

CHAPTER 6: CONTINUING A SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
QUESTION / PARAGRAPH	
Paragraph 6.1 Support:2 Object: 1 Comment: 1	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will offer exceptional opportunities for a generation of children. Cambridge is a key area for the 21st Century and needs infrastructure to match. The relevant council should treat this plan as an exception, a chance to evolve rather than to stand still. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan to 2031 must continue with a sustainable development strategy on the edge of Cambridge. The loss of 12,000 dwellings in Cambridge East is no excuse to change the strategy and move to a dispersal development strategy. Other equally sustainable land is available on the edge of Cambridge. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This sustainable development strategy needs to describe how to support "mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy", as described under "an environmental role" in 4.1. This would be by including requirements for high energy-efficiency in all new buildings and retro-fit (or replacement) of inefficient old properties. And also supporting sustainable, local communities, where the need for frequent or distant travel is reduced and low-carbon travel options are supported.
Paragraph 6.2 Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 0	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strategy contained in the adopted Local Plans remains the most sustainable strategy being founded on a robust and credible evidence base, rooted in the principles of sustainable development and having been through a Plan process. Any strategy dispersing major development away from Cambridge would be unsustainable and therefore unsound. If the LPAs revert to a strategy of more dispersed growth away from Cambridge the plans are likely to be found unsound as they would be contrary to paragraph 37 of the NPPF which seeks to secure a balance of land uses to minimise journey lengths. Not needed on the Green Belt. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
Paragraph 6.3 Support:0	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You should have used this opportunity to report

<p>Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p>back on the 'voting' (findings) of the summer consultation. What level of support was there for each of these questions..</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.3 Bullet 1</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 3 Comment: 2</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city is big enough. It's too crowded. We need green space we can enjoy. • Traffic issues. Overloaded infrastructure. Loss of countryside. Overdevelopment • There should be no more development than already committed on the edge of Cambridge. The full impact cannot be assessed until existing schemes are completed. These projects need a generation to mature and learn from mistakes. • Develop land on the edge of Cambridge whenever & wherever needed to sustain economic growth & prosperity. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our road system cannot cope with the increased traffic new housing developments are creating. And our countryside needs to be protected. No more mass housing developments around Cambridge.
<p>Paragraph 6.3 Bullet 2</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 8 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, if it is needed to support the wider needs of our community. The Green Belt is simply a planning construct to inhibit growth and drive up property values for the fortunate few. It is not 'sacred ground' and if we need the land then it should be used in the interests of the many not the few. The interests of the many start first with the economy, jobs and housing.. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land should only be released from the Green Belt if it can be demonstrated unequivocally that the benefits will outweigh the negative consequences for the City as a whole. • No, to avoid creating ugly urban sprawl. • The Cambridge Green Belt is precious in defining the boundary of the built-up area and in protecting the surrounding villages and countryside from becoming part of a larger 'Greater Cambridge' conurbation. The Green Belt should be preserved and if further housing development is necessary, it should be concentrated in new settlements away from Cambridge with proper investment in these new communities and their public transport links to the City. • The Green Belt is there for a reason and eroding it will spoil our beautiful city and surrounding villages. • Cambridge is a world famous historic City and the Green Belt should be regarded as a major

	<p>component of its character and its full retention underpin any growth policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Belt is needed to define the edges of the city, particularly as there is already much housing being built in this area and the new traffic already generated will be very heavy. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not without massive public transport investment.
<p>Paragraph 6.3 .Bullet 3</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 3 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the proposals are viable and acceptable. Let the market decide which start first dependent upon economic considerations. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not build on village Green Belt land. Stapleford would be spoilt. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.3 Bullet 4</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At some point the Marshalls airport site will have to be addressed and a way forward found. The sooner this starts the better.
<p>Paragraph 6.4</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Councils' current strategy is starting to deliver homes in places where people want to live in or close to Cambridge with good access to its services and facilities. The new settlements will result in more commuting and car journeys, increasing congestion and carbon emissions. Cambridge also has an acute shortage of affordable homes and these need to be built close to Cambridge. No. Do not crowd Villages. It will make Stapleford outside schools dangerous. Do not build on Green Belt land. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.5</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not spoil Stapleford by packing in more houses, where the extra traffic will be a threat to the life of the primary school children. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.6</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not build on Green Belt land. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.7 Bullet 1</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 4 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Belt should be protected to prevent the gradual creep of Cambridge into the surrounding

