

CHAPTER 10 – SUB-REGIONAL SPORTING, CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES	
Question No.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<b>COMMUNITY STADIUM</b>	
<p>Paras 10.1 to 10.6 (Introduction – community stadium issues)</p> <p>Support:106 Object:9 Comment:15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widespread support for concept of community stadium with community sport facilities;</li> <li>• Long overdue, much needed facility for all the community, especially young people;</li> <li>• Should be a sports village, with education and training facilities;</li> <li>• Would help to promote active lifestyles and a sense of community;</li> <li>• There is a shortage of all-weather pitches for the community, and Cambridge needs a bigger indoor sports hall – the proposed facility is to be welcomed;</li> <li>• Must make sure there are benefits for all, not just a stadium for Cambridge Utd – the facility must be available to the local community throughout the week;</li> <li>• Current problems of running local sports clubs because of high rentals for premises – a proper community venue would solve this;</li> <li>• Concerns about traffic impact if located south of Trumpington Meadows (when combined with traffic generated by residential development);</li> <li>• Ideal location would have rail access as well as road access to minimise local traffic impact;</li> <li>• Minority views opposing a new stadium for Cambridge Utd – better to invest in existing stadium, rather than build a new one;</li> <li>• No need for a new stadium for Cambridge Utd – would prefer smaller scale local facilities spread around the city and villages, rather than one centralised venue;</li> <li>• Alternative view in favour of a new stadium for Cambridge Utd – the club should be the anchor tenant, and it might help them to regain Football League status;</li> <li>• Cambridge Utd existing Abbey Stadium is out of date and incapable of viable improvement;</li> <li>• Not enough evidence to show if there is or will be sufficient demand to make a facility viable.</li> </ul>
<p>Paras 10.7 &amp; 10.8 (Principles for a Community Stadium)</p> <p>Support:58 Object:5 Comment:2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widespread support for the principles for a community stadium identified in the Issues &amp; Options document;</li> <li>• Any new facility must meet the needs of Cambridge Utd, as the only club capable of being the anchor tenant;</li> <li>• Alternative views expressed - the more clubs whose needs are met, the better; there should be no more than two main users, otherwise the playing pitch will not cope;</li> <li>• There should be a sequential approach to site selection;</li> <li>• Full support for the principle that the stadium must be available for community use;</li> <li>• Not convinced that the need for a community stadium has been proven, therefore it is premature to identify principles or consider a green belt location;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any site chosen should be capable of expansion of both buildings and practice/playing areas in the longer term.</li> </ul>
<p>Q4. Do you think there is a need for a community stadium serving the sub-region?</p> <p>Support:384 Object:70 Comment:131</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes (65% of responses);</li> <li>No (19%);</li> <li>Not in the Green Belt (7%);</li> <li>Should be investment spread across a number of local sports facilities/community centres rather than one multi-purpose stadium (3%);</li> <li>Would be 'desirable' but cannot be considered as a 'need' (1%);</li> <li>Undecided/not enough evidence/public money or S106 funds should not be used for Cambridge Utd/other comments (5%);</li> <li>If built, should provide for variety of sports – hockey, lead climbing wall, ice rink, athletics, cycle track, gym, swimming pool all mentioned.</li> </ul>
<p>Q5. Do you agree with the principles identified for the vision for a community stadium?</p> <p>Support:331 Object:33 Comment:25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes (78% of responses);</li> <li>No outright (5%);</li> <li>Partial agreement or other comment (17%):</li> <li>Other points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional principle – must have good strategic road access</li> <li>Additional principle – must have sustainable transport links</li> <li>Additional principle – must not have any substantial adverse effect on the local community where it is based</li> <li>Additional principle – must avoid adverse environmental impact</li> <li>Additional principle – must maximise its return on investment for long term viability</li> <li>Additional principle – must not be in the Green Belt</li> <li>Additional principle – must be sited away from housing</li> <li>There is no necessity for a stadium to be combined with sports facilities for local residents</li> <li>The term 'community stadium' misrepresents what is being proposed as it would be a sub-regional venue rather than a facility for the community</li> <li>The principles could make specific reference to other sporting needs, such as a lead climbing wall</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Q6. If a suitable site cannot be found elsewhere, do you think the need is sufficient to provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt to accommodate a community stadium?</p>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to plan for such a facility;</li> <li>Need for Stadium and associated sports facilities outweigh Green Belt;</li> <li>Can consider landscape impacts in design;</li> <li>Depend on the site;</li> <li>Sites outside the Green Belt have considerable disadvantages compared to the Green Belt options;</li> <li>Cambridge is the right location for Cambridge United;</li> <li>The site for a site in Cambridge has gone on for 30 years with no success;</li> <li>Can address shortfalls in sports provision;</li> </ul>

Support:303  
Object:62  
Comment:23

- Opportunity to benefit future generations;
- Social and economic benefits provide exceptional case;
- Have to consider the needs of the City;
- Its time the Council supported professional sport;
- More important than houses or shopping facilities;
- Alternative options such as new settlements are not appropriate;
- Most new stadium sites are on edge of Cities where accessible by road. Would keep traffic out of City;
- Only support if other options are not available;
- **Cambridge Regional College** – benefits of location near CRC should not be underestimated;
- **Cambourne Parish Council** - a Community Stadium as it should be in or on the edge of Cambridge
- **Sport England** – Could be justified if there is a lack of suitable sites outside Green Belt. Important that area big enough to encourage participation. Possible sites in built up area not big enough;

#### Object

- No exceptional circumstances;
- No specific need has been identified;
- Other options existing outside the Green Belt;
- Facilities could be dispersed rather than concentrated into one area;
- Already concluded no exceptional circumstances for housing. Community stadium would be more detrimental;
- It would open up the area for more housing;
- Would reduce area of open land around the City;
- Would not offer sustainable transport access;
- Support a stadium in the Green Belt, but opposed to building homes;
- **Grantchester Parish Council, Hauxton Parish Council, Shepreth Parish Council** – No exceptional circumstances.
- **Harlton parish Council** – no need identified, goes against Council's own findings.

#### Comments

- Depends on the benefits of the site e.g. access to public transport;
- If develop in the Green Belt, would need to compensate with accessible green spaces;
- Large amount of open land available in the area, not reasonable to restrict development if needed;
- Re-labelling a commercial stadium development as a 'Community Stadium' should not change the fundamental planning decision;
- Need a public interest vehicle to make the case for public subsidy, and manage the pooling of CIL and other receipts. Site needs to be low value and large

