

Summary of Issues Arising from First Proposals Representations

9.9 Historic England provided substantial comments in response to Policy GP/HA, which included various suggestions. Of particular note were comments that the initial policy approach set out in the First Proposals was too focused on the City and more needed to be done to recognise heritage across Greater Cambridge in a holistic way. Historic England suggested that the Councils should provide a positive strategy for the historic environment and include a strategic policy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment. Other commenting parties considered more could be done to recognise the value of heritage beyond designated heritage assets.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

9.19 Heritage assets play an important part in the local character and identity of the district, and it is it important that both designated and non-designated heritage assets are recognised, protected and wherever practical enhanced by development. Therefore, in refining the Local Plan's approach to the historic environment, the Councils have prepared Policy GP/HE as a means of

ensuring the historic environment is considered holistically through a strategic policy framework.

9.20 This overarching policy sets out the heritage strategy, alongside broader principles of conservation.

9.21 GP/HE address concerns raised in representations regarding HIAs by ensuring that applications have to submit a thorough, comprehensive and proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment, which considers the cumulative impacts, heritage significance and opportunities for enhancement.

Policy GP/HA Designated Heritage Assets

Summary of Issues Arising from First Proposals Representations

10.5 The comments from the first proposals of the Local Plan express broad support for the inclusion of a heritage policy, however some comments raised concerns about the policy's current scope and effectiveness. A central issue raised is the overly narrow focus on designated heritage assets within Cambridge city, with comments made about the insufficient attention currently being given to the heritage significance of surrounding villages, non-designated assets, and wider historic landscapes. Respondents felt that the policy fail to reflect the full richness of the historic environment, including intangible heritage, and lacks references to key resources such as the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record and local Conservation Area Appraisals.

10.6 Many comments highlighted the need for a more holistic and strategic approach to heritage across the entire Local Plan. It was suggested that rather than being confined to a single chapter, historic environment considerations should be embedded throughout the plan, influencing decisions on growth, infrastructure, and sustainability. Further comments suggested that the proposed policy would not adequately balance development with heritage protection and enhancement. Several stakeholders recommend involving Historic England's Historic Places Panel to provide a wider strategic overview.

10.7 Some respondents criticised approaches taken to the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment (SHIA) and individual Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), which were viewed as lacking rigour, transparency, and coverage. Comments were received around how these assessments effectively assess the cumulative impacts of development, and how they properly evaluate Cambridge's heritage as a whole. Other respondents suggested there was an overreliance on visual distance rather than cultural significance, limited consideration of archaeological potential, and limited assessments of non-designated areas or approach roads into the city.

10.8 While a number of comments were generally supportive of the policy, some suggested it did not fully align with national policy and guidance suggesting that new policies for issues such as Heritage at Risk, historic shopfronts, and

the treatment of archaeology, should be introduced to address gaps in the proposed policy approach.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

10.16 Policy GP/HA addresses concerns raised in representations around the design and impact of new development on designated heritage assets. By encouraging design that responds positively to the heritage context, new development will need to contribute to and enhance local distinctiveness, thereby ensuring growth complements rather than erodes the unique character of Greater Cambridge's historic urban and rural assets.

10.17 GP/HA also addresses concerns raised in representations regarding conservation areas, with clear and concise policy requirements, in regard to development that would affect the designated heritage asset, alongside buildings or structures that make a positive contribution to the wider conservation area.

10.18 In responses to the responses received, we have developed additional heritage policies to address the broad and diverse heritage of Greater Cambridge, including GP/HA which addresses designated heritage assets, GP/ND which addresses non-designated heritage assets with explicit reference to the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record, GP/AR which addresses archaeology and GP/SF which addresses shopfronts. Having individual policies for each element of the historic environment has enabled us to develop more specific and targeted approaches to different types of historic assets.

Policy GP/ND Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Summary of Issues Arising from First Proposals Representations

11.5 The comments received during the First Proposals consultation reflected the strong support for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment of Greater Cambridge. Comments received emphasised the need for a broader and more inclusive approach to heritage, expanding beyond designated heritage assets and more explicitly including non-designated heritage assets as part of the decision-making process. This included the need for references to be made to local records such as Cambridgeshire's Historic Environment Record.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

11.10 The Local Planning Authority acknowledge that planning policy should approach the historic environment holistically and consider aspects of the historic environment beyond designated heritage assets. The Local Planning Authority also appreciates that non-designated heritage assets can play a

very important role in helping to define the historic character of Greater Cambridge and that some locally important heritage assets make major contributions to community identity and wellbeing. Therefore, Policy GP/ND seeks to introduce policy requirements that seek to preserve non-designated heritage assets and ensure that decisions are balanced when considering development that either directly or indirectly affects these assets.

11.11 The Local Planning Authority also acknowledge that non-designated heritage assets are considered differently to designated heritage assets, both in terms of national planning policy and in law. Policy GP/ND has sought to separate requirements for designated heritage assets from non-designated heritage assets to provide clarity to both applicants and decision makers. This includes reference to Cambridgeshire's Local Heritage List – the primary database of non-designated heritage assets in Cambridgeshire.

Policy GP/AR Archaeology

Summary of Issues Arising from First Proposals Representations

12.10 Comments received emphasised the need for a clearer approach to archaeology within the Local Plan. This included the need for references to be made to local records such as Cambridgeshire's Historic Environment Record.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

12.16 The Councils appreciate that archaeology is a significant consideration for planning decisions and that the matter of archaeology can be very complex. Therefore, to clarify the Local Plan's archaeological requirements, taking account of the archaeological potential across the whole of the Greater Cambridge area, it was considered that the matter would be best addressed under a separate local planning policy, particularly when factoring the recent guidance published by Historic England.

Policy GP/CC: Adapting Heritage Assets to Climate Change

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

13.6 Broad support for the policy was expressed within the representations from a range of individuals, public bodies, organisations and developers. Histon and Impington PC supported the policy on the condition that retrofitting improvements don't harm heritage assets. Linton PC questioned the need for old buildings to adapt and argued that modern changes could harm the buildings. Comments included the need for clarity regarding what interventions are necessary to end heritage assets reliance on fossil fuels, that the policy should relate to all buildings of traditional construction and should relate to policy CC/NZ.

13.7 Cambridge Past, Present & Future stated that it would be useful to provide clear guidance on the appropriate location of solar panels on heritage assets and buildings within conservation areas. Gamlingay Parish Council stated that more support is needed to help residents with listed buildings retrofit temporary fittings to roof structures.

13.8 Historic England (HE) broadly support the policy but provided comments including that it should articulate the significant carbon output that is produced when demolishing old buildings and policies should recognise the benefits of sympathetic restoration and retrofitting historic buildings. HE noted that listed buildings, buildings in Conservation Areas and scheduled monuments are exempted from the need to comply with energy efficiency requirements of Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. HE noted that traditional buildings can be impacted by climate change to a greater degree than modern buildings and linked a number of publications to help guide the draft policy.

13.9 In terms of the additional survey questions, in relation to Q.4 (Cambridge North-East) and Q.13 (aspirational vision for Greater Cambridge) some respondents expressed a preference for retrofitting properties over creating new development.

Response to main issues raised in representations

13.23 Responses to general issues raised in representations include:

13.24 Representations calling for the policy to consider all buildings of traditional construction – policy in the local plan can only be applied for works that require planning permission. Traditionally built properties that do not fall under the definition of a heritage asset may not require planning permission for certain works to enhance their environmental performance and would fall outside the lens of the policy. However, it is noted that guidance for these types of properties is still important, and indeed the guidance documents and whole buildings approach referenced in the policy will be applicable. As such, wording has been added to the supporting text to promote the use of this guidance for all traditionally built properties.

13.25 Representations calling for guidance on the placement of renewable energy technologies for listed buildings – Historic England already publish guidance.

Policy GP/SF: Shopfronts

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

14.4 A standalone policy was not proposed in the First Proposals.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

14.15 Through drafting of the local plan the Councils identified that a new standalone policy was needed to address this issue.

Jobs

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the jobs theme:

Some developers, private-sector organisations and councils expressed support for the aims of the policies in this section. A few parish councils argued the statistics forecasting jobs growth need to be reconsidered after Covid-19 and three respondents argued that the figures were too high.

A few landowners argued that the policies do not promote the needs of Cambridge's high technology clusters or life sciences sectors. Some landowners also emphasised the need for the Local Plan to be flexible in its approach to commercial, retail and leisure uses. Contrastingly Histon and Impington Parish Council argued that new jobs should not be limited to high-tech jobs but cover a range of employment types. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that the Local Plan must effectively tackle poverty and inequality in Greater Cambridgeshire and that growth in high-tech clusters will not address these problems. Great Shelford Parish Council argued that the policies in the Jobs Chapter needed to place a greater emphasis upon protecting the rural economy. There were a few comments relating to sites, with developers arguing that their site could deliver the aims of the policies.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters includes:

- The evidence informing the needs identified in the plan has been updated to inform this draft local plan. Further information on this can be found in the strategy topic paper.
- Updated evidence has also been prepared to examine employment land supply needs, including for specific sectors.
- Policies have been included which seek to share the benefits of growth and development. Policies in this chapter propose to require an element of large scale proposals to provide affordable employment space. A policy requiring

employment and skills plans as part of proposals is included in the wellbeing chapter.
- Policies are included to support the rural economy.

The following proposed policies areas are addressed in this topic paper:

- J/NE: New employment and development proposals
- J/RE: Supporting the Rural Economy
- J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land
- J/PB: Protecting Existing Business Space
- J/AW: Affordable workspaces and creative industries
- J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks
- J/RC: Retail and Other Complementary Town Centre Uses
- J/SA: Cambridge City's Primary Shopping Area
- J/MS: Markets and Street Trading
- J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities
- J/FD: Faculty development and specialist / language schools

Policy J/NE: New employment and development proposals

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

This policy attracted a substantial number of detailed representations. Some parish councils, district councils, landowners and developers expressed support for the policy. Reasons included that it would support delivery of a mix of types of employment, ensure developments were appropriate in scale to their location, and could support providing jobs where there are good transport links.

Babraham Research Campus Ltd broadly supported the policy but asked that policy wording is clearly written to confirm that employment development will be supported in policy areas in the countryside. Other respondents sought amendments to policy areas, such as at Granta Park. Gamlingay Parish Council asked that proposals are proportional in scale and retain the character of the rural area so that they correspond with Gamlingay's Neighbourhood Plan.

Some individuals perceived there to be enough employment in the area and thought that facilitating more jobs would create a need for more homes. Contrastingly, other respondents, mainly developers and landowners, perceived the policy to be too restrictive, and that greater flexibility was required. Some argued that the policy should do more to support clusters, and allow more employment development in various locations. Endurance Estates argued that the emerging policies for industrial

development would suppress demand. The same respondent argued that the employment land evidence base underestimates the actual need for Class B2 and B8 uses. Similarly, Newlands Developments argued that the Plan needs to account for increasing growth in the research and innovation, logistics and advanced manufacturing sectors especially in the context of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. Tritax Symmetry stated that the failure to address logistics floorspace will lead to increased vehicle miles as businesses and households are supplied from facilities further away. A few developers, including Lolworth Developments Limited, stated that the Plan does not meet NPPF's requirement for planning policies to accommodate the bespoke locational requirements for storage and distribution operations of all scales.

The Education and Skills Agency asked for the policy to recognise the direct and indirect skills and employment benefits of education facilities. BioMed Realty asked for the policy to support the needs of clusters and proactively recognise opportunities for some densification to make best use of established R&D Parks, and that policies within the emerging local plan should explicitly support employment development. Hallam Land Management Limited argued that here should also be consideration of data centres. There were a few site-specific comments where developers promoted their land as a suitable place to deliver the policies. There were also objectors such as Trumpington Resident Association who argued that certain sites were not appropriate for development.

Response to Main Issues raised in representations

A number of comments raise issues about the overall quantity and type of employment land being supported by the plan. The strategy section of the plan considers these issues and has been informed by update evidence regarding need. The plan has also considered the needs of clusters, considering both quantitative and qualitative aspects of policy. Sites like Babraham Research Park and Granta Park have received specific policy responses in the draft plan responding to their specific circumstances. Since the First Proposals consultation additional evidence has been commissioned regarding the need for industry and warehousing land, and the strategy has responded to that need with proposed allocations.

A site representation was received to the call for sites submissions update in 2025 suggesting alternative uses for the Eternit site in Meldreth, for residential use or alternative industrial uses. The site did not meet the identified strategy approach to residential development. Very limited information was submitted on the suitability for alternative uses as a data or energy centre. It remains proposed as an established employment area.

Policy J/RE: Supporting the Rural Economy

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

The University of Cambridge and several parish councils supported the policy.

