

CHAPTER 7: GREEN BELT	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
QUESTION / PARAGRAPH	
Paragraph 7.1  Support:8 Object: 3 Comment: 3	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The green belt area as defined on the west side of the city where the city centre is close to open countryside is particularly important and should be preserved in its entirety.</li> <li>• Protect all of the Green Belt permanently.</li> <li>• Cambridge does not sprawl, keep it that way.</li> <li>• Case for green belt is stronger now than when introduced. Green Belt to the West and south west is an especially valuable amenity for the City and University.</li> <li>• The Green Belt protects and maintains the setting and compact character of Cambridge. The green lungs of surrounding fields and meadows that link into the suburbs and central Cambridge are a primary aspect of the City's heritage and attractiveness as a place to live. Urban sprawl would erode its identity and its relationship to villages.</li> <li>• Maintain the compact nature of the City and preserve the surrounding countryside.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge needs homes. Around 3,000 per year. We will have to use the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Development in GB1 and GB2 will defeat the purpose of the Green Belt on the South side of Cambridge. The same applies to all the proposed developments around Cambridge. There is plenty of land in the surrounding villages where development is needed to house people as opposed to creating economic activity. Improve the transport links to the villages.</li> <li>• The green belt in many areas is far from a beautiful vision of rural England. Exactly who does the green belt benefit these days? Most of it is privately owned, intensively farmed agricultural land which is certainly of benefit to food production, but of little other direct use to the majority of residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>East Cambs District Council</b> - It would be helpful to include that part of the Green Belt within East Cambridgeshire in the document.</li> <li>• There are areas around Cambridge trapped between the City, the Airport and the surrounding roads (M11 and A14) and these areas could be developed. Whereas the areas out towards Fulbourn should be kept to maintain Fulbourn as a village in it's own right.</li> </ul>

<p>Paragraph 7.2</p> <p>Support:7 Object: 1 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support, keep the Green Belt which is important for the character and heritage of the city. The Green Belt has a mixture of benefits. Productive farmland, City setting in a flat landscape, open vistas, darkness, biodiversity, and the green lungs of the city. The Green Belt is used by many people in the areas for family exercise, keeping fit, cycling and walking.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development within the Green Belt could significantly enhance the setting of Cambridge - all of the existing green spaces (parks and commons) that we cherish so dearly were once outside of town.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's the colleges and the open areas like Parkers Piece, Jesus Green and others that are the character of the city, not the Green Belt.</li> <li>Times change, needs change and Cambridge has to change and if that means the Green Belt has to go then so be it.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.3</p> <p>Support:3 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep the Green Belt open and permanent. Keep a green barrier between Cambridge and the villages.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We can build into the Green Belt and still maintain an attractive place for most to live, work, commute &amp; play. Relatively compact yes, small no.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To avoid the need to build multi-storey flats, which would ruin the city, expansion out to the major roads north and south must be considered.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.4</p> <p>Support:6 Object: 3 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support these goals.</li> <li>Essential to maintain the quality of the place which is important to the higher education and high-tech sectors.</li> <li>One further function is to promote compact developments where facilities are within walking distance, so a network of public transport routes can be devised which covers all communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was agreed through the last review of the green belt that the only national purpose relevant to the Cambridge Green Belt was that relating to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. That purpose needs to be made clear. It also appears, from paragraph 2.2 of the Inner Green Belt Study 2012 that the assessment has applied all five national criteria as opposed to just the criterion which is specific to the Cambridge Green Belt. Para. 2.2 of the appraisal also</li> </ul>

	<p>appears to introduce new purposes rather than assessing land against the agreed purposes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy is out of date and not fit for the times.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Fails to mention public access to Green Belt land.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.4 Bullet 1</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the check list of purposes and would add agricultural and food producing purpose and preservation of darkness and quiet.</li> <li>• Keeping Cambridge a compact city by preventing urban sprawl is crucial to protecting the character and ambience of the city that makes Cambridge so special. We don't want to end up as a large sub-urban metropolis with a sanitised historic centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nobody is arguing for unrestricted urban sprawl but economic growth and must not be restrained due to out of date planning policies and thinking.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.4 .Bullet 2</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What towns?. Necklace villages do not all need to be protected..</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.4 Bullet 3</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City and South Cambridgeshire should do more to promote the management of Green Belt as an asset to the people of the area through enhanced public access, recreation opportunities, and wildlife conservation. The Green Belt is currently seen solely as a means of restricting development rather than as a public benefit.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why? It is not as if Cambridge is framed by the Malvern Hills or the Wrekin. Cambridge is surrounded by largely agricultural land farmed and managed on an industrial scale. Apart from the river corridor, the Gogs and the buffer zones between nearby villages it is nothing special.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:.</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.4 Bullet 4</p> <p>Support:2 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge is a city with a world-class reputation. Protecting the setting of the city through the Green Belt is fundamental to maintaining the city's global status and special character.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The setting and character should be respected</li> </ul>