	<p>enough for economies of scale, and accessible. Should look again at alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Need to balance benefits with impact on Green Belt;</li> </ul>
<p>Paras 10.9 to 10.13 (Potential Community Stadium Site Options)</p> <p>Support:24 Object:23 Comment:12</p>	<p><b>Arguments in support: (number of similar reps)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the site option at Trumpington. Good access and well located. (12)</li> <li>• Support the Cowley Road site as outside the Green Belt and will have good public transport. (2)</li> <li>• Support CS4 the NIAB3 site. (1)</li> <li>• All the sites are suitable, let the club decide. (1)</li> <li>• A community stadium is supported. It will have community and health benefits. (1)</li> <li>• Support provision in a new settlement. (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Objections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map 3 does not show guided busway running to Trumpington (1)</li> <li>• The Trumpington site will cause traffic problems to the safe operation of the M11/A10 junction. (3)</li> <li>• No exceptional circumstance to justify loss of Green Belt, city already has a number of stadiums in or nearby. City sites preferred. (6)</li> <li>• This is an exceptional circumstance justifying loss of Green Belt. There is no space available that is not in the Green belt. (3)</li> <li>• Redevelop the existing Cambridge United site. (3)</li> <li>• None of the sites are suitable. (1)</li> <li>• The Milton site is not suitable as outside the city. (1)</li> <li>• The landowners and promoters are not prepared to make land available at NIAB3 (1)</li> <li>• Reject sites distant from Cambridge. These would cause traffic problems and lack community benefits. (8)</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important for the football club and Cambridge. (1)</li> <li>• No need for a new stadium, as the current one is never full. (1)</li> <li>• The Abbey site is poorly located with poor access. Cowley Road is way too small even for just a stadium. Newmarket Road would be viable but landowners want to use the site for housing. (1)</li> <li>• Can a stadium and community sports facilities be provided on different sites? Abbey Stadium - possible, proximity of existing community sports. Cowley - possible - with later development of some of the sewage works site. North of Newmarket Road - no - better for housing. (1)</li> <li>• Abbey site is too small. (1)</li> <li>• Reject sites that are distant from Cambridge. (2)</li> </ul>
<p>Q7. Which if any of the following site options for a community</p>	<p><b>Arguments in support: (number of similar reps)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support site CS5 at Trumpington. It has good access, will provide community and health benefits, has sufficient space and is viable. (219)</li> </ul>

stadium do you support or object to, and why?

Support: 238

Object: 27

Comment: 54

(some counted as supports)

- Cambridgeshire County Council support site CS5 at Trumpington. The site could also provide a Household Waste Recycling Centre. (1)
- Support site CS1 at Abbey Stadium as close to fans and existing facilities at the Abbey Sports complex. (13)
- Support site CS2 Cowley Road. Brownfield and will have excellent public transport. (7)
- Support site CS3 North of Newmarket Road. (9)
- Support CS4 NIAB3. (1)
- Support CS6 Union Place. (1)
- Support all the sites. (2)
- Support sites to the north of the City. (1)
- Support provision on brownfield land or in a new settlement. (2)
- Avoid a village location. (1)
- The promoters of a new settlement at Waterbeach state that they could consider inclusion of land within the site masterplanning to accommodate a community stadium, assuming the need is established. (1)
- Sites CS1 and CS2 are suited to the residential development which the City needs. CS3 is the most suitable. CS4 and CS6 may be too small. CS5 might be suitable but you cannot rely on the existing Guided Busway, or CS7 which would need better links to the A14. CS8 and CS8 are too remote for suitable use by the wider community. (1)

**Objections:**

- No justification for any loss of Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances. (9)
- Object to site CS5, loss of Green Belt and traffic and congestion concerns. Park and Ride already gets full. Loss of farmland. Previously rejected site. (12)
- Traffic and congestion concerns. (2)
- Object to CS4 at NIAB3. Landowners and promoters will not make land available. Loss of Green Belt, poor transport links. (2)
- Object to site CS1 due to loss of allotments. (2)
- Hanley Grange new settlement site should have been considered as a stadium site. (1)
- Reject all the sites. (7)
- Object to all sites distant from the fan base in Cambridge. Transport problems. (4)

**Comments:**

- Support CS2 at Cowley Road or CS7 Northstowe. (2)
- Support brownfield options first then a new settlement option. No to the Green belt options. (3)
- Support Sites CS1 and 8. Object to sites CS 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8. (5)
- Any site needs to be by a park and ride site for access and parking reasons. (1)
- Consider the Spicers site. (1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any site needs to be in or close to Cambridge. (1)</li> <li>• Support CS7 Northstowe and CS8 Waterbeach. (2)</li> <li>• Natural England comment that Site CS1 (object) would require mitigation measures to ensure negative impacts on these protected areas are avoided. Site CS2 and 3 are supported as it is sustainable and does not impact on the natural environment. Site CS4 (Object) would lead to the loss of farmland and farmland species. CS5 (Object) would lead to loss of wildlife habitat. CS7 (Object) Natural England continues to engage with interested parties on this site. (1)</li> <li>• Locate in a business area not a residential one. (1)</li> <li>• Any stadium at Waterbeach will require an assessment of impacts on Wicken Fen and the long term Wicken Vision. (1)</li> <li>• No need exists for Community Stadium. (3)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Option CS1 :</b> The Abbey Stadium and Adjoining Allotment Land, Newmarket Road, Cambridge</p> <p>Support:25 Object: 52 Comment: 16</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As long as it's outside the green belt. (2)</li> <li>• Should be at the heart of the population as it is intended to serve. (6)</li> <li>• This is a practical site being an extension of the current stadium. (6)</li> <li>• Provided there is alternative allotment arrangements it's straight forward. (4)</li> <li>• More infrastructures for cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>• Proximity to town centre is a plus. (4)</li> <li>• Easy to reach by public transport and roads. (5)</li> <li>• Existing facilities need to be redeveloped and the actual need defined before encroaching on green belt land.</li> <li>• Most feasible option. (2)</li> <li>• Encroachment on allotment land to the south should be kept to a minimum.</li> <li>• Provide a more frequent bus service and better park and ride options: longer opening hours.</li> <li>• Traditional and recognised area for sport.</li> <li>• The only thing wrong is the wishes to build houses on it.</li> <li>• Give allotment holders free rental for 5 years.</li> <li>• This site is preferable. (2)</li> <li>• <b>Caldecote Parish Council:</b> This has to be the most practical site being an extension of the current stadium. If all it takes is to move allotments then this seems very straightforward.</li> <li>• <b>Cherry Hinton Road and Rathmore Road residents Association:</b> Ensure CUFC stay at Abbey and this is by far the best use of existing space. Hope a bit more infrastructure, for cycle and pedestrians can be provided and also a halt on the existing railway. Provide alternative allotments for Coldhams Common South.</li> <li>• <b>West Anglian Orienteering Club:</b> Closet to centre. Already in use. Allotments can be relocated. Possibly the cheapest option.</li> </ul>

