

CHAPTER 8: A SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE

QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
QUESTION 1 / Paragraph	
Paragraph 8.1 Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 1	ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: OBJECTIONS: COMMENTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We support the objective to avoid such "significant" harm, and regret that none of the questions in this consultation address the degree to which respondents support, or disagree with the assessment that development of these sites would not, result in "significant" harm to the GB.
Paragraph 8.2 Support:0 Object: 5 Comment: 1	ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: OBJECTIONS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to any further loss of Green Belt as GB objectives are still valid and any development will worsen traffic. The Authorities are concerned that that further development on the edge of Cambridge would imbalance sustainability and work against a compact historic City and attractive setting. In reality, this would not be the case; by use of exemplar masterplanning, using a landscape approach, the attractive setting of Cambridge can be retained and enhanced. An example of an area with high levels of employment commitments is the Addenbrooke's / south of Cambridge high tech / bio tech cluster. The current development options do nothing to provide new housing in this area of a suitable size to balance the growth of jobs and workforce. A sustainable solution would be a new settlement. Papworth Everard Parish Council - This aim will support sustainable settlements of all sizes with mixed use development combining residential with employment development in a number of locations to provide the opportunity to live and work within the same community, to reduce the need for travel, congestion, carbon emissions and environmental impacts. The assertion that there is an outstanding demand for high quality employment sites is at variance with the statement (at 6.12) that planning permission already exists for more employment development than is forecast by 2031. Congestion adversely affects the economy and quality of life. The logical conclusion should be to reduce the planned developments. Dispute the necessity for new employment and housing to be on the edge of Cambridge. COMMENTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a link between local living and local jobs?

	<p>Are we building homes/jobs at a 1:1 ratio only for many of them to be bought by out-commuters and investors?</p>
<p>Paragraph 8.3</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • . This paragraph is unclear. Further, there is no evidence that allocating further larger sites on the edge of Cambridge would significantly harm the purposes of the Green Belt. • Object to any allocation that would harm the purposes of the Green Belt. We are not clear about the meaning of: "new housing would have to be delivered at the lower stages in the sequence". <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This seems already to have been ruled out for the sole purpose of maintaining the setting of the city?
<p>Paragraph 8.4</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 3 Comment: 8</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transport Strategy should have been available alongside this consultation. Its lack makes it harder to comment on the spatial strategy and proposed development sites. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any strategy to disperse growth away from Cambridge will make it harder to mitigate transport impacts and provide the necessary infrastructure. Such a strategy would be contrary to the NPPF and unsound. • Challenge whether effective, realistic and affordable measures to mitigate impacts of development exist? • There is a lack of a strategy for delivering reliable, affordable infrastructure links between centres of employment and new proposed residential developments. New housing should be placed along existing transport corridors <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properly planned infrastructure to support greater cycle use must be prioritised. • Rail can contribute to a transport strategy. Land could be reserved for a halt at Fulbourn on the Ida Darwin site. • Bus services are too expensive and inconvenient. • Ickleton Parish Council – The roads cannot cope with what we have now in terms of traffic generation. 'Build them now and address the problems later' does not seem particularly sustainable. Current policy implies a sticking plaster approach that is far from satisfactory. • The Transport Strategy should have been available as part of the consultation. Cycle Lanes from Central to West Cambridge are at full capacity and inadequate. • "Enhance accessibility" and "promote sustainable modes of transport" are mutually exclusive if

	<p>accessibility refers to private car use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urge that the needs of all transport users including car drivers are recognised and not just the cycling lobby. Growth rates in excess of 10% without building some new roads and widening others plus junction improvements will be needed at some point.
<p>Paragraph 8.5</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 3 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support analysis. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach of abandoning the consideration of larger Green Belt land releases on the edge of Cambridge is flawed as this is the most sustainable growth strategy. The meaning of the second sentence is obscure. Start planning now because the loss of the airport site is critical and the both Northstowe & Waterbeach developments may yet be delayed further. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing targets must be lowered.
<p>Paragraph 8.6</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The guided busway is not shown running south from the city centre to Trumpington. This is a critical omission given the importance of locating development close to transport infrastructure. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose the QTSQ area as a Major Green Infrastructure Target Area as part of the sustainable development strategy for the area.
<p>Question 1</p> <p>Where do you think the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages?</p> <p>Support:8 Object: 50 Comment: 237</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: (number of similar comments in brackets)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development should be beyond the city boundary. (2). Develop brownfield land in Cambridge and elsewhere and not Green Belt land. (1) Support development in the Green Belt. (2) <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use all brownfield sites before any Green Belt or greenfield site to protect food production and avoid flood risk. (4) No development in the Green Belt (7), develop in new settlements and villages (4). Do not develop Worts Causeway (2), or at Stapleford (2) This question proceeds on a flawed basis that all Green Belt land on the edge of Cambridge is of high significance. SCDC should not have to meet the deficit in Cambridge housing need. A critical comparison between new settlements and urban extensions in terms of sustainability has not been carried out. Neither is there a proper analysis of the extent to which new settlements can be