	but not at the expense of people having work and a decent place to live.
Paragraph 7.4 Bullet 5  Support:2 Object: 1 Comment: 1	<b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support where such sites exist.</li> <li>• Cambridge still has some brown field sites which can be developed. In addition sites which could be sustainable in the villages such as the ex-army site in Waterbeach need to be developed before Cambridge's Green Belt.</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is too little of such land in Cambridge to make a difference.</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are few such sites in Cambridge.</li> </ul>
Paragraph 7.5  Support:5 Object: 0 Comment: 2	<b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support these purposes, particularly to the west of Cambridge.</li> <li>• Adding more urban sprawl will dilute identity and amenity of the City and villages.</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We must expand but in a controlled way - the green belt only muddies the way forward.</li> </ul>
Paragraph 7.5 Bullet 1  Support:5 Object: 3 Comment: 0	<b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support and especially with regard to the west of the historic core.</li> <li>• Cambridge must avoid becoming a sprawling mass of housing and congested roads</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better facilities for cycling and walking are needed.</li> <li>• The strangulation of the city by the Green Belt has and will contribute to the overdevelopment of the city centre which will bring about the destruction of the very character that is trying to preserve</li> <li>• The centre has nothing to do with the Green Belt...</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b>
Paragraph 7.5 Bullet 2  Support:3 Object: 1 Comment: 1	<b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support and especially with regard to the west of the historic core.</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not at the expense of homes, jobs and a nice place to live.</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current rural setting of Trumpington and Grantchester is already threatened by planned developments and any further development would contribute negatively to their appeal and significantly change the character of the area.</li> </ul>
Paragraph 7.5 Bullet 3  Support:2 Object: 0 Comment: 1	<b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support.</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a real issue and if we can avoid altering</li> </ul>

	<p>the character of the necklace villages for the worse we should try. However I suspect that at some stage some communities are going to be subsumed into Greater Cambridge.</p>
<p>Paragraph 7.6</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 5 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each plan must consider if exceptional circumstances exist.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These are not exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>Does not correctly reflect the approach to Green Belts in the NPPF. The NPPF requires that green belt boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period (para. 83). There is no assessment in the consultation document of needs beyond 2031. Indeed, para. 4.4 makes it clear that the strategy only looks to 2031.</li> <li>Land and buildings in need of regeneration should be developed before loss of Green Belt land.</li> <li>There are appropriate sites for development outside the Green Belt such as at Waterbeach. So no exceptional circumstances exist.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.7</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not ignore these studies and give in to developers.</li> <li>Question the value of these studies.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.8</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All the fringe sites look fine..</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development north and south of the A14 and M11 would take away any need for any development on Cambridge's Green Belt and especially near Fulbourn..</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.9</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 3 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with this analysis.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a missed opportunity. The City and the County own two significant pieces of land and the 15 metre contour helps mitigate any "point of view" concerns.</li> <li>The case for Green Belt retention is weak. The land is not visible from Trumpington Road. Quality development and open space would be just as good.</li> <li>Some of this land could easily be developed for homes and the location is excellent.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.10</p> <p>Support:1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic growth is the key driver for change.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are exceptional circumstances for reviewing</li> </ul>

<p>Object: 5 Comment: 3</p>	<p>the inner Green Belt Boundary given the levels of housing need in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to promote sustainable patterns of development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not correctly reflect the approach to Green Belts in the NPPF. The NPPF requires that green belt boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period (para. 83). There is no assessment in the consultation document of needs beyond 2031. Indeed, para. 4.4 makes it clear that the strategy only looks to 2031.</li> <li>The NPPF (paragraphs 89 and 90) make it clear that development in the Green Belt is appropriate only in very special circumstances. The City and South Cambridgeshire have failed to make a case to demonstrate such 'very special circumstances'. Indeed, their justification for selecting the six Green Belt sites is that their release for development would not detract from the overall purpose of the Green Belt because of their low quality. The NPPF makes no differentiation on the grounds of Green Belt quality so this justification is irrelevant.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the Green Belt near Cottenham to avoid development in less sustainable locations.</li> <li>If suggesting that increasing Cambridge's housing stock by 50% is not 'exceptional' I cannot think what is.</li> <li>One investor postponing an approved scheme, albeit a major development, should not necessitate a review if the underpinning development strategy had appropriate contingency plans in place.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.11</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad location 10 appears to overlie one of the green corridors marked on the map (page 23) in Chapter 3 of Issues &amp; Options Report (June 2012).</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.12</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Councils have not taken account of submissions at the previous consultation which concluded that further land can be removed from the Green Belt at Broad Location 7 without detriment to the historic setting of Cambridge. Our submissions identified that the assessment of the worth to Green Belt function within the 2002 Green Belt Review was based on the highest value attributed to any part of the area being considered. Areas within Broad Location 7 assessed as being of</li> </ul>