	<p>countryside, particularly in the areas identified as being of 'medium to very high in terms of importance to the setting of the City and to Green Belt purposes' in the Council's own 2012 Appraisal of the Inner Green Belt..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unfair that Cambridge will have to lose its Green Belt to accommodate growth in Cambridgeshire. • Object to any more erosion of the Green Belt in principle. In addition, the infrastructure of the town and outlying villages just cannot take it. Traffic. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.7 Bullet 2</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option would be preferable to pushing the City's urban edge further out into the Green Belt. 'Satellite' developments, if given appropriate facilities, can become genuine communities with their own identity. • The development of more self-contained new settlements outside the City, with good facilities and transport links, is preferable to allowing Cambridge to extend piecemeal into its Green Belt. This will be better for both Cambridge and the inhabitants of the new developments, who will be part of a smaller-scale community rather than living in one of the outer suburbs of an ever-extending Cambridge. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If settlements are to be developed then there is no requirement to fully rely on transport to Cambridge for the provision of jobs. Why not put jobs within the settlements in line with the comments in 6.11? <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is better than loss of Green Belt if done sensitively and with infrastructure provided.
<p>Paragraph 6.7 Bullet 3</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 2 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not on the Green Belt • Village bus services are being cut. Why not develop jobs in the villages? <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited amount of sustainable development might be appropriate, if it did not adversely affect the character of the villages and may support local jobs and shops.
<p>Paragraph 6.7 Bullet 4</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided that this is not an excuse for not prioritising.
<p>Paragraph 6.8</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p>

<p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neither Authority has given due regard to our detailed submissions to Issues and Options 1 Consultations. The Councils have ignored our evidence that there is an appropriate sustainable location on the edge of Cambridge to accommodate housing and employment growth which would not impact detrimentally on the historic setting of the City by means of exemplar landscape-led masterplanning. CEG's approach to releasing appropriate sustainable land from the Green Belt at Broad Location 7 follows guidance in paragraph 84 of the NPPF and the LPAs must follow this approach too. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.9</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Cambs District Council - Welcome recognition of the development sequence set out in paragraph 3.6 of the Part 1 document (e.g. within Cambridge, on the edge of Cambridge, at Northstowe, and in the market towns and better served villages in South Cambridgeshire), and agree with the Inspectors conclusions that it remains the most sustainable strategy for the two District to 2016 and beyond (as set out in paragraph 6.9). <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome the acknowledgement that Independent Inspectors confirmed that the adopted LDFs provided the most sustainable development strategy for the districts to 2016 and "beyond". The Councils should not to pursue an unsustainable development strategy by reverting back to the dispersal of development away from Cambridge as this would lead to the two Local Plans being found unsound being contrary to paragraph 37 of the NPPF. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.10</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 4</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give priority to sites with existing or new rail stations. Give priority to sites which can help to regenerate the public transport network in the surrounding area, especially where it is relatively poor. Ensure that all major developments have public transport 7 days a week including both weekday and Sunday evenings and guarantee the future of such services. Use car-free developments as a strategy to make the public transport network more viable while giving new options to people who want to opt out of the car-dependent society. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Cambs District Council - We note the contents of the 'Sustainable Development

	<p>Strategy Review' (referred to in paragraph 6.10 of Part 1) - background document to the review of the two Local Plans (produced by the Joint Strategic Planning Unit). East Cambridgeshire contains a number of Market Towns, but we were not consulted on the Strategy Review or asked to feed into its production. Market Towns differ considerably in their ability to support sustainable growth (as referred to in Joint Statement 2010). The scale of housing growth needs to be linked to the ability of each Market Town to generate employment growth, and self-containment. The distance from Cambridge (where many jobs are located) and the quality of public transport links are also key factors to consider, when looking at the sustainability of individual Market Towns, or the sustainability of individual larger villages. The Sustainable Development Strategy Review does not pick up on significant changes in transport connectivity which have taken place in Cambridgeshire since the Structure Plan and the current District Plans were produced - such as the guided busway or planned improvements to the Science Park station. The Sustainable Development Strategy Review categorises all new settlements together. Potential options vary widely in their sustainability. For example, Northstowe's location linked to the guided busway has strong benefits which may not be replicated for other options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing public transport, no matter how good it is, will not prevent people from getting in a car if there's no reason not to. • The report highlights that the most sustainable sites for development are on the fringe of Cambridge, and yet most of these sites have been ruled out for a (misplaced) fear of ruining the aesthetic appeal of the setting of the city. • There are a number of major sites surrounding Cambridge that could well be better suited. At some stage soon they will come back into the reckoning given the loss of the airport site. Northstowe, Waterbeach & Bourne will buy some time for Cambridge but that is all.
<p>Paragraph 6.11</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 2 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support: The three central themes are supported. However, one important fixed variable which is acknowledged in paragraph 6.12 is that sufficient employment land already has planning permission to accommodate growth to 2031. A significant proportion of this is located to the South of Cambridge at the wider Addenbrookes complex and at the Genome Campus / Babraham Hall / Granta Park cluster. As a consequence, the new