The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) stated that the policy should be strengthened and properly enforced citing issues of security from opening up tracks and bridleways. At the same time, the British Horse Society highlighted the importance of the bridleway network for economic social and well being. KWA Architects argued the scope of the policy should not be limited to reusing and replacing buildings to allow, for example, for the equestrian industry's needs to be taken into account. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council wished to ensure that small employment sites should not expand into the countryside. Anaerobic digestion was highlighted as a potential alternative use and the need for a strategic plan identified. Cambridge Past Present and Future stated that if proposals relate to solar or windfarms the policy need to relate back to CC/RE and protection of landscape. Huntingdonshire District Council expressed concern over the deliverability of the policy in the context of the wide range of uses facilitated through the prior approval and notification process.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should enable the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural. The draft policy seeks to strike the right balance between supporting the rural economy, and restricting development where it would not be sustainable. The policy focuses initially on using existing resources such as redundant buildings, but will allow new buildings in appropriate circumstances. In combination with other policies in the plan this is considered an appropriate level of flexibility. Some types of development are now covered by permitted development rules, but it is important that the plan maintains a policy framework for the consideration of proposals when permission is required.

Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Some parish councils, government and political organisations expressed support for the policy, caveated by Gamlingay Parish Council that it must be above sea level and have suitable drainage. Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited questioned the need for this policy as they perceived it to already be included in national policy. Claremont Planning Consultancy suggested that there will be some instances where the loss of agricultural land will be required to meet development needs. In contrast, a number of respondents argued that the Plan's infrastructure and housing proposals would contravene this policy and the National Planning Policy Framework. It was suggested that this loss should be explicitly quantified in individual site policies. The Campaign to Protect Rural England argued that the policies should be strengthened

and properly enforced cited the damage and security issues caused by opening up tracks and bridleways.

There were requests that the policy take account of alternative reversible uses of agricultural land, for example equestrian uses and the land needs of renewable or infrastructure developments, was requested. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties asked for reassurances that this policy would not prevent habitat restoration projects on drained peat soils currently under agricultural use.

There were a few representations relating to specific sites; some argued that the policy would be contravened by the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus proposals. Whereas some developers argued that there were clear instances when it would be necessary to build upon agricultural land and posited specific examples.

Response to Main Issues Raised in representations

The NPPF states that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. This policy seeks to clarify how the NPPF will be applied in Greater Cambridge through preventing development which would lead to irreversible loss of Grades 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land unless under specific circumstances.

National Planning policy requires strategic policies to provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. The plan allocations have been through a comprehensive assessment in the HELAA process, and sustainability appraisal, where a wide range of factors, including the grade of agricultural land have been assessed. It is not possible to meet needs only using brownfield land in this area, and much of the remaining land is agricultural.

On other issues raised, footways and bridleways are addressed in Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity. Point 2 allows that temporary uses may be possible with an appropriate condition. The policies caveat under Point 1 for sustainability considerations and the need for the development provide the potential flexibility to address important climate change and infrastructure projects.

Policy J/PB: Protecting Existing Business Space

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Some individuals, developers, charities, and parish councils expressed support for the policy. Contrastingly, Croydon parish council argued that protecting business spaces should be considered on a case-by-case basis. A few developers, including Abrdn, argued that the policy should recognise the increasing importance of town centres catering for flexible uses, and that office uses are not always required. The same respondents also stated that re-developing brownfield land and re-providing existing uses alongside co-located residential uses is a better way to utilise land. DB Group Holdings LTD argued that protection for existing business space needs to extend to ensure that expansion opportunities are supported. The same group asked for measures to be included to ensure that other development that is supported by the Plan does not constrain existing successful business sites. There were also some site-specific comments, where developers and landowners explained how their sites could fulfil the aims of the policy.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

The representations provide a range of opinions, supporting the need for protection of employment land through to the need for flexibility. The draft policy strikes the right balance, protecting this important resource, but not being so onerous as to provide unreasonable levels of long term protection.

Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There were less representations in response to this policy compared to other policies in the Jobs Chapter. Some developers, parish councils, charities, and landowners expressed support for this policy. Histon and Impington PC wanted the affordability of the workplaces to be higher and set at 80% rather than 60%.

Contrastingly, Mission Street Ltd questioned the requirements of the policy due to a perceived lack of evidence justifying the level of affordable workspace and the scale of development that should provide it. The same respondent asked for clarity relating to key terms in the policy and asked for the policy to have greater flexibility so that the rate of affordable workspace is proportionate to the scale of the development. Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited argued that it was not acceptable for a commercial development to subsidise workspace. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties supported the aims of this policy but wanted the rate which is considered ‘affordable’ to be set through assessment of the ability of the target market to pay the rates. Contrastingly, the Universities Superannuation Scheme recommend that affordable workspace requirements are subject to viability

to ensure marginal schemes are not unnecessarily restricted from coming forward. The same respondent also argued that the provision of affordable workspace on-site is not always appropriate and wanted the policy to allow for financial contributions for equivalent off-site provision. A few developers and landowners put forward site specific comments and explained how their sites would deliver the aims of the policy.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

A need for affordable workspace has been identified. Further work will consider the appropriate levels of discount and these will be tailored to reflect market rates in different areas. The requirements for workspace will be a percentage and therefore will vary according to the scale of the development. An example is provided to aid understanding so that consultees can respond to the direction of travel. The policy recognises that there may be circumstances where off-site provision or payments in-lieu may be appropriate. Requirements for affordable workspace from commercial developments have operated successfully in other areas such as Hammersmith and Fulham and Lambeth. The policy recognises that there may be circumstances where off-site provision or payments in-lieu may be appropriate.

Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Issues raised in the representations include:

- General support for supporting a range of facilities from a number of the organisations that responded to the consultation.
- Requests for additional types of facilities to be added to the policy. These included showering facilities and water refilling stations, flexible business space and a range of green spaces.
    - A request for Section 106 contributions to pay for facilities and for investment support for active travel.

Response to Main issues raised in representations

Responses largely supported to aim of delivering appropriate facilities. The wording of the policy provides a broad framework that provides flexibility for employment parks to accommodate a tailored range of facilities to support the amenity of workers.

Policy J/MS: Markets and Street Trading

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

A standalone policy was not proposed in the First Proposals. However, in response to the proposed policy on Retail and Centres some respondents, especially parish councils, noted the importance of protecting and supporting smaller shops, services, and amenities in villages and elsewhere. Some respondents argued that facilities in new settlement centres should be protected to serve the residents and prevent car journeys.

While there was general support for the Council's strategic vision for Greater Cambridge, with a focus on community building, climate change mitigation and adaption, and enhancing local character, some respondents expressed concern that the proposed policies would not support the delivery of this vision. For example, on community building, some felt that the narrow focus on centres would result in heartless, community-poor developments.

The need for a more focused, standalone approach on markets emerged from this body of responses, given the potential for markets to positively support community development, alongside the need to put in place sufficient safeguards to ensure that permanent shops are not adversely affected by market traders selling similar goods and services.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

The policy takes a balanced approach in response to the general comments raised at the First Proposals consultation. Successful markets can play a crucial role in supporting community development and cohesion, supporting local economic development by providing opportunities for small and micro businesses to trade and enabling different members of the together to interact and connect.

The policy responds positively to those respondents that felt the Local Plan could go further in supporting initiatives that support community building. It provides explicit support for the establishment of new markets and the creation of well-designed places for them to take place, spaces which can be used flexibly for other community uses outside of trading hours.

However, in response to the concerns raised about the lack of safeguards to protect smaller shops, especially in villages, the markets policy puts in place proportionate criteria to ensure that markets complement rather than compete with permanent shops. This will be particularly important in villages, where the permanent retail offer can be a lifeline for local residents, and in emerging centres where permanent shops are at the early stages of establishing themselves.

Policy J/RC: Retail and Other Complementary Town Centre Uses

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Several respondents expressed support for the proposed policy in the First Proposals (J/RC). Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC argued that the policy needed to have a greater focus on rural shops and services. Abrdn, the Universities Superannuation Scheme and the Education and Skills Funding Agency, supported elements of the policy but objected to potential Article 4 Directions that restrict alternative uses, arguing that alternative uses improve vitality of city centres.

Contrastingly, Cambridge Past, Present and Future argued that shops and services should be protected from change of use through removal of permitted development rights. A few developers, including Abrdn, felt that the policy lacked sufficient

flexibility to enable Greater Cambridge's centres to adapt to the contemporary economic climate; in particular, the aspect of the policy which would resist the loss of retail or other town centre uses in existing centres and primary shopping areas. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that encouraging small-scale units in Cambridge may not be sufficient to attract the range of users mentioned in the policy.

Representations made in relation to other Local Plan policies are also relevant considerations for this policy. The Education and Skills Funding Agency (Department for Education) suggested that the Local Plan makes clear that education facilities serving a wider catchment area will not be considered a town centre use requiring sequential approach to be applied, but that any such facilities must be in sustainable, accessible locations (representation made in relation to the proposed approach to Policy WS/CF).

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

The plan seeks to protect and enhance the town centres of Greater Cambridge, but there are limits to what can achieved given the flexibility provided by national planning policy and general trends in retail provision. There were mixed views on whether Article 4 notices should be used to enable greater control change of use. The supporting text around the proposed policy clarifies the potential for these to be considered outside the plan making process, subject to there being sufficient evidence, but also highlights the potential for other planning controls, including conditions, to restrict inappropriate conversions wherever possible.

Some representors sought an emphasis on protecting rural shops and services. Reflecting the vital role these play in maintaining the rural economy and serving the day-to-day needs of residents more sustainably, the proposed policy incorporates specific protections for main town centre uses across Greater Cambridge's full network of centres, including both rural centres and minor rural centres, but also affords protection for village shops and services in smaller villages not part of the centres hierarchy. These are tied to the criteria established in Policy W/CF Community, Sports, and Leisure Facilities. The policy directs proposals for new town centre uses to the larger designated centres, in line with the proposed hierarchy, ensuring proposals are of an appropriate scale to the location.

In response to the comments raised around education uses in town centres, the NPPF is clear that education facilities should not be considered a main town centre use and, as such, are not subject to sequential testing. The policies in the draft Local Plan collectively do not preclude education uses within the network of centres, with the exception of within ground floor spaces within the Primary Shopping Area (see Policy J/SA), however proposals would be considered on their merits in line with the

general requirements of this policy and other relevant policies in the Plan, in particular Policy WS/CF Community, Sports and Leisure Facilities which establishes criteria for the provision of new facilities, including education.

Policy J/SA: Cambridge City's Primary Shopping Area

Summary of Issues Arising from First Proposals Representations

Cambridge's city centre was a key issue raised in response to Policy J/RC. Some respondents, such as the Universities Superannuation Scheme, supported the development of a specific approach to retail policy for Cambridge City Centre, including its shopping areas. Histon and Impington Parish Council questioned whether the City Centre would be able to support leisure activities. Others highlighted that flexible approaches may be needed to use classes to combat empty shops and help the City Centre function as an experiential destination, whilst some objected to the use of planning controls to control the change of use of existing buildings.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations

The policy responds directly to the feedback received in the First Proposals by proposing a specific policy for the Primary Shopping Area, which puts in place additional safeguards against inappropriate uses and proposals that would harm the role and purpose of the City Centre. The policy also, in response to comments raised by respondents, clarifies the range of specific uses (beyond retail) that would be deemed acceptable in ground floor spaces, and provides particular support for leisure and cultural development that would complement ground floor uses, recognising the need for additional flexibilities to enable the city centre to evolve sustainably whilst supporting its vibrancy and vitality.

Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

The consultation on the First Proposals indicated that in general there was support for the proposed policy direction. CBC Ltd indicated that a need for visitor accommodation, for both business and visitor use, and a conference centre had been identified at Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Marshall Group Properties stated that there are opportunities at Cambridge East to provide a range of retail and leisure services and facilities. There were requests for recognition in the policy of the potential role of retail centres, and particularly the city centre, in providing space for new visitor accommodation and attractions.

Concern was expressed over the loss of housing to short terms letting accommodation. There were also concerns over the capacity of visitor attractions to accommodate increased visitor numbers, with the levels likely to grow given growing population in the area and the development of new visitor accommodation. There

was a request that the policy should support well-designed, sustainable improvements to existing attractions and a suggestion that new visitor accommodation should be asked for a contribution to mitigate their impact. Greater clarity was requested regarding when new attractions would be acceptable in rural areas and concern that the policy would have the potential to conflict with the Plan's green infrastructure policies.

Response to Main issues raised in representations

Comments in general support of the policy approach are noted. Comments suggested support for additional visitor accommodation at specific strategic sites such as the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambridge East. This is addressed in the policy and site specific policies for these sites consider this issue.

In terms of visitor pressure, Cambridge City Council is working in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Visit Cambridge partners: Cambridge BID, King's College and Curating Cambridge to develop a new Destination Management Plan (DMP) for Greater Cambridge. The new DMP will provide the strategic roadmap for the sustainable development, delivery and management of tourism in Greater Cambridge. This aims to ensure that the visitor economy continues to positively contribute to the city and region in the future.

One representation queried what new attractions would be acceptable in rural areas given potential conflict with other policies. The draft policy clarifies that the focus is on supporting existing tourism assets, and that scheme is in scale with its location and the nature of the facility it supports.

The draft policy recognises the potential negative impacts of short term lettings and, where planning permission is required, introduces criteria which must be met in order for any application to be approved.

Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist / language schools

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There were not many representations in response to this policy. A parish council, the University of Cambridge, Anglia Ruskin University, and a developer expressed support for the policy. The Education and Skills Agency supported the policy direction but recommended that the supporting text makes a distinction between privately operated and state-funded education, due to changes of use under permitted development rights. Anglia Ruskin University provided a lengthy representation where they suggested improvements to the policy to better reflect their strategic priorities. B Marshall objected to the policy on the grounds that providing student accommodation for language students worsens the learning experience and leads to more under-utilised facilities and removes a source of income for low-income families. Contrastingly, F Gawthrop asked for the policy to be strengthened to not allow language students to stay in family dwellings.

Response to Main issues raised in representations

In addition to this policy, the Eastern Gate Public Realm Improvement Area covering ARU's East Road campus is proposed in the draft plan. Together, these policies support ARU's approach that their East Road campus and the wider area along East Road is the most sustainable locations for faculty development for ARU during the next plan period.

Further clarification has been provided to make clear that homestays are an acceptable form of off-site residential accommodation. This would mean a family remains resident in the property with one or more students. However, entire residential properties used to accommodate specialist college or language school students (and staff) with no resident family is not an acceptable form of off-site residential accommodation.

Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Some parish councils, developers, developers, political organisations and the University of Cambridge expressed support for the policy. A few respondents, including Carbon Neutral Cambridge, emphasised the importance of ensuring the policy Greater Cambridge's rural communities. Two commenters, including Central Bedfordshire Council, argued that the policy could be strengthened to refer to the provision of home office space in new dwellings as the emphasis is currently on the delivery of external hubs or extensions. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties asked that extensions were rigorously tested for proof of a need for homeworking.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

Representations showed general support for measures to support remote working. However, a revised policy approach is now proposed.

Homes

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the homes theme:

There is general support for the proposed housing policies from some Parish Councils, Cambourne TC and some site promoters. General comments on the homes chapter include support for the Local Plan requiring a wide range of housing – type, size and tenure - as this will improve the ability of the market to achieve enhanced levels of delivery and will support the creation of diverse communities. Specific comments suggest the need for family homes with gardens within the city and the need to reuse vacant buildings to minimise whole life carbon emissions. Parish Councils suggest that there is a need to prevent building of new homes while others remain empty, and the need to protect new homes from being lost to buy to let. Metro Property Unit Trust asks for the housing policies to recognise the importance of purpose-built student accommodation, as this reduces the demand on

the existing and proposed housing stock. Great Shelford PC highlight that homes do not make a community, and that they need to be supported by infrastructure. Many respondents emphasises the need for affordable housing, others questioned the need for more housing.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters includes:

- Noting support for address a range of housing issues in the emerging plan.
- Both Council's acknowledge that bringing vacant homes back into use is an important issue. Making the best use of existing homes in Cambridge is one of the key objectives in our Housing Strategy. Empty homes make up less than 1% of the housing stock.
- The draft plan identifies a range of specialist housing needs, including student accommodation.
- The draft plan is informed by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and includes policies that seek to ensure infrastructure responds to the need generated by new developments.

For the specific policies set out in the Homes chapter, a summary of the responses received on each policy are set out below:

- H/AH: Affordable housing
- H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing
- H/HM: Housing mix
- H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots
- H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes
- H/SH: Specialist housing
- H/CB: Self and custom build homes
- H/BR: Built to rent homes
- H/CO: Co-living
- H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)
- H/SA: Student accommodation
- H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside
- H/RM: Residential moorings
- H/GT: Gypsy and traveller pitches and travelling showpeople plots

Policy H/AH Affordable Housing

Representations Received

There is support for the policy direction from many developers whilst parish councils, community groups and individuals want the policy to go further by providing homes that are more affordable, more secure and are run by community groups or local authorities. There are also calls for affordable housing to be targeted at local people, older people and key workers and for a broader range of affordable tenures including low cost home ownership. Parish councils, community groups and individuals want to see the 40% requirement strictly enforced whilst developers call for flexibility based on robust viability assessments and review mechanisms which also cater for specific needs of schemes such as Extra Care schemes which cannot compete with market housing. They also highlight exemptions set out in the NPPF. There are disagreements over clustering with parish councils wanting affordable housing spread across developments but developers calling for some flexibility to match Registered Provider preferences. Developers argue that allocating more small sites will deliver more affordable housing more quickly than relying on strategic sites with their significant infrastructure overheads.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

There is an acute need for affordable housing in Greater Cambridge, and therefore seeking high levels of affordable housing on major developments for housing will make a significant contribution towards responding to our identified affordable housing needs. At least 40% affordable homes on major developments (including Built to Rent developments) and at least 50% affordable homes on Green Belt developments have been demonstrated to be deliverable through whole plan viability testing. National planning policy only allows affordable homes to be sought on major developments for housing, and therefore the policy reflects this, however, developers or Registered Providers can choose to deliver affordable homes on smaller developments or through the delivery of rural exception sites for affordable housing (see Policy H/ES). The draft policy takes account of the changes to national planning policy and guidance in relation to the provision of affordable housing that have been published since First Proposals, including the removal of the specific requirement for 25% of the affordable homes to be First Homes.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire have been identified as areas of high affordability pressure, and it is therefore important that the delivery of affordable housing for rent is prioritised, whilst also recognising that other affordable tenures may be required to support the delivery of affordable housing for rent through cross subsidy. The draft policy seeks an affordable housing tenure mix that will meet a wide range of housing needs and create mixed and balanced communities, whilst also taking account of viability. The Local Plan as a whole seeks to deliver truly affordable housing by requiring the provision of affordable housing on new major developments, but also by combining this with directing new homes to the most sustainable locations within Greater Cambridge where there is access to public transport or services and facilities within walking or cycling distance, and by requiring

all new homes to be designed to meet the highest achievable standards for water and energy use therefore reducing utility bills.

National planning policy makes clear that planning applications that comply with up-to-date policies should be assumed to be viable. However, national planning policy and guidance does allow for applicants to demonstrate through a viability assessment that in their particular circumstances that if some or all of the development requirements are imposed then the development is unviable. National planning policy and guidance have not been replicated in this policy as Local Plans should avoid unnecessary duplication with policies in the NPPF. No specific details have been provided on which costs may have been underestimated, however, the Viability Assessment to support the Greater Cambridge Local Plan has been prepared taking account of statutory requirements, guidance and best practice, and it considers a range of development scenarios and residential typologies. The Viability Assessment has specifically considered the delivery of affordable housing on specialist housing developments, such as for older people, and has concluded that it is viable to seek similar levels of affordable provision as with other homes.

National statutory and/or regulatory requirements apply such that no affordable homes can be protected in perpetuity, however any capital receipts received from the sale of an affordable home are reinvested into affordable housing in Greater Cambridge. Local Lettings Plans will be used where appropriate to prioritise affordable rent and social rent housing for local workers or specific groups of people. The mix of houses and flats on a new development is the result of its design, and is influenced by its location and the character of its surroundings – specific requirements are set out in Policy H/HM. To create mixed and balanced communities the policy requires new affordable homes to be dispersed in small groups or clusters throughout the development, and the policy allows some flexibility to reflect site specific circumstances. The policy does not preclude the delivery of modular pod affordable homes to meet the needs of those that are homeless.

A variety of sites have been considered through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment process and assessed against the development strategy for the Local Plan, and those sites identified as suitable and deliverable within the plan period have been allocated. Having considered a range of alternative strategies, the proposed development strategy focusses site allocations for new homes and jobs to the most sustainable locations of Cambridge urban area, the edge of Cambridge and the new settlements as these have: the least climate impact, active and public transport as the natural choice, and jobs, services and facilities near to where people live. Affordable homes will also continue to be delivered on windfall sites and through rural exception sites for affordable housing.

H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was general support for the policy with parish councils and individuals seeking stronger controls whilst developers prefer a more flexible approach. The stronger controls suggested include: the requirement for local community support and/or leadership; robust evidence of local need; stricter criteria particularly in the green belt; local connection policies; no market housing; and prioritising the most sustainable communities and community led housing initiatives. Those arguing for more flexibility suggested: prioritising key workers alongside local people; allowing schemes in the green belt and across all types of villages; and a more positive approach to market housing.

There was some concern that rural exception schemes could be used as a trojan horse to enable larger schemes or schemes on unsuitable sites to come forward. However, it was also suggested that rejected larger/unsuitable sites should be considered for rural exception schemes.

There was a preference for rural exception sites to be prioritised over First Homes exceptions sites with Green Belt controls seen as a key tool for achieving this.

Response to issues raised in representations

A number of responses called for stronger controls on exception sites. The draft policy approach already included a number of controls to ensure that sites are appropriate in terms of meeting local need and being a suitable scale and design in relation to the adjoining settlement. Some suggestions were already addressed by the draft policy approach while some were considered impractical or contrary to national planning policy.

Robust evidence of local need, local connection criteria and the requirement of a sequential test in the Green Belt have all been used very successfully in rural exception site policy for many years. The most sustainable communities have always been the most likely location of exception schemes as they tend to be bigger and have greater levels of need. They also tend to have better facilities. Community led housing schemes can be delivered through exception sites but they still need to meet the same criteria as other proposals.

The requirement for local community support or leadership is impractical although always welcomed and could be a material consideration in considering proposals given that rural exception schemes should be addressing local need. Failure to garner support could be indicative of issues with the proposal.

Not accepting any market housing would be contrary to national planning policy although the draft policy does seek to minimise market housing to that required for viability purposes.

Developers preferred a more flexible approach to exception sites. The draft policy is considered to be sufficiently flexible to allow affordable housing schemes to be delivered which address identified housing need. It is important that clear constraints are applied to the inclusion of market housing to ensure that exception sites remain focused on their priority. National planning policy is very clear about how exception sites can be used in the Green Belt and there is no scope to flex this (and this approach is supported by many respondents). Key workers are not specifically included in the priority groups for exception sites. However, where they are eligible for affordable housing they will be eligible subject to them meeting other criteria.

The danger of exception sites being used as a loophole to increase delivery of market housing on inappropriate sites is recognised. The draft policy sets out clear criteria for where a small amount of market housing will be considered acceptable. It is important that any viability assessments use exception site land values as their starting point.

It is a sensible suggestion to review sites rejected for allocation through the call for sites process for potential exception sites. However, any forthcoming sites will still need to meet the policy criteria and demonstrate they are suitable for development as rural exception sites or First Homes exception sites. The consideration of sites does not need to be included in the policy.

Some respondents argued that custom and self build plots should not be included within exception sites. However, Greater Cambridge is failing to meet its statutory duty to grant sufficient permissions for custom and self build plots to match demand as measured by the custom and self build register. This has contributed to a number of appeals being lost. Therefore, it seems reasonable to encourage the consideration of custom and self build plots wherever appropriate. If planned correctly there is no reason why custom and self build plots should create additional management or maintenance issues. Neither should they cause viability issues as demand is strong and numbers can be planned to ensure viability remains intact. The policy encourages rather than requires custom and self build plots.

There were calls to prioritise rural exception sites over First Homes exception sites. Rural exception sites have played an important role in supporting rural sustainable communities in South Cambridgeshire for decades. There are more than 50 such

schemes in the district enabling people unable to afford market prices to live where they have deep seated roots. Rural exception schemes are considered to make a more valuable contribution to rural communities than First Homes exception sites and will therefore be prioritised.

Policy H/HM: Housing mix

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Support, from Parish Councils and site promoters, for the approach that new developments should have a mix of housing sizes. However, site promoters are seeking more flexibility in the approach to allow for changing market conditions, changing requirements, and site-specific circumstances. Site promoters suggest the policy does not stipulate percentages, includes indicative mix only or the ranges for some housing sizes and tenures are amended, and that each development should determine its own mix. Parish Councils would like policy to address need for provision of bungalows and protection of existing smaller homes. Comments that housing mix should allow for the provision of homes for young single person households. A site promoter objects to the potential to include a planning condition that removes permitted development rights for extensions where that would cause harm to the housing mix. Another site promoter highlights that use class C2 schemes with self-contained dwellings will not always be able to provide the mixes suggested due to their different requirements.

Response to issues raised in representations

Ensuring local planning policies are both relevant and adaptable to local development contexts is a key consideration for the Councils. The percentage housing mixes presented within the Housing Needs of Specific Groups Update for Greater Cambridge (2025) have been included within the policy to provide applicants and decision-makers with a baseline housing mix to which new development of 10 or more dwellings should aim to achieve, unless an exception to the mix can be justified. Inclusion of the indicative housing mix within the policy is considered reasonable because it will ensure that new residential development will aim to deliver homes in line with forecast demand figures for the Greater Cambridge area. This approach is a progression of Policy H/9: Housing Mix of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) but adapted to include requirements for Cambridge and figures that are based on more up-to-date evidence of the area's needs.

Notwithstanding the above, the Councils also acknowledge that there are circumstances where a rigid housing mix would prevent some types of development from meeting specific needs or would be difficult to accommodate given the character and housing mix of the surrounding area. Developments of a particular nature, such as student accommodation development, specialist housing for older people, or developments for custom and self-build homes, may be allowed to deviate

from the housing mix requirements in the policy, subject to the submission of evidence as part of a planning application that the development will meet an identifiable accommodation need. The policy also highlights that deviations from the housing mix may be allowed due to the location of a particular development and the nature of the surrounding character, but planning applications will need to be accompanied by evidence that, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, justifies the alternative housing mix.