	<p>higher sensitivity in relation to the historic character and setting of Cambridge therefore skewed the results for the whole site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any further Green Belt release will cause significant harm.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.13</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 7 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered that the residential properties and their curtilages along the southern side of Huntingdon Road should be released from the Cambridge Green Belt. As a result of the North West Cambridge and NIAB development sites, the remaining area of Green Belt no longer performs the functions of Green Belt as identified in the NPPF and the boundary should be amended to take account of this.</li> <li>The 2012 study is flawed and cannot be relied on. Joint study terms of reference based on Cambridge City Council's 2002 Study to which SCDC objected strongly. SCDC Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 came to different conclusions about significance of land East of Airport Way and contribution to achievement of aims of Green Belt and findings were predicated on presumption that 'exceptional circumstances' had arisen which justified the release of land at Cambridge Airport from Green Belt. Did not find that Cambridge Airport did not make contribution to aims of Green Belt. Cambridge Airport should not be developed.</li> <li>Challenge the finding of the 2012 study regarding Zone 3: this large area of land has been designated as being an Area of Lower Importance in respect of its significance to the Green Belt and to the setting of Cambridge. It is our opinion that this typical fen edge landscape also forms a distinct edge to the City and should not be considered for Green Belt release.</li> <li><b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b> – Consider that the 2012 Green Belt Study gives insufficient weight to the Green Belt purpose of preventing coalescence of the surrounding necklace villages. FPCI therefore asks that this Study be reviewed and proper weighing given to the importance of the Green Belt to separate Fulbourn and Teversham from each other and the City within a rural setting. The study was not drawn to the attention of the public at the exhibition held in Fulbourn and therefore the public consultation for this stage of the Local Plan was incomplete.</li> <li>It was agreed through the last review of the green belt that the only national purpose relevant to the Cambridge Green Belt was that relating to</li> </ul>

	<p>preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. It also appears, from paragraph 2.2 of the Inner Green Belt Study 2012 that the assessment has applied all five national criteria as opposed to just the criterion which is specific to the Cambridge Green Belt. Para. 2.2 of the appraisal also appears to introduce new purposes rather assessing land against the agreed purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The methodology for the 2012 Inner Green Belt Review is fundamentally flawed and could be open to challenge. It is essentially little more than a qualitative opinion of the landscape quality that lacks any objective or scientific method and does not include agricultural land value, wildlife potential etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.14</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The three reasons for the increased value of the surrounding rural land to Green Belt purposes are very general in nature and do not allow for consideration of individual sites. The importance of sites (in Green Belt terms) needs to be taken into account on the merits of each individually. It is our contention that the majority of Broad Location 7 has no visual connection to the City core. However, there are opportunities for development to be designed so as to preserve and enhance the foreground in views that are important to the setting of the City</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City creep must be stopped at some point..</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.14 Bullet 2</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The southern edge of Cambridge around Addenbrooke's is an area that could surely only benefit from development given the existing dreadful views from the A10 and A1307?</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.14 Bullet 3</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Green Belt should not be eaten into further for house building..</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.15</p> <p>Support:3 Object: 3 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support particularly to the west of Cambridge.</li> <li>Support this analysis.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of land within Broad Location 7 facilitating views towards the historic skyline of Cambridge is limited to a small elevated part of a field to the southeast of the area. Areas which</li> </ul>