	<p>development strategy should investigate new settlement options to the south of Cambridge, and close to the railway corridor, that can better balance the growth of new jobs and houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As well as "good public transport", include support for other low-carbon travel, such as walking, cycling and electric vehicles. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that the strategy must not return to unsustainable patterns of development as detailed in the first bullet point under paragraph 6.11. Both Councils must employ and deliver the most sustainable strategy for new development in this Plan period to 2031 and beyond, which is within and on the edge of Cambridge. There is too much new housing development being planned for SCDC too far from Cambridge. If the LPAs pursue a growth strategy away from the Cambridge the plan would be contrary to paragraphs 18, 30 and 37 of the NPPF and would be found unsound. • Do not build on Green Belt land in Stapleford. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good public roads are needed as well.
<p>Paragraph 6.11 1st Bullet</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the comment on scale, just because a development can be densely built on does not mean that it should be, housing targets or not. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the absence of a proper integrated transport plan or any money to build infrastructure prior to development this is nonsense. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development needs to be sensitive to the needs of local residents, and to provide some benefit to the community.
<p>Paragraph 6.11 2nd Bullet</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If an area is congested already, it should not be built on densely, for fear of worsening an already bad situation (for example Newmarket Road). <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on the economic case and broad planning issues and then let the market do its job. If a community can't sustain itself so be it. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should not proceed without the infrastructure being in place or legally secured.
<p>Paragraph 6.11 3rd bullet</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not build on Green Belt. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a matter for the market not the planning authority unless you have money available to influence them.

<p>Paragraph 6.12</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 2</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the deliverable transport options? • If overcapacity in employment development is anticipated, surely this implies a lesser need for housing also, with the fortunate consequence that it will then be less difficult to achieve the important objectives of maintaining the special character of Cambridge and quality of life for its residents. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the land for this employment growth? • Character and quality of life are important for everyone in this area not just Cambridge residents.
<p>Paragraph 6.13</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not build on Green Belt land in Stapleford. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.14</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For many households, choice of home location is a compromise because the adults work in different places and the children's schools are another factor. Good public transport and road links are therefore essential. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Cambs District Council - All local authorities will need to have regard to the development sequence, which is reiterated in the Joint Spatial Planning Statement (July 2012) agreed by the Cambridgeshire authorities. This applies to new growth proposed in each Local Plan - not just outstanding commitments and allocations from previous Plans.
<p>Paragraph 6.15</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 3 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the figures listed within paragraphs 6.15-6.18 in relation to their existing housing supply are out of date and need to be updated in order to reflect the current position in terms of housing supply as detailed within the Council's latest Annual Monitoring Reports of December 2012. The potential capacity of the SHLAA sites within Cambridge City also needs to be updated to reflect the sites now being consulted on. • Do not build on Green Belt land. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove private off-street parking in central Cambridge. This would lead to a reduction in traffic trying to drive into the central areas particularly at peak times) and release land for development of residential accommodation and commercial or academic use. A good contribution