Acknowledging comments that new development should support the delivery of different types of housing, as well as different housing sizes, the policy explicitly supports proposals that introduce different accommodation types that are both sympathetic to a site's specific development context and any identified local or community needs.

The Councils also accept that the use of planning conditions or other planning obligations need to be relevant to the development permitted and reasonable in all respects. Therefore, only in some special circumstances, the Local Planning Authority may use planning conditions or other planning instruments to protect the housing mix of developments that have been designed to meet a particular community need.

Policy H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was general support for the policy from a range of public bodies and third sector organisations, although there were some additional comments that gardens can help mitigate surface water flooding and provide buffer zones to ecological sites, the policy needs to be strongly worded to prevent detrimental impact on neighbours, and there is a need to consider each proposal on a case by case basis. A parish council commented that green space is needed around properties in rural settings and developments in villages should have gardens of a reasonable size. One individual was opposed to sub-division of plots unless on very large plots where in keeping with the surrounding.

Concern was raised that there is often little biodiversity mitigation required for in-fill developments and that there has been a gradual loss of green habitat and trees. It was suggested the policy should be strongly worded to require biodiversity mitigation/enhancement. Also, Anglian Water were concerned that parking and hard landscaping areas increase the risk of surface water flooding and suggest the policy should require use of permeable materials.

Response to issues raised in representations

There were comments which were strongly in favour of protecting gardens. This policy responds to these concerns by setting criteria to guide development on garden

land to ensure that new development is appropriate and alongside consideration of other policies in the Local Plan mitigates negative impacts on ecology, biodiversity, heritage, surface water flooding and other local considerations. The detailed criteria set out in criterion 1 enable proposals to be considered on a case by case basis.

Policy H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Support for use of nationally described space standards from a mix of respondents. However, site promoters and housebuilders have asked for additional evidence and justification for their use as required by the NPPF. A statement that there are no nationally prescribed standards for use class C2 schemes.

General support for requirements for accessible and adaptable homes – meeting M4(2) and M4(3) standards. However, specific comments seeking higher proportion of homes required to meet M4(3) standards and requesting that this applies to both market and affordable homes. An individual is seeking amendments from these national standards. Site promoters and housebuilders suggest that additional evidence and justification is needed, and that an ageing population alone is not a reason to seek these standards

Support for requirement that new homes should have their own private amenity space, but with some respondents seeking flexibility as they do not believe that it is always necessary. A request that student accommodation is exempt from this requirement.

Response to issues raised in representations

There were calls for the Councils to provide evidence and justification for the inclusion of residential space standards in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan, as required by national planning guidance. The Councils have set out their evidence in Appendix 1 to this Topic Paper. As required, the Councils have provided justification for requiring internal space standards by considering need, viability and timing:

- Need: the research undertaken has demonstrated that since the introduction of the nationally described space standard, the majority of planning applications in Greater Cambridge comply with the nationally described space standard. This is in contrast to applications received prior to 2018. Furthermore, the research has shown that the policies are being applied flexibly. Additionally, societal trends provide further justification of need in the Greater Cambridge area.
- Viability: the nationally described space standard was applied as the minimum standard to all scheme typologies for all appraisals and it has not impacted viability. All typologies were found to be policy compliant in terms of being able to deliver appropriate levels of affordable housing and infrastructure contributions.
- Timing: As an internal residential space standard policy has been applied across Greater Cambridge since 2018, it is considered there is no need for a transitional period.

Comments suggested that there are no nationally prescribed standards for use class C2 schemes. As set out in the supporting text, there may be specific developments where meeting the required standards would not be appropriate for the identified occupants. Any exceptions would need to be clearly justified with evidence provided to demonstrate that the proposed development still delivers suitable and appropriate homes for the identified occupants

Respondents highlighted that it will not always be possible for every home to have direct access to private amenity space. The policy continues to seek private external amenity space for all new homes, however, the policy requirements allow for flexibility in the form of the provision of the private external amenity space, and consideration to be given to the location, context, orientation, and design of the proposed development. The policy also provides criteria to ensure that appropriate communal spaces can be delivered on certain schemes.

Developers had called for minimum private external amenity space standards to be defined in future drafts of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The policy sets out clear criteria for private external amenity spaces, as well as a set of defined minimum standards, that must applied in combination when formulating proposals. These have been set to ensure that all dwellings across Greater Cambridge are delivering private external amenity spaces that are well designed and appropriate for the intended dwelling.

There were several respondents requesting the Councils to provide evidence for the proportion of dwellings designed to meet the Building Regulations M4(2) and/or the M4(3) standards set out in the Local Plan, and the Councils to consider the inclusion of a proportion of market housing to meet the wheelchair user standards. National planning guidance sets out that where a local planning authority adopts a policy to provide enhanced accessibility or adaptability they should do so only by reference to Building Regulations M4(2) and/or M4(3) standards and should not impose any additional information requirements. As set out in the Housing Needs of Specific Groups Update 2025, it is evident that there will be increases in the proportion of older people and those with health and mobility problems during the plan period. There is also an identified specific need for homes for wheelchair users. In light of this evidence, the policy requires all new build dwellings to be at least Building Regulations M4(2) compliant, and a proportion of both market and affordable dwellings to be the higher Building Regulations M4(3) standard.

Policy H/SH: Specialist housing

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was general support for a policy focus on specialist housing and homes for older people from parish councils and developers. Parish councils want housing for older people to be integrated within wider communities and close to local services and transport. They also call for more independent living opportunities for the more able older people to allow downsizing and for accommodation to be sufficiently

flexible to allow people to stay in their homes if their mobility decreases. Developers want more land set aside for specialist housing and homes for older people with specific allocations to avoid crowding out from other housing types. They argue for a greater variety of sites to increase choice for older people. They also argue that the First Proposals are too dependent on urban extensions and new settlements and call for more brownfield and windfall sites in urban and suburban locations alongside release of land in the green belt. One developer supports the continuation of the existing approach used in Cambridge based on the criteria-based Policy 47: 'Specialist Housing' within the 2018 Cambridge Local Plan.

Response to issues raised in representations

There were calls for housing for older people to be integrated within wider communities and close to local services and transport. Ensuring that strategic sites include a proportion of accommodation for older people will help to achieve this as the developments can be planned so that accommodation for older people (and other specific groups where appropriate) are close to services that meet their needs.

It was argued that creating more independent living opportunities for more able older people will allow downsizing. Creating more independent living opportunities is partly about providing more choices. The more options older people have the more likely they are to find accommodation that enables them to live independently for longer. Some of these choices will be generated by offering a wider range of specialist accommodation, some will be generated by specifically adapting mainstream housing (facilitated through accessibility standards) and some will be generated by ensuring market housing is generally more spacious (through residential space standards).

Developers want more land set aside for specialist housing. The allocated strategic sites include requirements for the provision of specialist housing, and this draft policy requires unallocated strategic sites of 1,000 dwellings or more to include 10% of these homes as specialist housing for older and disabled people. The plan includes specific requirements for specialist housing for older people and disabled people, but also allows for a potential reduction in the requirement if the identified needs can be demonstrated to have been met or offset. This approach provides flexibility in responding to changes in market demand and is therefore considered more robust over the longer term.

Some respondents argued that the First Proposals are too dependent on urban extensions and new settlements. The criteria policy approach allows sites to come forward across a range of spatial areas where appropriate. For example, proposals will need to be proportionate in scale to the settlement where they are proposed. However, it is considered preferable that a significant proportion of specialist housing is provided on strategic sites as these are best able to integrate older people and other specific groups with the facilities and services they need.

There was support for the continuation of the existing approach used in Cambridge. Policy 47 of the current Cambridge Local Plan (2018) set out specific criteria against which all proposals for specialist housing will be assessed. The draft policy applies these criteria across Greater Cambridge. The criteria aim to ensure that specialist housing is needs driven, suitable for intended occupiers, close to essential services and facilities and does not over-dominate local areas. In addition, the criteria set out the conditions which must be met for proposals that will result in the net loss of specialist housing.

Policy H/CB: Self and Custom Build Homes

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Some general support for the policy, however detailed comments from developers / housebuilders on specifics of the proposed approach. Site promoters supported the requirement for self and custom build homes to be linked to demand on the Greater Cambridge Custom and Self Build Register and highlighted that this will mean that continual monitoring is required to ensure up to date information is available. Comments from some that the proposed approach will not deliver the necessary plots to meet the demand from the register and that the plots will not meet the wishes of those on the register, but this is countered by others that consider that the proposed approach will deliver more plots than there is demand for. Requests for further evidence and justification for the proposed approach, including the requirement for 5% custom and self build homes on major developments. Site promoters suggest that the policy should have a more flexible approach that supports self and custom build developments on the edge of settlements. Developers and housebuilders have highlighted concerns about the viability of the proposed approach and also that the marketing period for a custom and self build plot before it can be built without the self and custom build restrictions should be reduced to 6 months. Home Builders Federation suggest that including self and custom build plots within major developments adds to the complexity of their delivery. Specific request for custom finish to be included within the policy to enable high density developments to be able to comply with the requirements.

Response to issues raised in representations

There were calls for more monitoring to ensure permissions better match demand. Legislative changes have already impacted on the nature of permissions that can be counted as custom and self build permissions and our monitoring systems have been adapted to reflect these by capturing the reason for classifying each permission as a custom and self build permission. The register is not considered to provide an accurate reflection of the nature of demand. Registrants have provided little information about their needs and circumstances, there may be a significant gap between what registrants desire and what they can afford, and many registrants may no longer be interested in building their own home in Greater Cambridge (they may

already have built their own home in Greater Cambridge or elsewhere or may have changed their plans). Government guidance and legislation is clear that even where registrants are no longer interested in building their own home in Greater Cambridge they should not be removed from the measure of demand.

It was argued that more evidence is needed to justify the requirement for 5% custom and self build homes on all proposals of 20+ dwellings. Greater Cambridge has a significant deficit in matching the supply of custom and self build permissions to demand and this deficit has widened in recent years. A number of decisions to refuse permission for custom and self build homes in South Cambridgeshire have been overturned at appeal. Inspectors have concluded that the shortage of supply has outweighed any conflicts with the Local Plan where there are no significant impacts on the character of the local area. Delivering custom and self build homes on larger sites is a key part of the strategy to increase delivery in accordance with the spatial strategy.

There was support for specific custom and self build sites on the edge of settlements. The majority of custom and self build homes permitted in Greater Cambridge since 2016 have been in, or adjacent to, villages in South Cambridgeshire. The policy is intended to create a more balanced spatial distribution of custom and self build but it is intended that there will continue to be opportunities for custom and self build housing within rural communities. However, an exception site approach is not supported as this will potentially displace rural exception sites which have a strong track record in helping to sustain balanced communities in South Cambridgeshire villages where house prices can be out of reach of local people.

Developers called for more flexibility to reduce custom and self build plots due to viability and to lessen marketing periods before plots can be switched to market housing. Viability assessment has demonstrated that the requirement to include 5% of homes within proposals of 20 or more dwellings as custom and self build plots is viable at the plan level. Specific sites will have the opportunity to identify site specific issues. A twelve month marketing period is essentially a compromise between those that want shorter or longer periods but seems to be a commonly adopted approach. The requirement that custom and self build plots not delivered as custom and self build dwellings should be built out as affordable housing should act as an incentive for delivery. The register indicates strong demand but the policy recognises that if this current deficit in supply recedes the 5% level could be lowered to better match supply and demand.

There was support for custom finish to be included to enable high density flatted developments to comply with requirements. It is recognised that high density flatted developments will make up a major element of housing delivery in Greater Cambridge and a failure to deliver custom and self build homes on these sites would undermine the plan’s ability to match demand. The Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy 2024-2029 recognises the potential to deliver custom finish homes in these

developments but it is essential that they meet the legal definition of custom and self build housing if they are to contribute towards meeting the statutory duty to permit sufficient permission to match demand.

Policy H/BR: Build to Rent Homes

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There is support from site promoters and developers, and some Parish Councils, for the proposed approach to Build to Rent, given that it plays an important role in meeting housing needs, provides choice to residents and diversifies the housing market, and helps to create mixed and balanced communities. However, there are differing opinions on whether 20% affordable homes is the right approach, and strong objections from site promoters to any kind of restriction or limit on the amount of Build to Rent allowed within a development. Some site promoters and developers have suggested that there needs to be more flexibility within the proposed approach, and that more research is needed on Build to Rent by the Councils to inform the Local Plan and North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. An individual is concerned that there are already too many Build to Rent developments.

Response to issues raised in representations

There was support for the inclusion of a positive policy for Build to Rent. The policy is supportive of Build to Rent homes proposals where they meet a range of criteria. This approach is consistent with national policy and uses local evidence to shape the criteria where appropriate.

There was opposition to the imposition of any limits on Build to Rent. The First Proposals suggested exploring the appropriateness of introducing a limit to the scale of Build to Rent as a proportion of all dwellings. Whilst this has proved impractical the explicit policy intention remains that Build to Rent proposals do not create an over-concentration of this tenure in a local area. Proposals will be assessed on a case by case basis against a range of criteria designed, in part, to ensure Build to Rent proposals reflect local demand, contribute to place shaping, and support the development of mixed and balanced communities. Assessing proposals on a case by case basis also allows for specific circumstances affecting viability to be considered. However, evidence suggests that 20% Affordable Private Rent is viable, and therefore the standard 40% rates for other types of homes is proposed.