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Bad traffic links already on Newmarket Road, will only increase and cause gridlock. (15)
- Access will be difficult.
- Vital green and meeting space.
- Not big enough to help anyone but football.
- Site not big enough for serious development. (8)
- Loss of existing allotments unacceptable. (9)
- Allotment sites are a community/social good which belong to people living close to them. (4)
- Allotments have been worked on over years to concrete over them is mad, allotment holders unlikely to want to start again on an unworked site further away.
- Allotments are contributing towards exercise and healthy food production. (3)
- This land should be used to extend the allotment sites.
- Allotments are protected under the Council 2006 Local plan as of environmental and recreational importance.
- I do not understand how allotment land can be considered available for development; I thought allotment land was protected by law. (2)
- Allotments are a necessity now and into the future. There is already a waiting list of hundreds in Cambridge. (3)
- Loss of wildlife habitat. (2)
- Generate noise and air pollution.
- Radically reduce green space.
- Loss of allotments accessible by foot or bicycle. (3)
- A lot of time and money has been put into developing allotments, impossible to reclaim work. (2)
- Loss of common land.
- In favour of Trumpington Meadows. (2)
- Better to use the site for housing/mixed-use. (2)
- Stadium could be built in conjunction with the University around on of the numerous college sports fields.
- Poor location, facility would be better on the outer edges of the city.
- Green space is declining rapidly and needs to be protected.
- Not as accessible as other options.
- Unclear how the proposed additional sports facilities would be funded and no evidence of long term financial sustainability.
- Unclear if landowners of the allotments are prepared to make the land available for development. (2)
- Detrimental effect on community from construction works. (3)
- Abbey Pool and the stadium could be further developed to increase utilisation without spreading onto the allotment area.
- Security risk to local residents and properties deriving from free access to back of houses.
- Public sector provision cannot be justified to provide finance for a project of this nature. The project would be

	<p>financially unsound and become a burden on the local tax payers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments should be excluded from any land use for a community stadium, removing a local outdoors activity for a sub-regional facility would be inappropriate as would relocation of allotments.</li> <li>• 'Community allotments' are better than 'community stadium'.</li> <li>• Site next to park and ride seems more appropriate.</li> <li>• Outdated site with limited community uses.</li> <li>• <b>Whitehall Allotment Society:</b> Object because this is allotment land, allotments reduce carbon footprint and are a social activity for the community and families, haven for wildlife and educational for children. Access to the site would be bad.</li> <li>• <b>CPRE:</b> Object because it would be too small an area.</li> <li>• <b>Group of Residents on Elfeda Road:</b> Loss of existing allotments, significant increase in traffic on Newmarket road, detrimental effects on our community for the construction works.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional location for sports.</li> <li>• Access and transport links need to be thought out.</li> <li>• Not enough room or parking.</li> <li>• Abbey Stadium is not the best place for development and adds to traffic problems of the area.</li> <li>• With current problems at the club site I would suggest elsewhere, it is hard to get to and hard to park at.</li> <li>• Develop existing, established stadium that does not require further brown or green field site development for this purpose.</li> <li>• The right of way for the residential houses north of CS1 site must be taken into account in any future developments.</li> <li>• A further station could be built at Barnwell junction.</li> <li>• Allotments only benefit a small proportion of the community.</li> <li>• Could Abbey stadium be re-vamped to meet future needs of CUFU without the rest of the public sports facilities envisaged in the 'community stadium'?</li> <li>• Community stadium should be at the current site, this would cause least disruption, not effect green belt and be close to the core fan base which has been built up for years in that area.</li> <li>• <b>Anlian Water:</b> Overall rating: Green.</li> <li>• <b>The I&amp;O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association:</b> Most of us support if an alternative site for allotments is provided and a need for the stadium is demonstrated. If there is any inter-dependency between Grosvenor's support for community stadium construction and their wish to develop the Abbey Stadium site for housing, this should play no part in the choice of site for a</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Community Stadium.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council:</b> Should land to the south, the allotment gardens, be included in the development area we would have an expectation that suitable alternative land be made available for alternative allotments in the area. Release of the allotment gardens would be subject to ensuring that land is not covenanted in any way that would preclude its proposed use. In addition we would like to ensure that green space designation of the pitch remains.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage:</b> The Abbey Stadium and adjoining allotment land, Newmarket Road is the preferred option.</li> <li>• <b>Environment Agency:</b> Site low risk from fluvial flooding but foul and surface water drainage strategy required. Site underlain partly by Chalk Formation means ground water beneath is a valuable resource. Technical assessment for site acknowledges potential for contamination due to current and historical land use. Aware of former pits on site that may have been in-filled. Need site investigations prior to submission of applicants. Recommend preliminary investigations undertaken to ensure allocation of site is appropriate. Potential to use infiltration drainage on site; however geology of site may mean useable infiltration rates are not achievable. Constraints on location and design of any such features depending on contamination found, if any, and depth to groundwater. More pollution prevention measures are likely to be required for any employment or car parking uses on this site.</li> <li>• <b>Harlton Parish Council:</b> HPC does not support any of the sites except CS1 which includes the existing stadium.</li> <li>• <b>Save our Green Spaces (SOS):</b> The two football grounds are sizeable open spaces but not green ones and SOS would like to stress that their development should include provision of open space rather than just cosmetic tree planting. It is also important to avoid appropriating green space when seeking replacements for these two sports facilities. SOS would like to see the council ensure that the residential developments of a significant size provide and enhance green spaces in their area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Option CS2 :</b> Cowley Road Cambridge (former Park and Ride and Golf Driving Range)</p> <p>Support:25 Object: 32 Comment: 17</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best option.</li> <li>• Stadium could be built in conjunction with the University around one of the numerous sports fields.</li> <li>• Access would need to be improved and sewage works improved.</li> <li>• Existing facilities need to be redeveloped and the actual need defined before encroaching on green belt land.</li> <li>• Obvious place to put a stadium, the new station is there, guided bus, A14 and park and ride therefore it makes sense providing there is enough space. (2)</li> <li>• Support as it is a brown field site.</li> <li>• Good transport links (easy access by public transport) (7)</li> <li>• Doesn't interfere with the green belt.</li> </ul>

- If community stadium is required best place for it to be sited would be Cowley Road where it is already an industrial site and is next to car parking and the rail way station.
- No better site can be found in Cambridge therefore Cambridge City council would need to reconsider its plans for this site to decide whether it really wanted CUFC to continue as a football club within the city. (2)
- If this facility is really needed this would be an excellent place to put it.
- **CPRE:** It is within the city boundary and has good transport links which are enhanced by the proposed new Chesterton rail station. This is the only site CPRE support.
- **Cherry Hinton and Rathmore Road Residents Association:** Support for community facility but not including CUFC as it would crowd out other user.
- **Caldecote Parish Council:** Good transport, inside the city. Make the most effective use of the area for the stadium. Easy acquisition etc.
- **Rampton Parish Council:** Best option of those presented.
- **The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents Association:** Support is given if the need is demonstrated however limited size may be a problem. Community stadium would provide employment opportunities. It must be within the City Councils power to make this land available.