	to making Cambridge more sustainable.
<p>Paragraph 6.16</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The figures listed within paragraphs 6.15-6.18 in relation to their existing housing supply are out of date and need to be updated in order to reflect the current position in terms of housing supply as detailed within the Council's latest Annual Monitoring Reports of December 2012. The potential capacity of the SHLAA sites within Cambridge City also needs to be updated to reflect the sites now being consulted on. Emphasise the need for family homes with adequate outdoor space, car and cycle parking. We are concerned at the number of developments currently approved with inadequate allowance for car parking, on the basis that the occupants will use other means to get to work. Many people who do, also use their cars for leisure, and the lack of on-site parking increases parking congestion on existing streets. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The addition of 6000 new homes to the existing city is arguably a more realistic goal.
<p>Paragraph 6.17</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 3 Comment: 4</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing figures are out of date. A dispersal strategy must be avoided if the plans are to be consistent with the NPPF. No more Green Belt development until current allocations are completed and effect assessed. Move the jobs away from Cambridge for example to Waterbeach. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfortunately local people have long been priced out of Cambridge as housing has been sold/rented to London commuters as it has been seen as a 'cheaper' alternative to the capital (this has caused prices to skyrocket). Whilst affordable housing is being proposed some priority for it needs to be given to those on lower wages e.g. public service/ sector workers. If not then existing traffic issues will remain unchanged. Public transport is currently an unattractive option as unreliable and expensive. Better roads are needed and more room for cars to reflect the reality of peoples lives.
<p>Paragraph 6.18</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 8 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, build on the Green Belt. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing figures are out of date. Only 1,360 additional dwellings are currently identified as part of new allocations on the edge of Cambridge over the 20-year plan period. The

	<p>implication is that significant development over the Plan period will be directed to New Settlements in addition to Northstowe. The two Local Plans must employ a growth strategy which is not only sustainable but seeks to allocate land where people want to live. Allocating land on the Cambridge fringe would meet the requirements of paragraph 158 of the NPPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are alternatives to building in the Green Belt. Keep it as it is. • There are no exceptional reasons to justify development in the Green belt and the yield is too low to justify the impact. • The road system will not be able to cope. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.19</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 2 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints upon the size of Northstowe now depend upon the ability of the city centre and arterial approaches to absorb more buses. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In conjunction with the developments planned, allocated, or possible within and on the edge of the city, this gives a total of over 25,000 new homes, half as much again as the current size of Cambridge. The city cannot support such an expansion without tearing up the medieval historic core. The city centre is already overcrowded from the point of view of buses, delivery lorries and pedestrians. The document gives no indication that any of these issues have been taken into account. • The paragraph states that 7,500 dwellings are anticipated to be delivered at Northstowe by 2031. Our evidence is that only 4,500 dwellings are likely to be delivered by 2031 given the long lead-in times for new settlement delivery and the timing of upgrade works to the A14. There will therefore continue to be a serious shortfall of housing delivery in the plan period as there has been in the current plan period. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rail system would have been better than the guided bus. • The guided bus could form the core of an improved transport network. • While Northstowe is served by the guided busway, there are currently no services on Sunday evenings. Permission for development there should be linked with rectification of this anomaly. Also, while there are links to Cambridge, St Ives and Huntingdon, the last is slow; and we also need to plan for links in other directions to take workers, shoppers etc. both to and from the surrounding villages. No development should be