Some respondents argued that Build to Rent is not affordable. Evidence has shown that Build to Rent can form one option in a complex housing market. It will not be affordable to all households but is likely to be affordable to some households that cannot afford, or do not wish, to purchase their own home. Local Plan viability evidence demonstrate that 40% affordable homes within Build to Rent schemes is achievable but this may need to be balanced with the level of discount in comparison with local market rents (including service charges) on a case by case basis to achieve affordability for more households.

Policy H/CO: Co-living

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

The issue of Co-living was not covered in the First Proposals version of the Local Plan, and therefore there are no representations on this issue.

However, during the drafting process and development of evidence, it was considered that the Local Plan would be more effective with a standalone policy that responds to the demand for co-living accommodation.

Response to issues raised in representations

The issue of Co-living was not covered in the First Proposals version of the Local Plan, and therefore there are no representations on this issue.

Policy H/MO: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

Despite the low number of responses there was no consensus. Those in support recognised the contribution HMOs make to the housing mix but also wanted the policy to include purpose built self-contained housing for single person households and to be tightened to improve the quality of HMO housing. However, some respondents were concerned that the development of HMOs has a negative effect on the character and social cohesion of neighbourhoods.

Response to issues raised in representations

Some respondents recognised that HMOs play an important role in diversifying the housing mix. The policy is supportive of HMO proposals where they meet a range of criteria. This approach is consistent with national policy and uses local evidence to shape the criteria where appropriate.

There were calls for stronger controls to ensure HMOs do not have a detrimental impact on local neighbourhoods and that the quality of accommodation is appropriate. The policy will seek to control the degree of concentration in any neighbourhood whilst also driving up the quality of accommodation by requiring explicit management arrangements alongside the application of various space standards.

There was support for the delivery of purpose-built self-contained housing for single person households. However, this policy is focused on HMOs. The role of single person self-contained dwellings in diversifying the housing mix is recognised and is addressed through Policy H/HM: Housing mix.

Policy H/SA: Student accommodation

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was general support for the proposed student accommodation policy approach subject to a review of the overall student accommodation need. Croydon Parish Council raised concern about this need detracting from permanent local housing. One member of the public commented that there were already too many students. Histon & Impington Parish Council objected to student accommodation not providing visitor parking.

In terms of location, site promoters requested the city centre be treated as an appropriate location for new student accommodation. On this matter, Linton Parish Council supported the conversion of unused commercial buildings to student accommodation as a means of sustaining the city centre. One property developer suggested student accommodation directly adjacent to existing/proposed educational establishments should be supported.

The University of Cambridge raised concern about the intention for self-contained accommodation to be counted towards delivering the overall housing requirement for Greater Cambridge and highlighted that this approach should not be to the detriment of meeting other housing needs. Similarly, the Home Builders Federation highlighted the need for local evidence to ensure the dwelling equivalency rate used for student accommodation avoids overestimating the supply of homes returning to the open market.

Anglia Ruskin University raised concern with the policy approach which it considered unduly restrictive in that individual sites are effectively required to remain in their current general residential or student use, despite both contributing towards delivering the overall housing requirement. It suggested more policy flexibility in relation to individual sites.

Response to issues raised in representations

In response to the concern about counting self-contained accommodation towards the overall housing requirement for Greater Cambridge, no changes have been made to the policy approach. The needs of the student population are reflected within the area's local housing need, therefore any new units are counted towards meeting this need. Student accommodation provided either as self-contained units or bedspaces will contribute towards delivering the overall housing requirement for Greater Cambridge.

In response to the specific comments raised about the location of student accommodation, the proposed policy already supports such development in an appropriate location for the institution it is intended to serve and is therefore sufficiently flexible to afford support for new student accommodation in both the city centre and directly adjacent to existing/ proposed educational establishments. . The councils recognise the growth needs of the two large universities (The University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University) and other educational institutions within

Cambridge City and more widely Greater Cambridge which has been locally evidenced.

In response to feedback that visitor parking should be provided due to uses associated with student accommodation, while the policy approach for all new student development will require new development to be in locations well served by sustainable modes of transport, the potential for impacts on other local parking provision are noted. The policy will require all new proposals for student accommodation to demonstrate that they do not detract from local amenity, including parking provision, therefore the need for amenities such as visitor/disabled parking would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The suggestion made by Anglia Ruskin University for the policy to be more flexible in relation to an individual sites use, rather than individual sites effectively required to remain in their current general residential or student use, is already consistent with the policy approach. The policy provides for a range of student needs, whilst ensuring that any loss of student accommodation is balanced with the need to provide accommodation to meet the needs of existing higher education institutions. The policy supports development which releases private housing back onto the local housing market which is currently tied to an educational institution, and which also contributes towards delivering the overall housing requirement. Therefore, no change in policy approach is proposed.

While there has been no significant change in the overall policy intent from First Proposals, the policy has been amended to apply a criteria-based approach applied to student accommodation provided specifically for postgraduate, academic staff and academic visitors, which has been informed by updated evidence and precedent use of conditions in developments containing student accommodation.

Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There is support for the principle of the dwellings in the countryside policy from some Parish Councils and the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties. Additionally, Pembroke College state the policy would provide flexibility for development in countryside whilst ensuring the setting is not adversely affected. Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggest a need for clarification in the supporting text on the meaning of replacement dwelling in the green belt not being 'materially larger', and Parish Councils suggest dwelling density in the countryside should differ from that in towns and cities, and prioritising agricultural, low paid, essential and rural workers.

KWA Architects object to the policy, requiring wording changes to extensions in the Green Belt taking account of the permitted development precedent, occupancy of rural workers dwellings allowing family-living rights, and a three year limit on temporary dwellings for new rural businesses.

Historic England has concerns over reuse of buildings in the countryside highlighting that any proposals need to consider the historic environment and that heritage assets may form part of the local heritage of an area. Whilst Steeple Morden Parish Council stress the importance of ensuring structures are sound, Croydon Parish Council comment that dwellings should remain contiguous with villages, and Gamlingay Parish Council state that stand-alone annexes should be refused permission to limit number and sprawl into open countryside.

Response to issues raised in representations

Parish Councils raised a number of issues, sometimes based on local experiences. Proposals for new annex accommodation will have to meet the criteria set out in Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside. Criterion 5a is clear that extensions must not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling and criterion 2 requires that replacement dwellings are on a one for one basis.

It is agreed that housing densities are likely to be lower in the countryside than in towns and cities. Most proposals where Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside is an important factor will be for single dwellings and are likely to involve much lower densities than typically found in urban areas. However, the suggestion that proposals should be contiguous with village boundaries is impractical as by definition the policy is largely concerned with sites in the countryside and many will be some distance from village boundaries.

The call for dwellings to be prioritised for agricultural, low paid, essential and rural workers over commuters is addressed through criteria 6-9 which support the development of dwellings to meet the needs of rural based enterprises. However, it would be inappropriate and impractical to focus other parts of the policy, such as extensions and replacement dwellings, on these groups.

The suggestion that structures should be of sound build is supported through criterion 1b (re-use of buildings) and criterion 5b (extensions to dwellings).

Historic England's concerns that the re-use of buildings element of the policy should consider the impact on the historic environment is partially addressed through criteria 1c and 1d. Additionally, proposals will have to comply with the plan as a whole including policies with a specific focus on protecting the historic environment.

The requirement for replacement dwellings in the green belt to be not materially larger than the one they replace reflects national green belt policy and each case will need to be judged on its own merits. Previous plans have attempted to use a 'percentage uplift' approach to controlling proposals but this proved difficult to operate.

The policy wording regarding extensions in the green belt is consistent with the wording in the NPPF (paragraph 154c). The supporting text in the policy is also clear

that in determining what constitutes ‘a disproportionate addition’ account will be taken of the extent to which the dwelling could be extended under permitted development rights.

The concern that dwellings to support rural based enterprises should be restricted to single workers is not recognised. It is wholly reasonable that where a worker who needs to be on site requires a family home that this is allowed. Each case should be treated on a case by case basis and the applicant should explain why the type of dwelling proposed is required when the planning application is submitted.

Temporary dwellings to support a rural based enterprise may be permitted for up to 3 years where more time is needed to demonstrate the viability of a business. A concern was expressed whether this was long enough, but it is considered that up to 3 years provides an appropriate time length to test the viability of a business.

Policy H/RM: Residential moorings

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There was support for addressing provision from Huntingdonshire District Council. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight the need for engagement, and for provision of appropriate facilities.

Response to issues raised in representations

Concern that issues with current provision should not be replicated in any new provision has been addressed through criterion 1h which requires that the design of new moorings is appropriate for the intended use and issues such as flood risk and manoeuvrability have been considered. The Accommodation Needs Assessment of Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople, Bargee Travellers, and other caravan and houseboat dwellers identified limited demand for additional residential moorings but the stakeholder engagement did call for any additional moorings to be supported by investment in facilities to address current deficiencies.

Policy H/RC: Residential caravans

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

The Cambridge GRT Solidarity Network and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties raised concerns regarding sufficient provision of sites and the effective assessment of need. The Environment Agency highlight the importance of addressing flood risk.

Response to issues raised in representations

One respondent suggests we review the vulnerability of tenure but did not provide details on the nature of the vulnerability. However, the government has published a collection of resources on park homes including information on buying and selling park homes, fees and other payments, and site rules. These are considered to come under the jurisdiction of environmental health and are not considered to be matters of planning policy.

Another respondent suggests the policy should distinguish between mobile home parks and caravans on farms used by seasonal agricultural workers. All proposals for residential caravans will be assessed against the same criteria as other proposals for residential development. However, each proposal will be assessed on its own merits. In certain limited circumstances caravans for seasonal workers can benefit from permitted development rights. However, they will often still be subject to other licensing requirements beyond the jurisdiction of planning.

One respondent highlights that caravans and mobile homes are particularly vulnerable to flood risk. However, the draft Local Plan already has a robust flood risk policy (Policy CC/FM: Managing Flood Risk) which takes account of climate change. Each proposal will be assessed on its own merits and proposals for residential caravans and park homes will need to demonstrate that they have addressed flood risks in a manner appropriate to the development proposed.

Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

A number of organisations highlight the importance of provision of sites, and ensuring those sites are suitable, such as having access to facilities, and appropriate foul drainage. Best practice examples are highlighted. One developer expresses concerns regarding the provision of sites as part of major developments.

Response to issues raised in representations

There are suggestions that additional sites should be allowed in a range of locations with access to facilities, to provide choice for future residents. The Local Plan as a whole seeks to direct new homes to sustainable locations with the least climate impact, active and public transport options, and near to jobs, services and facilities, and national planning policy states that local planning authorities should very strictly limit new pitches or plots in the open countryside away from existing settlements. The draft policy allows for new pitches or plots to be delivered in a range of locations provided that a series of criteria are met.

There are concerns regarding the provision of sites as part of major developments, however, strategic sites provide an opportunity to deliver Gypsy and Traveller pitches, alongside other types and tenures of housing, to ensure that new communities meet the needs of different groups in sustainable locations with access to services and facilities. It is therefore important that both allocated and unallocated strategic sites are required to provide serviced land to accommodate Gypsy and Traveller pitches so that this land use can be considered, alongside the other land uses, within the masterplanning and design process.

There are suggestions for additional site considerations. National planning policy for travellers sets out specific considerations for the design of sites or yards, and these are reflected in the requirements set out in this draft policy. Specific requirements in relation to Green Belt and flood risk have not been included in this policy, as these are set out in national planning policy and also included within Policy GP/GB: The Cambridge Green Belt and Policy CC/FM: Managing Flood Risk of the Local Plan. The policy requires the provision of essential utilities including drainage and sewerage, and other policies in the Local Plan will also apply to any proposals such as Policy CC/IW: Integrated Water Management, Sustainable Drainage and Water Quality.

Policy H/CH: Community-led housing

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

There were few comments on this policy but they were broadly supportive. It was argued that community-led housing should be seen as part of a broader package of affordable housing options but there were differing views on how community-led housing should relate to rural exception sites. There was a suggestion that the policy could adopt the proposed approach to custom and self build homes whereby 5% of dwellings on larger sites should be set aside for community-led housing.

Response to issues raised in representations

There was support for the broad concept of community led housing with various suggestions for policy detail. Community led housing can play an important role in the housing market by meeting local and specific needs that cannot be readily addressed through more mainstream or large scale delivery models. However, it is important that community led housing is not built in inappropriate locations or displaces other more appropriate housing schemes. Assessing community led housing proposals against the policies applicable to residential developments in general provides a level playing field. Policies to support exception sites and custom and self build will also provide opportunities to deliver more community led housing but not at the expense of other more valid proposals.