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Site doesn't seem large enough to accommodate a sporting village. (8)
- Site better suited for housing.
- Traffic congestion.
- Access to the site is poor.
- Putting the site in congested part of the city and on the wrong side of the river for Cambridge United traditional catchment area.
- Too near sewage works.
- Poor transport link.
- High value land needs careful thought for development once station is up and running.
- Densely populated area and no real infrastructure existing.
- Golf driving range is a leisure facility we do not want to lose. (2)
- Existing landowner has clearly stated this site is not available for development as a community stadium therefore this is not a reasonable option. (2)
- Lack of land available for delivering outdoor sports facilities.
- This site has the potential to become and major employment centre for North Cambridge especially considering the proximity to the station. Using it for a stadium would represent an appalling wasted opportunity. (3)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is a business/industrial area of the city. There would be little residential development in the immediate vicinity and therefore little likelihood of developing a community spirit which would be required to make this a success.</li><li>• Public sector provision cannot be justified to provide or finance any project of this nature.</li><li>• Unclear how this would be funded and no long term financial sustainability.</li><li>• Unlikely to integrate with existing communities, this is likely to seriously hinder its ability to function as a community stadium.</li><li>• Large influxes of people visiting the stadium would add to traffic and parking issues in an already congested part of the city.</li><li>• Poorly located and would need to be part of a more comprehensive approach to the planning of this part of the city than is currently envisaged. Station development will make this whole area a target for more lucrative uses. Public transport to city generally poor as priority is given to needs of commuters, with buses by-passing Cambridge residents.</li><li>• <b>Cambridge City Council:</b> The property services department of the city council support current plans for a high density, mixed use employment led development at Northern Fringe East. The city council owns land in this area and would expect to make its land available to contribute to a realisation of this vision. The council would expect to work closely with other landowners and stakeholders to deliver a high quality development and supports the various principles for development set out in the issues and options dated June 2012.</li><li>• <b>Harlton Parish Council:</b> HPC totally oppose all the sites in the green belt, both on a basis of objection to green belt development and also because of public transportation and access problems. HPC research has determined that the vast majority of the support comes from the northern part of the city; Support from the southern part is extremely small. Considerable transport issues with any site south of the city.</li><li>• <b>Indigo Planning Ltd:</b> The site is not suitable for the proposed facility and better alternatives are available. Site has limited access and detachment from residential development making the site unsuitable. The land owner has stated that this site is not available for the proposed use. The site has significant constraints and the proposal would cause adverse impacts, so should therefore be discounted as a community stadium.</li></ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cowley Road is the best option as it has transport links and is close to the city and surrounding areas. (2)</li><li>• Better to use brown sites first.</li><li>• The Chesterton new site is the only suitable site and would be more convenient for supporters.</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there has to be a stadium, the old park and ride site would result in the least environmental impact.</li> <li>• Current access of a single lane would be problematic.</li> <li>• Restricted size could impact on the vision of the project and reduce advantages from inclusion of provisions for multiple sports and other amenities.</li> <li>• Cowley Road has benefits given the nature of the site and accessibility from both the city and A14.</li> <li>• Best option is for Cambridge United to stay at the Abbey Stadium as this is their long established home with potential to develop other sporting facilities if required in the future, if another site is required then Cowley Road would be the obvious choice due to transport links.</li> <li>• Cowley Road is not up to this level of traffic.</li> <li>• Stadium should be within easy reach of those living in the city. This site is suitable.</li> <li>• The stadium would need to be in a relatively central place such as Cowley Road.</li> <li>• <b>Anglian Water:</b> Wastewater treatment works assessment: Green. Foul sewerage network capacity assessment: Green. Surface water network capacity assessment: Red. Overall rating: Green.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage:</b> No objection to this site being used for the community stadium.</li> <li>• <b>RAON:</b> This would appear to move the stadium site closer to what is effectively the Cambridge ring-road, which may be preferable to the current Abbey Road site, though without a detailed traffic plan, allowing for the likely changes to pedestrian, cycle, train, and car usage, then the question is quite pointless at this point as no real consideration of possible impact can be given.</li> <li>• <b>West Anglian Orienteering Club:</b> Too small, no potential.</li> <li>• <b>Environment Agency:</b> Adjacent first public drain. Site at low risk from fluvial flooding but foul and surface water drainage strategy required. Site underlain by superficial river terrace deposits underlain by Gault formation. Groundwater beneath site important as base-flow into local watercourses and for local abstractions needs maintaining. 16 known groundwater abstraction with 1km: 15 deregulated abstractions up to 650m southeast for general farming and domestic use; and one for spray irrigation 690m northeast. Drains adjacent to site flow in River Cam. Technical assessment for site acknowledges potential for contamination due to adjacent land use. Expect use as a bus depot to be potentially contaminative. Need site investigations prior to the submission of applications. Recommend preliminary investigations undertaken to reduce allocation on delivery risks. Potential to use infiltration drainage on site; more pollution prevention measures are likely for any employment or car parking uses on this site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Option CS3 :</b> North of Newmarket Road,</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the best choice as it is not too small or too far away</li> </ul>

Cambridge East

Support:17

Object: 23

Comment: 15

from the city centre. (4)

- Park and ride service should help transport people efficiently from the city centre, especially on match days. (2)
- Easy to be reached by public transport and roads. (2)
- Not on green belt land. (2)
- Stadium could be built in conjunction with the University around one of the numerous college sports fields.
- Existing facilities need to be redeveloped and the actual need defined before encroaching on green belt land.
- Good size and infrastructure with A14. (2)
- Close to existing football stadium so local fan base can be maintained.
- The pros for this area seem to outweigh the cons.
- It will keep traffic away from Cambridge.
- **The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association:** Support if need is demonstrated. We agree with the "pros" but do not know the strength of the final "con".

#### OBJECTIONS:

- If this land is to be built on, it would be far better for housing, Marshalls are actively pursuing this. (6)
- Land here is not available which means there is no realistic prospect of the stadium being located here. (5)
- The landowner doesn't want this land to be used for this sort of facility and size limitations, support would be given for this area if the airport moved away.
- Land should be returned to green belt, lovely green space that should be preserved. Area around it is residential and is not suitable for accommodating fans on match days and could disrupt residents. (2)
- Infrastructure for this site to be viable would need to be improved.
- Any new site should be away from the A14.
- Public sector provision cannot be justified to provide or finance any project of this nature. This project would become financially unsound and a burden to the local council taxpayers.
- There are no amenities in the area to accommodate loads of fans before and after matches, for example pubs and restaurants.
- Stadium lighting could be a problem for aircraft.
- Public transport access is not good.
- Development of the site for a community stadium would further increase the shortfall in housing and affordable housing delivery.
- Unclear how the proposed stadium would be funded and no evidence of the long term financial sustainability.
- **Harlton Parish Council:** HPC totally oppose all sites in the green belt area because on green belt development and also because of public transportation and access problems. HPC research has determined that the vast

majority of support comes from the northern part of the city. Support from the southern part is very small, thus there would be considerable transport issues with any site in the south of the city.

- **CPRE:** We object as Marshalls are actively pursuing development for the site for housing.
- **Caldecote Parish Council:** This appears to be far better used for dwelling development, without disrupting existing communities.
- **Marshall Group of Companies:** Need is very questionable. Housing is a much more important priority. Marshalls will not make its land available for community stadium. Necessary size and height of a stadium and associated floodlighting will be incompatible with the safe operation of the runway and associated electronic equipment.