	<p>allowed which commits the public sector to heavy costs in upgrading the A14.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The point about buses getting trapped in City traffic neatly highlights just how seriously the City needs serious disincentives to inbound car travel down major congested routes such as Histon and Newmarket Road. • Rejected SHLAA site 274 in South Cambs is being promoted to north of Guided Busway adjacent to Northstowe. • Build more roads.
<p>Paragraph 6.20</p> <p>Support:5 Object: 5 Comment: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach should be a priority area for redevelopment, a huge amount of land and houses already there; good local schools already set up to serve a larger population. • Yes, but money is needed for transport infrastructure. • Support a new town at Waterbeach. This would deliver the infrastructure and road system necessary and thereby cause less disruption than a smaller development which would not have the road support and would place a burden on the A10 and the B1047. Delivering 4,500 houses in the plan period would address both the acute and long term housing needs. The sustainable transport solutions required would help to cut existing car commuting journeys for residents already in the area. • Support the development of Waterbeach, Northstowe and Bourn Airfield as sustainable communities with employment opportunities and schools. • Ickleton Parish Council - It is essential to locate new settlements where they will give rise to as little London bound commuting as possible. Building in smaller villages would not deliver sufficient housing without destroying those communities and overloading local road networks. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question the extent to which any significant development could be delivered at Waterbeach given the significant levels of infrastructure and other site specific constraints. Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield are less sustainable locations than the edge of Cambridge. Relying on significant housing at these New Settlements will undermine the deliverability and flexibility of the Plan and result in the shortfall in housing delivery continuing and the plans would not meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing as required by paragraphs 14, 47, 158 and 159 of the NPPF. Consequently the plans would be unsound.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach Parish Council - The transport infrastructure is already under strain. Flooding is a potential risk. We therefore seek assurances that, rather than referring to the option of a new town in terms that imply a fait accompli, all matters relating to a possible development at Waterbeach Barracks are considered in depth and reported in a responsible and open manner. • Major development on the Waterbeach Barracks Site is undesirable. Some of the reasons are as follows: 1. Road links are inadequate, with congestion on the A10 already unacceptable and bound to increase following planned developments around Ely. 2. Potential contribution of rail to the transport links is greatly exaggerated and would cost a very large amount. 3. The suggestion that development at Waterbeach could contribute 4,500 dwellings by the end of the plan period is hugely over-optimistic. • The responses submitted on behalf of Hinxton Land in September 2012 exposed the flaws in the Sustainability Appraisal that led to Hanley Grange new settlement being dismissed as an option. Hinxton Land is concerned that it has received no substantive response to the earlier objection. As a consequence, Hanley Grange should be reinstated as a new settlement option. • Concentrating new developments in two places, i.e. Bourne & Waterbeach means that the disruption would continue for a long time, be greater risk for developers and require more infrastructures. Smaller developments within villages and infills would deliver housing sooner. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach is rail served so quite suitable. Bourn Airfield could also be rail served if the route of the east-west rail link was chosen appropriately, and in any case could help to support the Cambourne Hub idea. • The issues raised here are equally applicable to sites distant or even close to the city when it comes to buses getting trapped in city traffic. In-bound commuting becomes a major problem at the edge of the city where the traffic collects. The biggest contributor to the journey time delay is getting into and through central Cambridge. • Swavesey Parish Council - Strong concern raised over proposed development at Bourn relating to surface and foul water drainage. With the amount of additional foul water drainage now coming through Swavesey Parish from Cambourne (and to come from Northstowe) increasing flood risk for Swavesey
--	---

	<p>Parish, serious consideration must be given to what would be planned for drainage for any development in the Bourn area. There is no sewage treatment plant at Cambourne (or Northstowe), perhaps one should be considered for further development in the Bourn & Cambourne area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>Paragraph 6.21</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 5 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stapleford will be spoilt if Green Belt built on, village will be changed forever, roads too busy and children's lives at risk outside primary schools. • There may be scope in developing in the larger villages but not without a full assessment of existing services and infrastructure and plans for how growth in population will be supported by investment in infrastructure. It is not sustainable to overload rural villages without consideration of the effect on the existing the population. • Regarding Melbourn the school is full to capacity, the roads - especially New Road, Orchard Road and the High Street are already congested and consequently are often unsafe. The village framework is there for a reason. It sets out the advised size of Melbourn and protects greenbelt land. The village was never built to support so many people - and the cracks will start to show if we push facilities too far. • Great care should be taken before building in villages surrounding Cambridge: many already do not have sufficient infrastructure to cope, and building outside Cambridge encourages commuting, with increasing traffic problems, as public transport is not good. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment call for sites, sites put forward, and the resulting assessment, gives a good basis for the realistic delivery of housing.
<p>Paragraph 6.22</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 2 Comment: 0</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only if Green Belts are permanent can they fulfil their function of separating town from surrounding villages, preventing urban sprawl. If each planning cycle justifies nibbles from the Green Belt, it will in time disappear. This is a danger between Histon/Impington (and Girton) and Cambridge. If expansion is driven by employment, then when the capacity of a town is reached, employment needs to be developed elsewhere, perhaps at some distance. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the basis that the Cambridge Urban Fringe is

	<p>the most sustainable location for new development, aligned with the exceptional circumstances in seeking to meet the acute housing shortage, we agree with the need to review the site options. The Local plans must employ a growth strategy which is not only sustainable but to allocate land where people want to live, so developers can build there. Allocating land on the Cambridge fringe would meet the requirements of paragraph 158 of the NPPF which requires that LPAs take account of market signals in preparing their strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do not build on village Green Belt. <p>COMMENTS:</p>
--	--