It was suggested that the community led housing policy should mirror the custom and self build policy. To an extent this will happen as self build community led housing proposals will be supported by the custom and self build policy where appropriate. However, it is not proposed to introduce a ‘percentage policy’ where, for example, all schemes over 20 or more dwellings are required to deliver 5% of these as community led housing. This could have the consequence of concentrating community led housing within larger scale developments when most groups are seeking a more rural location or a site with specific characteristics often related to a community of interest. Larger scale development proposals could include a community led housing element where demand is identified, potentially as part of

their affordable housing requirement. However, it is anticipated that the majority of community led housing proposals will come forward as windfall sites.

It was argued that the plan must be clear about which policies will apply to community led housing developments. Community led housing proposals will be considered against the same criteria as other housing proposals which should aid clarity. It is not proposed to introduce policy based exceptions as this could lead to poor quality development. Where there are viability or other reasons why it is not appropriate to apply certain criteria or policies to a specific proposal these should be justified in the same way that other residential proposals would be required to.

Infrastructure

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments on the infrastructure theme:

Many respondents expressed support for the broad direction of the policies. Some respondents added caveats to their support, requesting that development is located appropriately to maximise the benefits from new strategic infrastructure and that new infrastructure receives adequate investment. Shepreth Parish Council argued that new development should fund the expansion of existing infrastructure. Natural England and the Environment Agency commented that infrastructure and connectivity improvements must be achieved in balance with the need to protect natural spaces and wildlife, ensuring that adverse impacts to the natural environment are avoided.

Some comments focussed on the relationship between national and local government. One respondent argued that discussion should take place with national government to enable Water Resources East to bring forward their timelines for infrastructure projects. Great Shelford Parish Council perceived there to be little joined up thinking between local authorities in relation to overseeing different infrastructure projects. Croydon Parish Council argued that national infrastructure policy will overshadow local policy, rendering the proposals irrelevant.

There were many suggestions to improve the policies. These sought to address perceived shortcomings on issues such as utilities to support sustainable travel and net zero, the need for improved health infrastructure, the needs of disabled people in respect of reducing car travel, the management of journeys to school and college, and broadband provision. A few respondents considered that the forecasted energy grid capacity figures were too low and would need to be increased. A few respondents considered that infrastructure should be operational before new houses were occupied.

Some respondents criticised the public transport system in Greater Cambridge, arguing that it needs to be improved to bring benefits to the area. Universities Superannuation Scheme argued that the Local Plan should recognise an integrated

transport solution will take years to deliver and in the interim there should be no restrictions on existing modes of transport. One respondent questioned whether people buying new homes will necessarily be working or studying within the 30-minute walking radius. A number of respondents asked for specific traffic interventions in their area and North Newnham Resident Association asked for roads to not be destroyed when things such as bus lanes are added to them.

There were a few comments arguing against the proposed relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant on the grounds that it was functioning infrastructure. Another respondent argued that national infrastructure projects, such as East- West Rail do not align well with GCSP's proposals. A few developers argued that that their sites were well-placed to deliver the aims of the policy and therefore the Plan should allocate their sites. One commentator argued that GCSP needed to enforce all developer obligations.

There were lots of comments, particularly in the quick questionnaire, about the need for facilities to accompany housing development, such as schools, doctors, green spaces, and transport infrastructure to deal with congestion, and questions whether infrastructure could cope with planned development.

Response to the Main Issues Raised in Representations:

Respondents raised a number of important matters through previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan. These matters have been considered during the preparation of the plan and its policies.

The Councils' response to these matters include:

- The location of development proposed in the strategy has considered the availability and proximity of infrastructure.
- Infrastructure needs have been explored though the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies this consultation.
- Water issues have been explored further, and evidence prepared to support the draft plan to demonstrate how a sustainable water supply will be available to support the proposals.
- Anglian Water's proposal to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment works has now received planning consent, the local plan therefore responds to the development opportunity available near the Cambridge North station.
- Policies are proposed which address the requirements, funding and timing of infrastructure provision.

The following proposed policies areas are addressed in the infrastructure chapter:

- I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity
- I/TH: Travel Hub Facilities
- I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles
- I/SD: Servicing and Last-mile Deliveries

- I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure
- I/AD: Aviation development
- I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning
- I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery
- I/DT: Digital and telecommunications infrastructure
- I/CM: Construction management

Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

1.13 Many respondents supported the policy. However, a substantial number of respondents added caveats to their support and provided suggestions to improve the policy. For example, some respondents stated that a more ambitious approach is needed, that the effects of home working need to be considered in the policy and concerns were raised about e-scooters.

1.14 Some respondents argued that the policy had omitted things such as how elderly and disabled people will be included in the design of transport routes. Some argued that the policy should focus on designing active transport routes and not the provision of car parking. Other comments emphasised the importance of integrating new developments and new communities into existing facilities and transport routes.

1.15 Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) suggested including a reference to CCC's Transport Assessment Team's guidelines for new developments. North Hertfordshire District Council asked for more data relating to Cambridge South Station due to their concerns that it could create pressures in North Hertfordshire. Suffolk Council suggested that the policy should aim to enable transport across administrative boundaries. Suffolk Council also argued that there is a need to add rail dualling to the infrastructure delivery plan. Persimmon Homes East stated that the findings from the Active Travel Toolkit must be included in viability assessments. One commentator asked for the Active Travel Toolkit to be available for consultation prior to publication.

1.16 Many developers and landowners argued that the policy's aims will be achieved if development is directed to sustainable locations. Linked to this, many developers and landowners argued that their sites were well-placed to deliver the policy's aims. Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that growth in the region will lead to an increase in Park and Ride usage, but the Plan has not allocated land for this. SCT also suggested that the Plan safeguards land for infrastructure and includes a policy for planning gain to

retrofit infrastructure which is missing from areas which are not reached by funding.

1.17 Gamlingay Parish Council suggested that there needs to be a cycle link between Potton and Cambourne to address the missing link in the Bedford and Cambridge route. There were a few comments criticising the location of East West Rail. Some respondents objected to redeveloping NEC on the grounds that it would increase traffic. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) perceived there to be a lack of joined-up thinking between Greater Cambridge's local authorities. CPRE and a few other respondents argued that there needs to be an integrated transport plan which aligns with the Local Plan. Trumpington Residents Association stated that development should be restricted unless essential infrastructure is planned and financed. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that travel hubs are incorrectly equated as Park and Ride locations.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

1.18 The policy seeks to ensure new development is located and well-designed with high quality connections and transport infrastructure providing real opportunities to switch between different travel modes, to provide a genuine travel choice for people of all ages and abilities and to reduce the reliance on the private car. It prioritises non-car modes but does not exclude cars, to create places and spaces with people at the heart.

1.19 The Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) is a suite of documents setting out the long-term strategy for transport in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It sets out a vision and goals for how transport supports a better future and describes the projects needed to make that new future possible; this includes things like better buses and helping more people to cycle and walk. A range of transport projects and schemes are being planned and brought forward by bodies such as Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Greater Cambridge Partnership, including public transport and cycle routes and new Park & Ride provision.

1.20 Part of the LTCP, the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy (GCTS), will evidence the transport measures needed to address travel needs and enable development in Greater Cambridge. Developers will be required to mitigate their transport impacts, including by providing contributions towards the delivery of transport infrastructure identified in the GCTS (and other transport plans), enhancing the provision across Greater Cambridge. Transport mitigation associated with delivery of the development strategy is being considered in the Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Appraisal.

Policy I/TH: Travel Hub Facilities

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

1. 4.13 This is a new policy approach, so was not subject to consultation in the First Proposals. However, the following representations were made with regards to park and ride usage that have helped to formulate this new policy.

- Transport Evidence shows traffic is assumed to grow from 2015 baseline, contravening local transport objectives, and huge growth in Park and Ride use for which land is not allocated.
- Scale of development puts pressure on travel links to City. Development should be net reducer of greenhouse gases and cars into City, not just provide access to Park and Ride. Subsidise buses, provide for other modes. Long delivery times for large scale infrastructure projects, no immediate effects. Public transport is lifeline to some people; consider good value, single ticketing. Travel hubs are incorrectly equated to Park and Ride; suggest pilots be set up.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

This is a new policy approach, so was not subject to consultation in the First Proposals. Comments were received with regards to allocation of land for additional park and ride facilities, this policy seeks to support and enhance the use existing park and ride provision to create travel hubs. Proposals for new travel hub sites in appropriate locations will also be supported in principle, subject to the satisfactory assessment of the proposed development's transport effects, and the demonstration of the need for and feasibility of such development. Applications will be considered on merit it has not been considered necessary to allocate additional land for this purpose.

Policy I/EV: Parking and Electric Vehicles

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

5.16 A variety of organisations expressed general support for the policy. Some organisations supported the policy but suggested changes, including providing additional information about the required parking standards, providing flexibility to consider site specific circumstances, and minimising visual clutter.

5.17 Some respondents provided critical responses to the policy; North Newnham Residents Association for example wrote that there is a tension between parking provision and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport which could require improvements at the expense of cars. B Hunt questioned whether the policy is needed when the Greater Cambridge Partnership are preparing an integrated parking strategy. A few respondents, including the Home Builders Federation, asserted that electric vehicle requirements should be addressed through building regulations. A few

respondents, including Smarter Cambridge Transport stated that the policy title should be amended to reflect a wider range of transport modes.

5.18 Cambridge Past and Present and Future argued that the electric grid will need an increase in capacity of local substations by around 50% to deliver the policy. Persimmon Homes East wrote that viability does not consider the upgrades to the national grid that would be required by the policy.

5.19 Some respondents provided comments specific to the cycle and mobility parking elements of the policy and included suggestions to improve the policy. Examples include using S106 monies to retrofit neighbouring communities, ensuring there is space for non-standard cycles such as e-scooters in new developments, and ensuring that new developments deliver storage for all users. Some respondents provided comments specific to the car parking elements of the policy. Examples include addressing the lack of parking for visitors and deliveries in new developments, including operational parking for logistics uses, and designing new developments in a way which will prevent parking on the pavement.

5.20 Some respondents provided comments specific to the electric vehicle elements of the policy. Examples of the suggestions include addressing the issue of charging points in public car parks and on streets, the need for more charging points at community facilities in rural areas and rapid charging points were perceived to be essential.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

1.25 The policy reflects the updated NPPF by requiring developers to justify and evidence the level of car and cycle parking provision for their development proposals through a vision-led approach. The policy provides flexibility to respond to site specific circumstances within the overall transport aim of promoting sustainable modes of transport. Noting that there is a higher propensity for cycling within Greater Cambridge the policy includes minimum cycle standards, including a requirement for a proportion to accommodate non-standard cycles, to ensure sufficient provision to meet local needs.

1.26 The updated Building Regulations set out requirements for electric vehicle charging. The policy ensures there is sufficient grid capacity and that infrastructure for electric vehicles is considered and designed-in from the outset and is located so that it does not cause street clutter or conflict with active travel routes and users. Charging infrastructure requirements is being considered in the Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Appraisal.

Policy I/SD: Servicing and Last-mile Deliveries

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

6.16 Many respondents expressed support for the policy, for example, the Universities Superannuation Scheme requested that the role of larger logistics, warehousing facilities and last-mile hubs are supported in the Local Plan. Huntingdonshire District Council suggested more information needs to be included to understand how unacceptable impacts to the strategic networks are to be assessed and also requested additional information to assess the impact of developments upon surrounding areas. Histon and Impington Parish Council emphasised the need for GCSP to speak to people in the logistics industry so they can gain more expertise.

6.17 Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that the Local Plan needs to identify a logistics hub location and included possible suggestions where it could be located and requirements it needed to meet. SCT also asserted that there should be a variety of sites in different locations to provide break-out and consolidation logistic centres. I Butnar argued that cargo cycles for local deliveries and the provision of cycling logistics depots should be common across Greater Cambridge. Similarly, SCT stated that the access roads for logistic hubs should be appropriate in relation to weight and size of vehicles and non-motorised user routes should be sufficiently wide for cargo bikes to use. Endurance Estates argued that Logistical hubs will not address longer journeys by delivery vehicles because the identified need for strategic logistics floorspace will not be met and therefore their site should be allocated.

6.18 The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties requested stronger wording in the policy to support the need to move to a system of rail freight and suggested a further ‘Green Line’ should be established so that existing levels of road freight transport will not increase as a result development. They also proposed ensuring villages have access to freight travel hubs to lower net carbon emissions. A few developers explained how their sites could potentially deliver the aims of the policy.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

6.58 Support for the general policy approach, particularly the move towards sustainable modes of transport for last-mile deliveries, has been noted. The Councils agree that the perspectives of stakeholders operating in the logistics sectors will be important in shaping appropriate logistics facilities in the area. The Local Plan will be subject to various rounds of consultation where stakeholders can provide further comments on the approach to planning

policy, and stakeholders will be able to provide their views on site-specific proposals through the planning application process itself.

6.59 The Councils also recognise and appreciate that modal shifts away from road freight vehicles towards more sustainable means of transportation will play a significant role in helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and local road traffic. The policy provides explicit support for sustainable, innovative approaches to last-mile deliveries such as providing facilities as part of consolidation centres that support the use of cargo bikes or electric vehicles. The draft plan has responded to the opportunities provided by rail. The movement of freight is also a matter for the local transport authority to consider in their transport plans. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership have commenced work on freight strategies for Cambridgeshire.