**COMMENTS:**

- Good place but no public transport.
- Might as well stay where it is.
- Good transport links with park and ride and A14 nearby and soon the new rail station, however Marshalls are putting in a planning application for residential therefore I think this site will become unavailable.
- Park and ride would have to be given a new location which could be close enough to proposed stadium; Newmarket road would have to be upgraded as it is already very congested.
- As long as full set of other facilities as well as stadium, it is within the traditional catchment area for Cambridge United.
- Newmarket Road and Trumpington area have traffic black spots and this will get worse whether the stadium is built or not.
- Advantages in terms of location with Cambridge United's area of core support. However it seems a non-started if the land is not available.
- Marshalls have indicated this land is not available for use, this says enough.
- Footpath and cycle route must be retained.
- **Anglian Water:** Wastewater Treatment Assessment: Amber. Foul Sewerage Network Capacity Assessment: Green. Surface Water Network Capacity Assessment: Red. Overall Rating: Amber. May require additional treatment capacity to serve development.
- **English Heritage:** This is a large site allocation which abuts the green belt and while English Heritage would not object in principle to the community stadium being sited within this overall area, we do not believe it would be appropriate for the stadium to be located near the green belt edge. A structure of this size incorporating floodlights would adversely impact on the green belt.
- **RAON:** This would move the stadium closer to what is effectively the Cambridge ring road which could be preferable to the Abbey Road Site. Without a detailed

	<p>traffic plan, allowing for the likely changes to pedestrian, cycle, train and car usage, then the question is quite pointless at this point and no real consideration of possible impact can be given.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environment Agency:</b> Site low risk from fluvial flooding but Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy required. South site underlain by super river terrace deposits. North site underlain by Chalk Formation. Groundwater beneath is a valuable resource. 3 groundwater abstractions for domestic supplies within 350m. Field drains in north of site. Technical assessment for site acknowledges potential for contamination. OS plans suggest several works on site and former railway on N boundary considered potentially contaminative. Need site investigations prior to submission of applications. Recommend preliminary investigations are undertaken to ensure that the allocation of the site is appropriate. Potential to use infiltration drainage on this site; Constraints on the location and design of any such features depending on contamination found and depth to groundwater. More pollution prevention measures are likely to be required for any employment or car parking use on this site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Option CS4 :</b> Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road (NIAB 3)</p> <p>Support:8 Object: 190 Comment: 14</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good transport links from the A14 and guided bus route but difficult to reach from other parts of Cambridge without driving. (2)</li> <li>• Good sized site with little impact on local communities.</li> <li>• Consideration would have to be given to parking provision and improving public transport links to the site.</li> <li>• Existing facilities need to be redeveloped and the actual need defined before encroaching on green belt land. This may be a remote option for a way forward if the need is actually defined.</li> <li>• Good site, easy to be reached by public transport and roads.</li> <li>• Keeps traffic away from Cambridge. (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further housing or a community stadium should be built on this land. (142)</li> <li>• The roads into Cambridge are already congested, a residential neighbourhood is not an appropriate place for fans to celebrate or console themselves,</li> <li>• Road pollution from A14 would be hard to reduce.</li> <li>• Infrastructure to this site would need to be improved, also not close enough to Cambridge.</li> <li>• Histon and Impington would be gridlocked and destroyed.</li> <li>• Any new site should be away from A14.</li> <li>• Public sector provision cannot be justified to provide or finance any project of this nature. Project would be financially unsound and become a burden on local council taxpayers.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This already dense new development will have important repercussions on local traffic. The additional traffic/parking from visitors to a sports stadium threatens to overload the system. In addition noise and light pollution from the stadium will negatively affect local resident's lives.</li> <li>• Too far away from the traditional catchment area.</li> <li>• Increased traffic. (2)</li> <li>• Too small got proposed range of facilities. (3)</li> <li>• Lack of accessible public transport. (3)</li> <li>• Unclear how proposed stadium would be funded and no evidence of long term financial sustainability.</li> <li>• Outside broad development envelope and lacks the ability to be designed into new development.</li> <li>• Concerns about air quality. (2)</li> <li>• Separation of Histon and Cambridge must be preserved. (3)</li> <li>• Poor location.</li> <li>• The best solution for Cambridge football ground would be within Cambridge not outside the present boundary.</li> <li>• Stadium could be built in conjunction with the university around one of the numerous college sports fields.</li> <li>• Not suitable for the stadium, would be better used for housing.</li> <li>• The site is off-centre and the part of the guided bus way passing near it is very unlikely to give access to the new station. The existing road layout is too close to the A14 and would create severe match day congestion. (3)</li> <li>• Housing and industry should not be mixed up.</li> <li>• Distance from city centre, access and traffic congestion. (2)</li> <li>• Leave green belt as use another option. (10)</li> <li>• Caldecote Parish Council: On green belt.</li> <li>• Castle Residents and other Citizens of Cambridge: This side of the city will experience the greatest impact of development already envisaged. The 'community stadium' would bring threat to the amenities of resident living close by.</li> <li>• Harlton Parish Council: Oppose sites on green belt because its green belt, public transport and access problems. Research has determined that the majority of the support comes from the northern part of the city, support from the southern side is small and therefore considerable transport issues with any site in the south of the city.</li> <li>• Girton Parish Council: Concerns about air quality.</li> <li>• Storey's Way Residents Association: Aware of issues and options consultation, our view is that no further housing, nor a proposed Community Stadium should be built on this land.</li> <li>• Histon and Impington Parish Councils: Potential site conflict with the existing Histon football club. Not only is there an issue of competition for spectators and therefore impact on business of HFC but also the thought must be</li> </ul>
--	--

given to the potential for simultaneous home games and therefore higher volumes of traffic and for this reason alone should be rejected. There is no provision for parking and this is green belt land.

- The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents Association: Site is on the edge of Cambridge and only accessible by road. Transport issues surrounding this site cannot be easily resolved. It is on green belt land and the air quality will be worsened from traffic. Site size and shape are unsuitable.
- Histon and Impington Village Action Group: This is the only part of land separating Cambridge from Histon and Impington. Residents do not want the village to lose its identity or be seen as an extension of Cambridge. If the stadium was placed here this would add to traffic through the villages.
- Richmond Road Residents Association: Concerns about additional traffic generated and the impact on the local road systems and adjacent facilities. Would prefer modest residential and light industrial use as proposed elsewhere.

**COMMENTS:**

- Cowley Road would be the most suitable site as it is close to the A14 for road connections and near the railway line.
- Not the best option.
- This land is more suitable for a stadium than housing or employment.
- This is the best site because of the excellent road infrastructure and guided bus route.
- This site makes sense given the transport links.
- Great for A14 links but will create more traffic as there is no other public transport than the guided bus.
- Too close to Histon Stadium.
- If there were a Histon road option as access from further afield is better via the motorway and surrounding roads.
- What about the impact on Histon FC.
- Anglian Water: Wastewater Treatment Works Assessment: Green. Foul Sewerage Network Capacity Assessment: Green. Surface Water Network Capacity Assessment: Red. Overall Rating: Green.
- English Heritage: Would not object in principle to the location of a community stadium on this site.
- RAON: This would move the stadium closer to the Cambridge ring road which may be preferable to the current Abbey road site though without a detailed traffic plan, allowing the likely changes to pedestrian, cycle, train and car usage the question is pointless as no real consideration of possible impact can be given.
- Environment Agency: surface and Foul Water should follow the drainage strategy which is currently being finalised. Site underlain by superficial river terrace deposits underlain by Gault Formation. Groundwater beneath site is important as base-flow in to local watercourses and for local abstractions. 16 known groundwater abstraction