	<p>have level views where there is a mixed foreground to the city edge may be able to accommodate change more easily. This generalisation doesn't take into account Green Belt coalescence and urban sprawl. It's an over-simplification to consider whether areas are perceived from higher land or level views as an indicator of sensitivity in relation to the setting of Cambridge and Green Belt purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development does not always cause harm.</li> <li>• Disagree with the considerations.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While 'views' are important - they are only one small factor in consideration of any Green Belt development.</li> <li>• Sometimes views of the core are blocked by trees. Could any development around the South where the land is most elevated do any harm to the terrible existing view across to Addenbrooke's?</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.16</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 3 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unless and until there is an objective assessment of housing need then the assessment of whether it is appropriate to release Green Belt land and the extent of such release cannot be undertaken. It is acknowledged that there are some areas within the Inner Green Belt at Cambridge South East that play a role in protecting the setting and special character of Cambridge. These factors have been considered for individual land parcels across the site and there are areas of lesser importance to the setting and character that are included within the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Disagree that there is a strong link between the intensively farmed land that constitutes much of the Green Belt and historic buildings and green spaces inside Cambridge.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.17</p> <p>Support:3 Object: 5 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important analysis.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is agreed that there is a need to ensure that the Green Belt is retained in some locations, in order to ensure the continued protection of the setting of Cambridge. But there is the potential for Broad Location 7 to be developed in such a manner as to protect the openness and setting of the City in important views from elevated viewpoints to the south and southeast of the City, including providing increased public access to viewpoints.</li> <li>• Do not agree that there needs to be a minimum distance between a view point and development. What is important is the landform between, the</li> </ul>

	<p>landscape structure, how any development would be viewed in the context of the existing city and other development (such as major infrastructure).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public access can best be assured through development.</li> <li>• Views from the motorway and major roads should carry little weight.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The view south from the A14 towards Cambridge is unattractive. This must not happen elsewhere around the city.</li> </ul>
<p>Paragraph 7.18</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 3 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review has been thorough and is definitive.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing need cannot be satisfied even if the whole Green Belt were to be developed such is the attraction of Cambridge.</li> <li>• The 2012 Inner Green Belt Boundary Study does not assess all the sites at a similar scale, leading to potential for results to be skewed. By grouping large areas of land together there is potential for smaller parcels of a higher sensitivity to skew the findings for wider areas and provide a flawed representation of the contribution made by smaller parcels of land to Green Belt. This approach has been followed through by the Technical Assessments of Sites on the Edge of Cambridge. The detailed consideration against Green Belt purposes has been misinterpreted within the technical assessments of sites.</li> <li>• Basing the selection of the six Green Belt sites on such a flawed qualitative exercise as the 2012 Review means that these sites must be regarded as suspect. Before such selection can be made, a comprehensive quantitative review using a recognised and approved methodology must be undertaken. This exercise is anyway invalid as the NPPF does not differentiate between areas of high and low Green Belt quality for development purposes.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.19</p> <p>Support: 9 Object: 4 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the possible Green Belt sites considered for release serve some Green Belt function for Cambridge and they should all be retained. Given that there are other non-Green Belt options (such as new settlements) no 'exceptional circumstances' exist (para 83 of the NPPF).</li> <li>• <b>Ickleton Parish Council</b> - Support the analysis.</li> <li>• If every time the Local Plan is reviewed more land is taken out of the Green Belt, what's the point in having the designation - it becomes meaningless.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assertions within this paragraph are sweeping</li> </ul>

	<p>and do not take into consideration site-specific factors at a local, detailed level. Not all of the land within the Inner Green Belt is necessarily fundamentally important to the purposes of Green Belt designation. The majority of Broad Location 7 makes a limited contribution to the purposes of Green Belt designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Green Belt review has approached the issue from the perspective of how development on the edge of Cambridge affects its setting. It appears to consider that the setting of the City is of greater importance than the implications of Climate Change. There remain opportunities for development on the edge of Cambridge without fundamentally affecting its setting. The Green Belt study does not consider the impact that development away from the City has on its form as a compact city or its setting. Review also fails to consider the effect on the historic city of car-borne commuting into Cambridge.</li> <li>• The City Council appears to have an impossible conundrum, on the one hand an admission that fringe development is the best route forward, but on the other a desire to maintain the status quo.</li> <li>• This is simply a subjective and prejudiced conclusion of little merit. Since when has the 'setting' of a town taken precedence over the needs of its residents? Since when has the town been focussed on its historic core - perhaps a few centuries ago. Doubt if taking some more Green Belt would change anything fundamentally.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Return Cambridge Airport to the Green Belt. Development north of Newmarket Road will form a finger of development.</li> <li>• No further incursions into the Green Belt in future should be permitted now that the tipping point has been reached even in 'Exceptional circumstances'.</li> </ul>
--	--