6.60 The Councils' approach to freight consolidation has been informed by the various studies and strategic actions discussed above. The evidence indicates that efficiency improvements to local logistics activities could be improved through enhanced micro-consolidation and macro-consolidation facilities. The preferred policy approach seeks to support new micro-consolidation centres given the need for sustainable last-mile facilities in Greater Cambridge. In addition, the need for employment land for logistics and distribution has been considered through the employment needs evidence. Allocations are proposed in response to this need.

Policy I/SI: Safeguarding Important Infrastructure

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

7.9 A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy's direction. The policy was supported by the Environment Agency, who also noted that they expected safeguarding to include what is required for water infrastructure more broadly (water supply and waste), green infrastructure and biodiversity. The University of Cambridge supported the intention to continue to safeguard research at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge.

7.10 Anglian Water Services Ltd requested that GCSP considers safeguarding land in the next stages of the Local Plan for new infrastructure, possibly including a recognition of the need for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plan relocation. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) which is linked to the Ministry of Defence, stated that Bassingbourn Barracks should be identified as safeguarded infrastructure to support its ongoing defence needs and protect it from being impacted by external development. The DIO suggested that GCSP should consider including a specific planning policy to deliver this. DIO also stressed the importance of safeguarding the airspace above Cambridge airport

and keeping it free from obstruction. The DIO also noted that the Plan needs to ensure that new development does not disrupt their technical asset 'East 2 WAM Network' which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system.

7.11 B Marshall criticised the policy for not mentioning water infrastructure and did not perceive the Lord's Bridge Telescope to be important infrastructure. I Butnar asserted that the rail infrastructure plans are not ambitious enough and instead the policy should place a greater emphasis upon how the provision of station can help neighbouring communities thrive. Steeple Morden Parish Council suggested including disused railway lines for potential infrastructure needs.

Response to issues raised in representations

7.30 Multiple stakeholders who own or operate infrastructure made representations highlighting the manner in which their infrastructure should be safeguarded. In response, stakeholders have been contacted to assess appropriate safeguarding options which have been implemented into the policy wherever possible. Where infrastructure has been covered by policy within the existing local plans, infrastructure operators have been directly consulted to ascertain whether the existing safeguarding policy adequately safeguards the relevant infrastructure.

7.31 The Environment Agency made a representation suggesting flood risk infrastructure should be safeguarded and that the SFRA evidence base can inform the identification of flood risk infrastructure for safeguarding. Beyond the functional floodplain, the SFRA does not identify any specific flood risk infrastructure for safeguarding. It is considered that policy CC/FM will adequately manage any development which would affect the integrity of flood risk infrastructure.

7.32 Anglian Water reference the potential for safeguarding the location identified for the relocated Cambridge Treatment Works. Subsequently the site has gaining a Development Consent Order. Safeguarding waste site sis a matter for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Policy I/AD: Aviation Development

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

8.9 A limited number of representations were received to this policy. A few parish councils expressed general support for the policy. There were some criticisms of the policy: Cambridgeshire County Council questioned the wording of the policy, specifically the implication that aviation would not have a significant adverse

impact on the environment. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties also argued that, due to environmental concerns, the policy should support no development of the airport except under exceptional circumstances. Contrastingly, D Lister perceived the balance of the Plan to be weighted too far towards protecting other parties from aviation and does not do enough to protect airfields.

8.10 There were some suggestions to improve the policy: Imperial War Museum and Gonville and Caius College argued that the proposed policy does not consider Policy TI/5 from South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan and stated that the Local Plan needed to align with policy proposals from Civil Aviation Authority. Steeple Morden Parish Council argued that the Local Plan should recognise the need for a national network of general airfields.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

8.18 The National Planning Policy Framework requires planning policies to recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the General Aviation Strategy. The draft policy recognises their economic benefits, and with the application of this policy and the policies within the wider plan will allow their adaptation whilst considering environmental impacts.

Policy I/EI: Energy Infrastructure Masterplanning

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

9.10 There were many comments expressing support for the policy. A few respondents added caveats to their support: Carbon Neutral Cambridge wanted the policy strengthened to require developers to contribute to the costs of improving the power grid and others argued that smart localised energy systems should be the new norm, no matter the size of new development and that new development provides an opportunity to bring this service to existing developments.

9.11 Some comments criticised the policy; Persimmon Homes East Midlands argued that clarification is required on the definition of an energy masterplan and the outcomes of these should be fully considered within any viability assessment. D Blake stated that the policy mentions digital systems but omits discussion of water supply, sewage, gas, and hydrogen. Metro Property Unit Trust stated that the policy only sets requirements for households and should also set the requisite non-residential floorspace threshold, including whether thresholds/exemptions for other types of applicable accommodation. Cambridge

and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the threshold should be based on impact, not scale. R Pargeter stated that the policy focusses on new development, but a significant increase in electric cars is likely to require grid reinforcement, especially in rural locations, even in the absence of any new site developments.

9.12 A few comments wanted to change the scope of the policy. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC argued that the timespan for these changes should be brought forward in anticipation of new demand from new railways. D Lister stated that the plan should consider the role of a distributed grid of micro generation, not just large power station supply and substation infrastructure. Cambridge Past, Present & Future states that there needs to be committed way forward for strategic electrical energy supply planning.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

9.24 A number of respondents requested clarification on the definition of an energy masterplan and the need for the outcomes of these to be fully considered within any viability assessment. Further detail on the content of energy masterplans along with the scale of development that they will be required for has now been added to the policy. With regards to impact on viability, the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan will include costings of the infrastructure required to support growth, which will be fed into the viability work that will accompany the Local Plan.

9.25 Representations were also received suggesting that the policy should also include water, although consideration of water infrastructure is included within policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery. There were also comments about the scope of the policy and the thresholds at which the policy should apply, and the policy has been updated to clarify the thresholds for both residential and non-residential development. While there was some call for the policy to be based on impact instead of scale, at present the threshold for the preparation of energy masterplans is based on number of new homes and non-residential floorspace. This is in recognition that for many schemes, the exact level of energy requirements may not be known at the application stage.

9.26 Comments were also received regarding the need to also consider the impact of the impacts of the significant increase in electric cars on the need for grid reinforcement, especially in rural locations, even in the absence of any new site developments. The impact of the electrification of transport is being considered as part of the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan, which will look at both the requirements of new development but also the increase of electric vehicles across Cambridgeshire. This plan will identify where further grid reinforcements are planned and will help to inform UK Power Networks business plans.

9.27 Some comments requested a change of scope of the policy, for example bringing forward the timespan in anticipation of new demand from railways, giving consideration to the role of a distributed grid of micro generation and the need for a committed way for strategic energy supply planning. While these issues sit outside the remit of a local plan, they will be considered as part of the Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan, which is currently under development and due for publication late 2025/early 2026. It should be noted that this document will not be a static document but a digital plan that will be kept up to date as new projects are identified, helping to identify the costs associated with upgrading the energy system to support net zero carbon and growth, and helping to inform UK Power Networks business planning. The Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan will also inform the Regional Energy Spatial Plans currently under development by the National Energy System Operator (NESO). The Cambridgeshire Local Area Energy Plan will form part of the evidence base for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and will inform viability work.

Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

10.12 Some respondents expressed general support for the policy, although a few added caveats to their support. The Wildlife Trust stated that greater emphasis should be placed on funding strategic natural greenspace and green infrastructure which needed to be delivered with explicit funding mechanisms outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the policy should include penalties for not delivering on infrastructure commitments.

10.13 Some respondents criticised the policy; D Lister stated that thresholds for contribution to infrastructure should be replaced as it allows for developments to be sized just under the threshold to avoid contributions. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group stated that funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services to meet growing demand.

10.14 Cambridgeshire County Council expressed a preference for contributions towards educational facilities to be sought through S106. The Education & Skills Funding Agency of Department for Education posted a substantial representation and made many points, including their request that the Plan identifies specific sites that can deliver school places to support growth based on the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan, that viability assessment inform options analysis and site selection in the district, and they recommend that to pass the soundness test of ‘effectiveness’, the Plan should ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments.

10.15 A few respondents argued that the scope of infrastructure provided for in the Local Plan should be widened. North Hertfordshire District Council requested that GCSP shares data with them to understand the potential impact of Cambridge South Railway Station. Suffolk County Council provided a substantial representation which emphasised the importance of cross-boundary working on a number of key planning issues, such as transport and green infrastructure and the need to ensure that planning obligations can be used to mitigate impacts upon neighbouring authorities.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

10.31 The common issue raised on the draft policy was that it was not detailed enough about a specific form of infrastructure the individual respondent was concerned with. However, this is not easily addressed, as requirements will vary on a site by site basis, informed by a range of policies and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The policy has been amended to be clear that the Councils expect development proposals to meet relevant development plan requirements in full on site through the design led approach and to contribute towards strategic infrastructure as identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

10.32 The reference to the 'relevant development plan requirements' avoids the need to list the out the infrastructure types in this policy as the relevant policies e.g. on green infrastructure, education, or community facilities, will provide clarity on the scope of the infrastructure items to be defined under each, and will set out the policy requirements to be met by new development and the form of any obligation, including whether off-site provision or a financial contribution in lieu is acceptable. This is preferrable approach than seeking to cover this under the one infrastructure policy which would be unable to recognise and account for any nuisances between different forms of infrastructure.

Policy I/DT: Digital and Telecommunications Infrastructure

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

1.22 Some organisations expressed general support for the policy, with a few organisations such as Carbon Neutral Cambridge emphasising its importance. Some parish councils stated that there was a need for enhancement of mobile phone coverage in villages with poor reception by well sited and suitably camouflaged masts.

1.23 Trumpington Residents Association stated that there was a need for the GCSP to ensure that the policy is properly implemented so that residents have connectivity when they move into new homes. Respondents criticised the policy, stating that the wording of the policy provides a loophole for developers and instead the policy should mandate that new developments

have at least 1 gigabit per second connectivity. They also stated that it should be mandated that developers supply Category 6 network points in every room in new dwellings to allow hard wiring equipment. Cambridge Past, Present & Future also criticised the policy stating that it was disappointing that developers are not required to consider gigabit connections at all sites and that Cambridgeshire needs to support the delivery of gigabit connections in areas where fibre connections are not cost effective.

1.24 A few developers asked for confirmation in relation to whether all development is required to provide a 'Connectivity Statements', or whether the policy direction is intended for major developments. If the latter, floorspace, and dwelling thresholds should be stated, to provide applicants with clarity. Some other developers argued that it is important that the eventual policy wording recognises to what degree digital infrastructure is under the control of the developer themselves as opposed to statutory bodies. Linked to this, the Home Builders Federation argued that the Council should not impose new electronic communications requirements beyond the provision of infrastructure as set out in statutory Building Regulations.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

1.25 In developing the policy, the councils have sought to make digital connectivity requirements for new development clear, outlining that a gigabit capable connection (i.e. connectivity speeds of at least 1 gigabit per second) should be delivered unless an agreement cannot be reached with network operators to provide such a connection. The councils recognise the need for the policy to be clear when requirements will take effect and how applicants should demonstrate compliance with stated policy requirements. Thresholds for development floorspace or the number of units have been built into the policy for small-cell technology requirements or for when network coverage will need to be assessed. Furthermore, Connectivity Plans will not be a planning requirement for new dwellings as they are already a requirement of Approved Document R of The Building Regulations. However, the councils will expect planning applications to be accompanied by correspondence with both digital and telecommunications network operators to confirm how the proposed development will be connected, and details of how digital and telecommunications infrastructure, including cabinets, ducting and masts, have been integrated into the wider placemaking strategy for the proposed development. Requirements have been set out within the policy and guidance on how to demonstrate compliance with these policy requirements has been provided within the supporting text.

1.26 The position adopted by the councils does not conflict with the position adopted by the Building Regulations Approved Document R and is

considered to be in alignment with Government plans to ensure that the country's homes and places of work are equipped with next-generation communications infrastructure. The policy approach taken by the councils seeks to ensure that new non-residential development also benefits from the same level of digital connectivity as new homes to ensure that businesses in Greater Cambridge will also benefit from reliable, high-speed network connectivity.

Policy I/CM: Construction Management

Summary of issues arising from First Proposals representations

12.14 Various consultees expressed support for policy requirements in relation to construction management and CEMPs. Some respondents highlighted that CEMPs should include how the sourcing and transportation of materials from construction will be managed to limit the carbon emissions from construction activity. Others highlighted that construction activity should prioritise on-site material reuse, which could be controlled as part of submission documents such as CEMPs. Others stated that policy should be clear on the stage in the planning process when CEMPs are required.

Response to Main Issues Raised in Representations

12.26 The councils acknowledge the support received in relation to the introduction of CEMP requirements as part of the Local Plan. The councils have sought to ensure that the details expected as part of CEMPs are made clear to applicants within the policy and supporting text. Requirements have been included for temporary haulage roads and material storage to ensure that trips to/from sites during construction are limited to only what is required.

12.27 With regards material reuse during construction, construction management requirements will be read in conjunction with the Local Plan's approach to the circular economy, material reuse and sustainable waste management (Policy CC/CE). In addition to details on the secure storage of construction materials to limit waste from contamination or loss due to theft, reference has also been made to DEFRA's Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites to safeguard against the need for unnecessary soil waste and imports.