	<p>within 1km: 15 deregulated abstractions up to 650m southeast for general farming and domestic use; and one for spray irrigation 690m northeast. Drains and streams across and adjacent to site which flow in to tributaries of Cottenham Lode. Technical assessment acknowledges potential for contamination. Need site investigations prior to submission of applications. Recommend preliminary investigations undertaken to ensure allocation of site is appropriate. Potential to use infiltration drainage on site; more pollution prevention measures likely for employment use on site.</p>
<p><b>Site Option CS5 :</b> Land south of Trumpington Meadows, Hauxton Road Cambridge</p> <p>Support:87 Object: 93 Comment: 20</p> <p>In addition, petition with 140 signatories opposing the site.</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> (number of similar comments in brackets)</p> <p>Support location due to transport / access / location (44)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport links are good and it would also avoid adding to congestion in the city centre.</li> <li>• Would incur the least overall vehicle-miles driven by users of the stadium.</li> <li>• (Orwell Parish Council) Of the sites suggested we feel Trumpington with the P&amp;R car park, the Guided bus route, and its proximity to the M11 is the best alternative.</li> <li>• Must be accompanied by a major upgrade to the local infrastructure. At the very minimum: A new junction on the M11 specifically for the stadium, widening of the A1309 into Trumpington, sheltered walkway from the Park and Ride to the Stadium, additional Park and Ride buses when a major event is taking place, a stadium car park for 500 cars.</li> </ul> <p>Advantages to the community / New Facilities (15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would bring significant community and sporting benefits. The development also presents the opportunity for much needed new homes.</li> <li>• Should provide beneficial facilities to the wide community of all ages and abilities.</li> <li>• A good site for a sports development area which Cambridge is in need of</li> <li>• Near enough to Cambridge to support existing clubs with improved facilities. As Cambridge is central in the East will open up opportunities to host important sporting events.</li> </ul> <p>Loss of Green Belt justified/will be minimal/ can retain some green space (11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the best of the options in terms of both its size and its location adjacent to the City, thus justifying a review of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• As this piece of land is sandwiched between the park and ride car park, a major A-road and the M11 motorway it is clearly not an area of outstanding beauty or pleasant countryside that needs protecting. There would still be plenty of green space over the other side of the M11</li> </ul>

dividing Trumpington and Hauxton and the proposals offer more useful, pleasant open space than is currently provided.

Viability (1)

- Deliverable and available immediately. Wide range of stakeholder support, including Cambridge United FC, Cambs FA and Cambridge City Hockey Club.

**OBJECTIONS:**

Traffic Issues – congestion, safety, parking (50)

- A10 through Hauxton and Harston overloaded with heavy lorry and other vehicles, and cannot support increase in traffic, unacceptable levels of traffic congestion.
- Reported that the Highways Agency is of the opinion that the A14/M11 is at capacity. The Trumpington Park & Ride is already full on Saturdays. People will park in Trumpington and Grantchester villages, damaging these local environments, increasing congestion and raising accident risk. Heavy foot traffic across the Meadows is unacceptable.
- Harlton PC research has determined that the vast majority of the support comes from the northern part of the city. Support from the southern part is extremely small. Thus there would be considerable transport issues with any site in the south of the city.
- Ickleton Parish Council agrees with the Councils' initial assessment of the site. It is unsuitable because it would be accessed predominantly by car.
- Whilst motor access sounds easy, parking appears restricted and the traffic impact of the new housing developments, particularly at Trumpington Meadows & Glebe Farm has yet to be seen in reality.

Green Belt (49)

- (Shepreth, Ickleton, Caldecote, Harlton Parish Councils, Cllrs Orgee and Kenney) It continues to fulfil Green Belt functions, and there are no special circumstances justifying its removal from it.

Inadequate Infrastructure (public transport) (19)

- There is already great pressure on facilities and particularly on transport. The provision of an 8000 seat stadium is foolhardy, particularly when there is no proven case for it anyway.
- The proposed site is quite some distance from the P&R facility and will cause huge transport problems. The guided busway to Trumpington is a single deck bus - to quote this as a good means of transporting fans from the other side of Cambridge or the railway station, is naive and misleading.

- Transport links and parking for this site are poor and will have an adverse impact on the adjacent sites and Trumpington itself.
- Trumpington Park and Ride is often full - especially Saturday afternoons
- Site is too far away from guided Bus and Park and Ride, let alone Railway Station.

#### Visual impact/ harm to City gateway (17)

- (English Heritage) A Stadium here would have a very serious adverse effect on the approach into Cambridge from the south, and English Heritage would oppose it. Following the development of Trumpington Meadows, this site now forms an extremely important role in buffering Cambridge from the M11.
- Positioning will degrade the setting of both the gateway and the housing.
- Being one of the main entries to the City, it will severely affect one's first impression of Cambridge.
- Any further development north of the M11 would negate the effort of creating a sharp edge to the current development.
- It would make this approach to Cambridge less rural and less attractive
- View from A10 towards Trumpington Church is valued. Views ruined if stadium with floodlight towers, associated buildings and a raft of additional housing up to the M11.

#### Landscape, biodiversity issues (12)

- Would reduce the important new riverside open space, which promises to become a valuable extension to the much-loved Grantchester Meadows. We fear that building on this land would damage to the area around Byron's Pool, an area rich in biodiversity and history and includes the Cam, fish pools and a fish pass created by Cambridge City Council
- Occupying land already identified for the new Country Park.

#### Community Do Not Support / Will Not Benefit Community (11)

- The local community has rejected the proposals which they say is evidenced by 900 signatures on petitions submitted to Cambridge City Council's Local Plan Issues & Options consultation held in summer 2012. They support the Trumpington Residents' Association's opposition to the inclusion of this site in the list of potential community stadium sites.
- Note one of the above petitions has been submitted as a late representation to the Issues & Options 2: Part 1 Joint Consultation.
- Provision of "health, leisure and educational facilities" is in