	<p>delivered in the plan period. Massive up-front infrastructure costs will come at the loss of affordable housing. Both Councils have failed to meet objectively assessed housing need. (1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop more housing in Cambridge. Relying on provision in new settlements will worsen the shortage of affordable housing in Cambridge. (1 • Develop land at Fen Road for Traveller pitches. (1 • Develop new settlements like Waterbeach. (2 • Papworth Everard Parish Council – Object to housing only development in Papworth. (1 • Allow large garden redevelopment on the edge of the Green Belt. (1 <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Concentrate development in new settlements and better served villages.</u> This will reduce commuting and relieve congestion in Cambridge. Transport links should be improved to allow commuting. Some parts of the County may benefit from more development. (37) • <u>Concentrate development in new settlements with appropriate infrastructure.</u> Village infrastructure cannot cope with more development. (36) • Expand Northstowe. (1) • <u>Concentrate all development in Cambridge.</u> Movement by bicycle is practical in Cambridge and the roads cannot cope with more cars and buses. University are freeing up central land. (8) • <u>Concentrate development in urban extensions to Cambridge</u> in the interests of sustainable development, economic growth, good access to jobs and services, and access by public transport and by bicycle. Whilst protecting the most important areas of Green Belt such as Grantchester Meadows (16). Develop south of Addenbrooke's between Shelford and Granhams Road (1). • <u>Concentrate development in the better served villages (15),</u> villages on the busway are particularly suitable (1), develop at Green Belt villages (1). • <u>Protect the Green Belt from development.</u> It has recently been reviewed and releasing land in every plan would make the policy to protect it meaningless. Land is available elsewhere. It provides the setting for Cambridge, maintains its scale, protects the necklace villages and protects wildlife. (77) • Allow some small scale development in the Green Belt. (2) • To provide adequate housing, Cambridge must increase development in the Green Belt beyond the 680 housing units proposed. 46.5 % of the housing proposed to 2031 is located in new
--	--

	<p>settlements in South CAMBS, making Cambridge's housing and economic development hostage to external political and fiscal forces. Housing development of CC 921, 926, 927 & parts of SC232 in Broad Location 1 would add over 4,000 housing units to 2031, while development of CC 904 and SC 294, 295 and parts of 105 in Broad Location 5 could add an additional 1,500 plus units to 2031 (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some parts of GB3 and GB4 could be developed if done sensitively (land west of Trumpington Road and Trumpington Meadows). (1) • Allow development on Madingley Road and affordable housing at Barton, Grantchester and Madingley. (1) • Remove land from the Green Belt to relocate Marshall North Works to enable existing site to be developed for residential. (1) • Develop at the edge of Cambridge, in new settlements and sustainable villages. (7) • The Welcome Trust would support additional housing south of Cambridge to provide greater choice. (1) • No growth should be allowed as there are insufficient water resources. (1) • Villages such as Barrington should take more low cost/first time buyers homes and social housing. (1) • Move jobs to the north of England and similar areas. Protect land for food production. (2) • Only build on brownfield land wherever it is. (2) • Barton Parish Council – Protect the Quarter to Six Quadrant. Develop brownfield land away from this area and the city. (1) • Dry Drayton Parish Council – Protect the Green Belt. (1) • Haslingfield Parish Council, Harlton Parish Council, Foxton Parish Council – Protect the Green Belt, develop new settlements. (3) • Grantchester Parish Council – Protect the Green Belt, develop new settlements. (1) • Ickleton Parish Council – Develop at new settlements and the better served villages. (1) • Milton Parish Council – Protect the Green Belt, avoid develop near Milton including Waterbeach, and avoid overloading the A14 corridor. (1) • Sawston Parish Council – Employment growth is concentrated in Cambridge so most growth should be in urban extensions to Cambridge. (1) • Shepreth Parish Council – Protect the Green Belt, direct any development north and east of the city. (1) • Stapleford Parish Council – Protect the Green Belt and especially to the south of the City. (1)
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teversham Parish Council – Protect the Green Belt. Develop only within existing framework boundaries and the city urban area. Return Cambridge Airport to the Green Belt. (1) • Waterbeach Parish Council - Although the Green Belt is important, it should not be prioritised above the needs of the surrounding countryside. Development to the north of Cambridge is not viable or sustainable as the infrastructure is severely stretched. The infrastructure south of Cambridge would seem more able to support sustainable development. (1) • Cambridgeshire County Council - In order for the development strategy to be sustainable known infrastructure shortfalls need to be addressed, including a Household Recycling Centre to serve Cambridge South. (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better traffic management is needed. (1) • Review the Green Belt at Cottenham. This may avoid pushing development to less sustainable areas. (1) • Only develop brownfield land (6) and not the Green Belt at Fen Ditton (1). • No to Green Belt development at Stapleford (traffic, danger to children). (2) • The A14 and A10 cannot cope with more traffic. (1) • Protect farmland, (1), areas of high environmental and biological value (1). • No village development. (2)
--	--