Sustainability Appraisal

There was support from statutory consultees regarding the overall approach, with detailed comments to be taken into account for the next stages. Other comments questioned the assessment of individual site proposals. In some cases this was because village development was felt to have been unfairly assessed against sustainability objectives. There were comments regarding the relationship between

the Cambridge waste water treatment works relocation proposals and the North East Cambridge site.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

Natural England is generally supportive of the interim findings of the HRA. Other comments raise issues regarding water supply impacts, and recreation impacts on protected sites.

Sites

First Proposals stage

To inform the First Proposals 2021, more than 700 sites were tested by the councils through the Greater Cambridge Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (2021) (HELAA), in a wide range of locations across Greater Cambridge. Following this consultation 43 new sites were tested and a further 181 sites were retested based on updated information.

The testing of sites for possible inclusion in the First Proposals development strategy and through sustainability appraisal focused on sites informed by the emerging preferred strategy option, and the testing carried out utilising the agreed HELAA methodology concluded as to whether a site was suitable, available and achievable for development.

Draft Plan stage

For this draft plan stage, in addition to over 700 sites previously tested by the councils through the HELAA 2021 98 new sites were tested and a further 196 sites were re-submitted, following their submission in representations to the Greater Cambridge Local plan, including during the First Proposals 2021 consultation.

The testing of sites for possible inclusion in the draft plan development strategy and through sustainability appraisal has again focused on sites informed by the emerging preferred strategy option (see below), and the testing carried out via the HELAA as to where a site was suitable, available and achievable for development.

Overview of approach taken to identifying sites for assessment

Following a review of responses to the First Proposals consultation, meetings were held by the Joint Local Planning Advisory Group between Autumn 2022 and Spring 2023 where members looked at the issues raised through the consultation. In early 2023 members made decisions about the Development Strategy, key sites and an updated need for jobs and homes. These decisions have guided the preparation of the Draft Local Plan.

The broad strategy choices considered to be reasonable options at First Proposals stage remain valid, and the following groups of sites sitting within these broad strategy options have been tested:

- Newly promoted sites
- Previously submitted sites reassessed based on updated information

However, the 2025 housing and employment need figures are higher than those that informed First Proposals 2021. This has resulted in a necessity for a re-examination of options, and a widening of testing to ensure reasonable options have been fully considered. As such, sites need to be identified from additional broad strategy sources of supply that align with the First Proposals development strategy principles.

Drawing on the above, the additional broad strategy source of supply now subject to site specific consideration for allocation, and to sustainability appraisal, is new settlements.

Cambridge Urban Area

The development strategy for Cambridge Urban Area has sought to direct development to where active and public transport is the natural choice, where green infrastructure can be delivered alongside new development, and where jobs, services and facilities can be located near to where people live. We have sought to make the most of brownfield land, and to use the land we have identified efficiently.

Summary of the main issues raised in general comments:

Support was noted for:

- Development, protection and enhancement of the historic core
- Development of brownfield sites
- Protection and enhancement of the character of local area
- Reduced pressure on rural areas and reduced redevelopment of greenfield locations
- The change of use of existing buildings
- Engagement with network rail was welcomed

Concerns raised with regards to:

- The benefits of redevelopment of retail parks and the football ground were questioned, suggesting that this would have a detrimental effect on local facilities and could potentially result in current occupiers looking for new sites in rural areas.
- To protect wildlife there needs to be a balance between wildlife and people living in the urban area
- Loss of grassland
- A need to address capacity issues in Cambridge city centre.
- Better co-ordination of transport bodies
- Use of realistic traffic modelling to remedy the issues of gridlock
- Reduction in unnecessary private car use
- Resolve the lack of secure parking

- Over reliance on proposed development in the urban area and to the northeast of Cambridge to support the housing needs arising from growth
- Cultural provision has not been addressed, resulting in pressure on existing uses

Issues raised in the representations include:

- General support for developing in the Cambridge urban area, with particular support from Parish Councils.
- Huntingdonshire District Council and the University of Cambridge commented on 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.
- Teversham PC raised concern about the benefits of redeveloping particular sites if facilities are then lost or relocated to rural areas. Concern was also raised about the potential for loss of green spaces impacting on wildlife and quality of life.
- Cambridge Past, Present & Future and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties raised concern about whether the capacity of the urban area was able to accommodate the scale of the proposed growth.
- Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council and the University of Cambridge raised concern about private car use, and potential for 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 noted for protection of the historic core, however, Historic England and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight the need to consider wider setting and views, and submission of more detailed considerations and evidence.
- General support for appropriate development in the Cambridge urban area is noted.
- Policies in the wider draft local plan should seek to ensure that heritage is appropriately protected and development is of high-quality design.
- Concerns raised by 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 the 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 were made that no reference has been made to the pandemic and its implications for future development.

Response to Issues Raised in the Representations

- Some representors made representations with regards to potential loss of open space and existing provisions as a result of site allocations. These issues have been carefully considered through the site testing process. Responding to national planning policies to make best use of brownfield land including through development densities, whilst protecting character and heritage.
- Some representors made representations, with regards increased traffic and gridlock and over car use, resulting in the need for more alternate transport options. Transport modelling has been used to inform the local plan. Measures will be designed to address traffic in Cambridge, along with improvements to support public transport and active travel. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, as the local transport authority, are developing a transport plan in parallel with the local plan.
- Some respondents made representation as to whether the Greater Cambridgeshire area, could sufficiently accommodate the amount of growth proposed. A range of different strategy choices have been considered to inform the strategy of the draft local plan. The approach responds to climate change and sustainability evidence, providing the best opportunity for growth to be supported by infrastructure.
- Representation was made that the plan does not mention the implications of the pandemic. There are many changes which have followed the pandemic which have influenced the draft local plan. The importance of green infrastructure and open space has been recognised, and the need for a variety of local community spaces and cultural provision. Health and wellbeing are also an integral theme of the plan
- Historic England highlight needs to consider wider setting and views, and need for more detailed considerations and evidence. The draft local plan has been informed by a suite of evidence. Including Heritage Impact Assessments and a Tall Building Study.

Edge of Cambridge

The Local Plan seeks to complete the planned new neighbourhoods on the edge of Cambridge from previous plans as well as bringing forward new opportunities for sustainable developments, which successfully link the city to the countryside, and where active and public transport is the natural first choice.

Issues Raised in the Representations Include:

- Proposed approach to development on the edge of Cambridge
- General support for development on the edge of Cambridge.
- Encroachment into the Green Belt should be minimal taking account of the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Setting of Cambridge needs to be considered and preserved.
- New development needs to include provision of education and health services and facilities that are delivered in a timely manner and connected to the community,
- Site allocations need to include clear requirements for well-designed places that promote healthy lifestyles, including provision of open spaces, good access to sustainable modes of transport and taking account of the lessons learnt from the pandemic,
- New development needs to include truly affordable housing
- Concerns raised about over development on eastern edge of Cambridge
- Focussing new development on large sites could lead to problems with infrastructure provision, viability and housing delivery
- Concerns raised that new developments could have negative effects on traffic such as congestion, with impacts on those travelling into Cambridge from the villages.
- Concerns raised that not enough sites are being allocated to meet long term demand and given its sustainability there are more sites that could be allocated, including several new sites suggested.
- There is need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge, due to the high reliance on infrastructure delivery.
- Representation made from promoters and landowners with regards to rejected sites and requests for allocation of specific sites.

Response to Issues Raised in Representations

- Representations supporting the approach set out in the First Proposals are noted.
- Some representors considered that no further development should take place in the Green Belt, others, including a range of site promoters, considered that more sites should be identified. These issues are addressed in the Strategy Topic Paper.
- Representations highlighted the need for development to be supported by sufficient infrastructure, affordable housing and open spaces. The Draft Plan

is informed by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, that is reviewed and updated as the plan progresses. Where appropriate policies require developers to contribute to meeting infrastructure needs.

New Settlements

The Local Plan seeks new towns to mature into great places to live and work, making the most of their existing and planned public transport links to Cambridge and other centres. Towns should be real communities with their own distinctive identity, with the critical mass necessary to support local businesses, services and facilities.

Issues Raised in the Representations Include:

- 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 the 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.
- Representations submitted by some site promoters' highlight the potential for further new settlements to be identified, including the creation of delivering new settlements around existing infrastructure and services.
- Other site promoters' highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the issues raised of focussing development on large sites.
- Representations received from site promoters for the allocation of specific sites

Response to Issues Raised in Representations:

- Support for the new settlements approach in the First Proposals consultation is noted.
- Some representors propose alternative strategies and question the approach to new settlements. However, in the context of Greater Cambridge, and when considering green belt policy, the strategies proposed are the appropriate element for meeting development needs.
- Representors raise the importance of infrastructure delivery to meet the needs of new settlements. The Draft Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, which at an early stage seeks to identify the infrastructure that will be needed, how much it will cost and how it will be funded.

- In addition to the existing sites proposed, several more sites have been submitted through the Call for Sites process. The additional sites have been tested and considered against alternatives. To meet development needs a new settlement site has been identified.

Rural South Cambridgeshire

South Cambridgeshire is home to over a hundred villages, ranging from larger Rural Centres like Sawston and Histon and Impington which provide services to surrounding villages, and to very small villages like Heydon and Newton with very limited services.

The Local Plan wants rural villages to continue to thrive and sustain their local services without encouraging lots of new homes in places where car travel is the easiest or only way to get around. Therefore, some development is proposed in and around villages that have good transport links and services, while in smaller villages, only small-scale infill development and affordable housing would be permitted.

Issues Raised in the Representations Include:

- A number of Parish Councils support the strategy for the rest of the rural area. Some considered that Neighbourhood Plans should have greater influence on the proposed strategy. They also highlighted preservation of rural character and identity of villages as being important. In addition, development should be limited to that required based on local needs. Loss of good farmland and countryside should be avoided.
- A number of site promoters objected to the small amount of growth proposed for the rest of the rural area, for reasons including:
    - The long-term viability of rural settlements is ignored;
    - The approach is counter to the national planning policy objective of supporting and promoting mixed and balanced communities;
    - The approach ignores the need for local affordable housing and the need for more small and medium sized sites that can be delivered more quickly.
- Several site promoters suggest that more investment should be put into improving transport links in the villages
- Site promoters suggest that there are opportunities for a cluster of developments around Melbourn due to its public transport links, services and facilities, whereas Melbourn PC state that the village has no further capacity for development based on its existing infrastructure provision.

- Garden centres are not referred to in the First Proposals Plan. Respondents commented that garden centres should be recognised within the rural area strategy, as they provide employment, retail and leisure opportunities
- Support was submitted for the rejection of specific sites, along with requests from site promoters for specific sites to be allocated

Response to Issues Raised in Representations:

- Representation from several Parish Councils support the strategy for the rest of the rural area which is noted.
- Some comments recommend higher levels of development and that the plan should have allocated more sites. Many of the representations reflect comments and issues addressed when considering the Strategy section of the Draft Plan. Having considered a range of alternative strategies, the proposed development strategy directs site allocations for new homes and jobs to the most sustainable locations of Cambridge urban area, the edge of Cambridge and the new settlements as these have: the least impact on climate change, active and public transport as the natural choice, and jobs, services and facilities near to where people live.

Rural Southern Cluster

South of Cambridge, the area around the M11 and the A1307 corridor is home to a range of major business parks with world-leading facilities and has some excellent and improving public transport links. The Draft Local Plan supports this business cluster through ensuring that more business space is provided where needed but also seek opportunities for new homes in this area.

Issues Raised in the Representations Include:

- Representations support the approach for the clustering of development in the Rural Southern Cluster, however:
    - There is a need to protect villages from disproportionate levels of development, as this will have impacts on village character, historic assets, landscape character, and wildlife habitats.
    - The scale of proposals is inadequate and does not take account of the economic potential of the area.
    - Further Green Belt release is necessary to ensure vitality of rural areas.
    - Sites within public transport corridors should be prioritised.
    - Small sites included in Neighbourhood Plans should be included.

- Concerns were raised over traffic congestion, inappropriate infrastructure, lack of water supply, and effects on landscape and floodplains,
- There are other public transport and employment clusters within the area that should also be considered, for example around Melbourn.
- There is a need to consider the cumulative effects and impacts of the level of development proposed in this area, particularly on transport, landscape, agricultural land, and existing settlements,
- Provision of infrastructure should be a priority for new developments.

- New development needs to include truly affordable housing.
- New development needs to include provision of health services and facilities.
- Site allocations need to include clear requirements for well-designed places that promote healthy lifestyles.

Site Specific Comments:

- Granta Park and the Welding Institute should be referred to given their importance to the area.

Rejected Sites:

- Support for the rejection of specific sites.
- Requests from site promoters for specific sites to be allocated

Response to Issues Raised in Representations:

- Some comments seek additional development, and that the plan should have allocated more sites, and released further green belt. Many of the representations reflect comments and issues addressed when considering the Strategy section of the Draft Local Plan.
- Other comments reflect concerns about the level of development. The Draft Local Plan has been informed by a range of evidence to identify development needs and select the sites to meet that need. This includes consideration of infrastructure needs, and how the needs generated by new development will be met.