	<p>direct competition with the provision of such new facilities at Trumpington Meadows Primary School and longer-term Clay Farm community centre, and the proposed secondary school in Long Road could affect the viability of all these facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate in a local area which would gain limited benefit from the development</li> </ul> <p>400+ homes (11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extra 400+ houses would over-develop the site.</li> <li>• Development also appears conditional on the construction of over 400 properties more than currently approved. These will have adverse impacts on all local facilities - traffic, schools etc.</li> </ul> <p>Better Alternatives (9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Shepreth Parish Council) Would be better located at Waterbeach / Bourn airfield</li> <li>• Better to improve present stadium</li> <li>• I&amp;O 2 itself states Abbey Road is adequate for CUFC needs.</li> <li>• Build on brownfield</li> <li>• Consider Cowley Road or Near Park and Ride Newmarket Road and Waterbeach.</li> </ul> <p>Unviable (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current attendance figures at all 3 local football clubs prove conclusively that any such project would be financially unsound and become a burden on the local council taxpayers.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <p><b>Comment</b></p> <p><b>Favour location due to transport / access (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Orwell Parish Council) Of the sites suggested we feel Trumpington with the P&amp;R car park, the Guided bus route, and its proximity to the M11 is the best alternative.</li> </ul> <p>Transport/ traffic concerns (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without a detailed traffic plan, allowing for the likely changes to pedestrian, cycle, train, and car usage, then the question is quite pointless at this point as no real consideration of possible impact can be given.</li> </ul> <p>Drainage/ Water Resource/ Contamination (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Environment Agency) Foul &amp; Surface Water Drainage Strategy required. Strategy needs to comply with previously agreed greenfield runoff rates. Groundwater</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>beneath site is valuable resource Potential for contamination related to former occupants, Need site investigations to ensure allocation of site is appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Site Option CS6:</b> Land between Milton and Impington, north of A14 (Union Place)</p> <p>Support: 11 Object: 46 Comment: 10</p>	<p><b>Arguments in support: (number of similar reps)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good access/ potential for good access (3)</li> <li>• Provision of new facilities/ amenities (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Objections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor access/ transport issues/ too far from city/ isolated (23)</li> <li>• Green Belt – threat to principle of preventing coalescence of communities within it, and with Cambridge City and no special circumstances (22)</li> <li>• No justification/ need for conference/ hotel/ concert hall/ changes to or new Park and Ride (5)</li> <li>• Impact on traveller site north of the A14 (3)</li> <li>• Undeliverable/ unviable (3)</li> <li>• Conflict with Policy CS26 Minerals and Waste Development Plan (2)</li> <li>• Impact on colony of common toad (2)</li> <li>• Impact on and conflict with Histon Football Club (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible restrictions on development due to permitted landfill site to north (1)</li> <li>• Accessibility (2)</li> <li>• Air quality issues (1)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Option CS7:</b> Northstowe</p> <p>Support: 11 Object: 37 Comment: 16</p>	<p><b>Arguments in support: (number of similar reps)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility/ good public transport/ cycle access (4)</li> <li>• Not green belt (3)</li> <li>• Employment potential (2)</li> <li>• Provision of community facilities (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Objections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location: Too far from city/ poor access/ loss of identity and support/football club want Cambridge location/ not a community hub for Cambridge (31)</li> <li>• Endorsed DFD NAAP contains no provision for stadium/ conflict with other planning proposals/ better used for housing (4)</li> <li>• Unviable (3)</li> <li>• Too long before could be developed (3)</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too far from city (5)</li> <li>• Community facilities for new town (2)</li> <li>• Location: do sports clubs wish to locate/ relocate outside Cambridge (2)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Option CS8:</b> Waterbeach New Town Option</p>	<p><b>Arguments in support: (number of similar reps)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible: Close to railway, motorway and Park and Ride (4)</li> </ul>

<p>Support: 13 Object: 34 Comment: 13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not in green belt (2)</li> <li>• Could be integrated into plans from outset (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Objections:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location: Too far from city/ poor access/ loss of identity and support/football club want Cambridge location/ not a community hub for Cambridge (27)</li> <li>• Will take too long to develop (4)</li> <li>• Unviable (2)</li> <li>• Loss of land for housing (2)</li> <li>• Impact on Denny Abbey and its setting (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsuitable location so far from Cambridge (4)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Option CS9:</b> Bourn Airfield New Village Option</p> <p>Support:7 Object: 43 Comment: 10</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good option as it is a brownfield site. (2)</li> <li>• If the (current) football stadium is used for housing, a replacement should be located away from the city (1)</li> <li>• If need is established, this is the preferred site (2)</li> <li>• Has good road access (1)</li> <li>• Keeps traffic away from Cambridge (2)</li> <li>• Should not be built in the Green Belt (2)</li> </ul> <p>What the Parish Councils and Developers say :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Oakington &amp; Westwick Parish Council:</b> If need is established, this is the preferred site.</li> <li>• Has good road access</li> <li>• <b>Shepreth Parish Council:</b> If need is established, this or Waterbeach are the preferred sites.</li> <li>• Should not be in the Green Belt (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site too far to outside of Cambridge (32)</li> <li>• Poor Public Transport links/non car access (and therefore would cause congestion) (17)</li> <li>• Site more suited to housing (1)</li> <li>• The Taylor Family &amp; Countryside properties are not prepared to release the airfield for this use (1)</li> <li>• Site not suitable for any large development due to its proximity with Cambourn (1)</li> <li>• Will create a corridor between Cambridge and Cambourn (1)</li> <li>• Preserve the history and current use of the site (3)</li> <li>• Agree with the 'cons' as listed in the consultation document (1)</li> <li>• Unlikely to act as a hub for the wider Cambridge/South Cambs community (1)</li> <li>• Cambridge United unlikely to find this a suitable location (3)</li> <li>• Poor accessibility identified by the assessments of this site (1)</li> <li>• Unclear whether the land budget is sufficient to allow for a</li> </ul>

	<p>community stadium. It is likely that the community stadium would either displace existing community infrastructure being planned for residential land (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence as to the long term financial sustainability of the operational model (1)</li> <li>• No proposals exist currently, so not clear how any stadium here would act as a community hub (1)</li> <li>• No justification, either in terms of need or site suitability to locate new community stadium at Bourn Airfield (1)</li> <li>• Object to all sites (3)</li> <li>• Any project would be financially unsound due to attendance figures of all 3 main sports teams in Cambridge (1)</li> </ul> <p>What the Parish Councils and Developers say (in more detail):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grosvenor/Wrenbridge: Cambridge is sequentially preferable</li> <li>• Unlikely to act as a hub for the wider Cambridge/South Cambs community</li> <li>• Cambridge United unlikely to find this a suitable location</li> <li>• Poor accessibility identified by the assessments of this site</li> <li>• Unclear whether the land budget is sufficient to allow for a community stadium. It is likely that the community stadium would either displace existing community infrastructure being planned for residential land</li> <li>• No evidence as to the long term financial sustainability of the operational model</li> <li>• No proposals exist currently, so not clear how any stadium here would act as a community hub</li> <li>• The Taylor Family &amp; Countryside Properties (UK): No justification, either in terms of need or site suitability to locate new community stadium at Bourn Airfield</li> <li>• Cambridge United FC does not wish to move outside of Cambridge</li> <li>• The Taylor Family &amp; Countryside properties are not prepared to release the airfield for this use</li> <li>• <b>Bourn Parish Council:</b> Too far out of Cambridge and poor public transport links</li> <li>• <b>Caldecote Parish Council:</b> Too far away from city, poor travel options, would overload A428 and surrounding network</li> <li>• <b>Cambourn Parish Council:</b> Unlikely to meet principles of policy so is not viable.</li> <li>• Would not be able to provide or support infrastructure for site of this scale in a sustainable way</li> <li>• Transport and access to development would be a major concern</li> <li>• <b>Harlton Parish Council:</b> Poor public transport access</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will any locally significant sports club wish to locate/relocate to such a facility in this location?</li> <li>• How does this (and other) locations relate to Cambridge</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>United's fanbase?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to comment without a more detailed Transport Assessment which would give likely impacts/changes to pedestrian, cycle, bus, train and car usage</li> <li>• Are is better for road links than some other options, but public transport less good</li> <li>• Dry Drayton Parish Council: Views given previously related to the site as a housing proposal and not for its use as a Community Stadium.</li> <li>• These centred on traffic impacts.</li> <li>• No specific view on this proposal for the stadium, but note that it would be 10km from the city and with poor non-car access.</li> <li>• Anglian Water: The foul drainage constraints for these sites are currently being considered and options explored in liaison with the Environment Agency and the consultants acting on behalf of the landowners</li> <li>• Environment Agency: Give detailed comments on the drainage and flood risk of the site:</li> <li>• Surface water drainage will need to be controlled appropriately to achieve Water Framework Directive 'good ecological potential</li> <li>• It is likely that surface water will need attenuating to a natural greenfield run-off rate in a catchment that reacts unnaturally quickly to run-off. This will require a strategy for the site, and possibly involve works off-site, which the Environment Agency would seek to help enable wherever possible.</li> <li>• There is strong potential for this to link into a much enhanced green infrastructure network which would need addressing before the master planning stage.</li> <li>• Foul water drainage could be a significant issue.</li> <li>• Working with partners to assess issues</li> <li>• A surface and foul water drainage strategy should cover all phases of development, including construction phases, to prevent flood risk and pollution of the water environment.</li> <li>• the groundwater beneath the site is a valuable resource that needs to be maintained and its good Water Framework Directive status protected.</li> <li>• There is potential for contamination due to current and historical land use. Suitable non-intrusive and intrusive site investigations will be required prior to the submission of any future planning applications. To help offset delivery risks, we recommend that preliminary investigations are undertaken to ensure that the allocation of the site for this scale of development is appropriate.</li> <li>• There is the potential to use infiltration drainage on this site; however the geology beneath the site may mean that useable infiltration rates are not easily or viably achievable.</li> <li>• More pollution prevention measures are likely to be required for any employment or car parking uses on this site</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage:</b> No objections in terms of heritage impacts, although it is noted that the site is remote from the city</li> </ul>
<b>ICE RINK AND CONCERT HALL</b>	
<p>10.14-10.17</p> <p>Support:39 Object: 3 Comment: 8</p>	<p><b>Ice rink</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very strong support for the idea of an ice rink.</li> <li>• The success of the temporary ice rink on Parkers Piece shows that there is strong demand</li> <li>• An ice rink would promote active lifestyles</li> <li>• Cambridge needs more sports facilities</li> </ul> <p><b>Concert hall</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few representations made regarding the arts facility proposal</li> <li>• There is a need for a multi-purpose arts facility housed in an iconic building</li> </ul> <p><b>Location and transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ice rink proposal should be integrated into community stadium proposals / don't integrate this proposal with the community stadium proposal- spread out the proposals in different areas.</li> <li>• West Cambridge is close to other sporting facilities and is accessible from the city centre and main roads</li> <li>• The site will need parking and to be accessible by bicycle from the city centre, and should be near a park and ride</li> <li>• The Trumpington community stadium site would be better used for an arts centre. An arts centre in Trumpington would be used across the day and evening, whereas a community stadium would cause surges of traffic at times of events.</li> <li>• Ice rinks have heaviest use in the evenings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Framework for considering proposals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need has already been proven. Requiring further evidence will delay to this proposal / Evidence to show the need should be provided.</li> <li>• Evidence should be shown that the proposal is deliverable and viable.</li> <li>• Allocation of a specific site will progress this proposal more quickly.</li> <li>• Add a requirement that the facilities should be financially self-sustaining.</li> </ul>
<p>Q8a. Rather than identifying specific sites, should the Local Plans include a general policy to assist the consideration of</p>	<p><b>Arguments in support:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for including a general policy (30 respondents)</li> <li>• Support from Cambourne PC but split two uses into two separate policies. Need to consider how they impact on existing facilities in area.</li> <li>• Support from Oakington and Westwick PC</li> <li>• Only support if not in Green Belt</li> </ul>

<p>any proposals for sub regional facilities such as ice rinks and concert halls, should they come forward?</p> <p>Support: 32 Object:12 Comment:14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be commercially viable</li> <li>• Most prove there is a need for these uses</li> <li>• Cambridge Past, Present and Future – important to take an opportunity to make Cambridge a more interesting place to live especially for young people.</li> <li>• Perhaps the University could provide land at its proposed West Cambridge development?</li> <li>• If Clifton Road site is development could be ideal location (Rustat Neighbourhood Assoc)</li> <li>• Cambridge Leisure and Ice Centre – support especially if it helps to identify suitable land.</li> <li>• Responsibility of planners to identify site – Trumpington Road?</li> </ul> <p><b>Objections</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitely opposed especially in this time of financial constraints (8 respondents)</li> <li>• Objection from Harlton PC</li> <li>• Hauxton PC want evidence of need for these facilities and how they would impact on viability of existing facilities.</li> <li>• Must be clear business case for these (3 Respondents )</li> <li>• Opposed if this delays Community Sports Project. (5 respondents)</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge Cangaroos Trampoline Club would like to have purpose built trampoline centre in area – need to consider where. – Northstowe? Trumpington Fields?</li> <li>• Sport England – need for ice rink supported through Cambridgeshire Horizon sub-regional sports facility strategy 2006. Need to update this strategy to assess need for indoor sports facilities.</li> <li>• Would need to plan carefully such venues so they fit into city and are not an eyesore.</li> <li>• Should identify specific sites</li> <li>• Need firm commitment otherwise it will never happen</li> </ul>
<p>Q8b. Are the right principles identified? If not, what should be included?</p> <p>Support: 28 Object: 4 Comment: 15</p>	<p><b>Arguments in support:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policy principles (18 respondents)</li> <li>• Need separate policies</li> <li>• Haslingfield PC, Harlton PC, Oakington PC support</li> <li>• Support but not in Green Belt (5 respondents)</li> <li>• Support but need good local management of facilities to make them viable</li> <li>• Should also consider a mixed use and other associated needs that may benefit from juxtaposition.</li> <li>• Design key to acceptability</li> <li>• Need to maximise use of public transport but recognise that public likely to use cars and so provide car parking for them (6 respondents)</li> <li>• Cambourne PC supports but suggested others be added</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>1. Increased participation in cultural and recreational</p>

	<p>activities;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Reflect the key requirements and priorities of the sub-region's new and existing communities;</li> <li>3. Be financially sustainable.</li> </ol> <p><b>Objections</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wrong principles Concert Hall is good because can be used for other uses but ice rink only for ice based ones.</li> <li>• Too general – need strong objectives. Important to include cross cutting environmental sustainability considerations</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a need? Viable? (5 respondents)</li> <li>• Cambridge Leisure and Ice Centre disagrees with principles for ice rink and suggest similar principles to those used for community stadium. Suggest University money to fund facility</li> <li>• Users of new facilities should be able to use car to access facility</li> <li>• Should encourage use of buses to access facilities and train station</li> <li>• Cambridge Past Present and Future – provision of these facilities should not be at expense of prime sites for employment</li> <li>• Should be in city centre (3 respondents)</li> </ul>
--	--