



Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan

Summary of Responses to Issues and Options Report Consultation

December 2014 – February 2015

November 2015

The Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan is being prepared jointly by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council. The Issues and Options Report was the subject of consultation between 8 December 2014 and 2 February 2015.

This document contains a summary of all the comments submitted to the Issues and Options Report (in question order) and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Report. All of the full submissions can be viewed at <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/localplan/>

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q1. Do you support or object to this vision for CNFE? Do you have any comments?			
1	<p>RLW supports the proposed vision, in particular the references to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -embracing "modern commercial business needs and buildings"; -"the proposed new railway station and extension to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway to create a well- connected and vibrant place"; -acknowledgement given to the importance of the regeneration of this area in contributing to the wider growth agenda. <p>Part of the vision is incompatible with identified priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the site's continued use for aggregates and waste management will detract from the key objective to deliver a high quality business centre; -given the employment-led focus, 'sustainable urban living' will comprise part of the overall vision 	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
1	<p>The vision of major remaining brown field site needs substantially strengthening - to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * maximise land use * create important opening to Fenlands/ Districts * develop on a larger/ denser scale and enhance site * avoid substantial risk of a piecemeal strategy * substantially contribute to longer term requirements of city by providing revitalised gateway, more employment led/ mixed use community; it has not yet achieved provision of a substantial/ distinctive/ modern/ dynamic/sustainable/vibrant urban community - it needs to deliver substantial City's future housing (aiding relocation/ reconfiguration of the water treatment plant - essential to the strategy for the site). 	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
1	<p>Broad support offered but subject to: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for employment content to be maximised and be dominant use - Housing need on this site uncertain - Reflect overall transport sustainability and not just new station as gateway 	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
1	<p>Natural England supports the vision and objectives of the plan to enhance and protect the natural environment, including local wildlife sites and existing and proposed open spaces . We are pleased that the Plan will promote the creation of a network of green spaces and corridors, incorporating ecological mitigation and enhancement and measures to manage surface water.</p>	Natural England (Janet Nuttall) [1009]	
1	<p>The Wildlife Trust would like to see specific mention of biodiversity in the vision statement. We suggest that "opportunities to enhance the environmental assets" be changed to "opportunities to enhance the existing environmental assets and create new green space to benefit biodiversity."</p>	The Wildlife Trust BCNP (Miss Sian Williams) [1071]	
1	<p>CNFE is only location in Cambridge area which has strategic railhead - essential for growth of the area as the only means through which mineral is brought into the area. Alternative would be hard rock by road. The railhead has essential role in hard rock for improvement of A14. To retain these railheads is strongly supported and consistent with County Council's policy in the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) and Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012). 'existing and new waste management facilities safeguarded / delivered (including HRC and inert waste recycling facility)'. This is welcomed.</p>	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
1	<p>1. Serious public money needs to be invested.</p> <p>2. Inaccessible location</p> <p>3. Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential</p> <p>4. Power line would need to be removed.</p> <p>5. Relocation of stagecoach needed.</p> <p>6. New station could increase traffic.</p> <p>7. Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area.</p> <p>8. Transport links would need to be improved.</p>	Dr Anthony J Cooper [1885]	
1	I support redevelopment of the area to use this rather unloved, inefficiently used part of Cambridge more intensively, rather than building on green belt areas.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
1	<p>Masterplan should safeguard a route for a road across into Fen Road Chesterton either via a new level crossing or a bridge over the railway, to link across at an appropriate point in the road system on the other side, avoiding residential areas already developed by Travellers there.</p> <p>The new Household Waste Recycling Centre here is misguided: people will bring bulky waste by car anyway, and the current site at Butt Lane is much more suitable.</p> <p>The development should provide everything for its residents including doctors, schools, and cemetery.</p>	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
1	It is important that the document acknowledges the contribution that the existing employment areas within the CNFE can make through plot densification, including the St John's Innovation Park.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
1	<p>Using this area well is a good idea. However, I strongly object to any proposal to move the sewage works to another site, for two main reasons:</p> <p>a) Waste of huge existing investment in the present site; and</p> <p>b) Destruction of some other area by moving it, as that area would be likely to be in the green belt, and destroying green belt with a sewage works is just as bad as building on it.</p>	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
1	<p>New road adjacent to sewage works as access to station.</p> <p>Pedestrianised boulevard on existing Cowley Road</p> <p>Relocated Police Station</p> <p>New covered square to be a real destination for Cambridge</p> <p>New NIAB-sized site for 4000+ houses adjacent to the station, in addition to the residential towers</p>	Ben Cofield [5605]	
1	As in previous comment.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
1	The MOD has no objections to the proposed Area Action Plan.	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MRS LOUISE DALE) [5616]	
1	This seems to include all the relative issues	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
1	The vision detailed in CNFE is not realistic with regards to what can be achieved within the AAP and does not detail any clear timescales for achieving the vision. Any unrealistic, undeliverable and over-inflated vision will damage Cambridge's ability to meet the wider stated vision of both Councils. The proposed vision details that the development will ensure that the aggregates railhead and the existing waste management facilities will be safeguarded and that new waste management facilities will be delivered.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
1	As a major landowner within CNFE, the Council supports the vision as set out. It is essential CNFE AAP is properly master planned avoiding piecemeal developments. The AAP area has some significant physical barriers (e.g. the A14, planned Guided Busway extension, Milton Road and the railway line) meaning that any development here could potentially be relatively isolated. More specific references needed in vision regarding: scale and type of development; good transport links; and creating a permeable site. Piecemeal and incremental infrastructure improvement should be avoided to bring the whole site forward in a timely and cohesive way.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
1	The area needs to have an overall vision, not piecemeal development. The vision is appropriate	Nicky Morland [5636]	
1	Whilst I think a railway station to the north of Cambridge would be an excellent idea and long due I have my misgivings about the rest of the possible development.	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
1	The area is very suited to being developed but needs an overall plan.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
1	1) The Sewage Works should be moved elsewhere, to enable residential use. Commercial units would be acceptable against the A14, to provide a sound/pollution barrier. 2) There is more need for housing than for commercial units. 3) The aggregates railhead should be accessed by westbound off- and on-slips from and to the A14. Aggregates lorries should NOT travel via the Milton Road. 4) The HWRC should STAY at Butt Lane. 5) A road bridge across the railway should link to Fen Road, or the planned foot/cycle bridge should be extended to Fen Road giving access for Fen Road residents.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
1	Brookgate supports the proposed vision and agrees with the need for comprehensive planning. The new railway station will create a high quality transport gateway, acting as a catalyst for the regeneration of the wider area. The CB4 site presents a unique opportunity for integrated development to occur. The Chesterton Partnership has the ability to deliver a comprehensively planned re-development of the largest brownfield site in Cambridge, without the involvement of multiple land owning parties. The deliverability of the CB4 site is essential to ensure the regeneration of the CNFE will occur in tandem with the new rail station opening.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
1	A new development on a large, previously developed site in a highly sustainable location in one of the UK's leading growth locations is greatly welcomed. The vision set out in Section 2 of the consultation document is commendable because it seeks to make best use of a significant area of brownfield land for new development. This should alleviate pressures on housing, transport and commercial space generated through growing numbers of new businesses around Cambridge and the attraction of the city region to inward investment.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
1	A new development on a large, previously developed site in a highly sustainable location in one of the UK's leading growth locations is greatly welcomed. The vision set out in Section 2 of the consultation document is commendable because it seeks to make best use of a significant area of brownfield land for new development. This should alleviate pressures on housing, transport and commercial space generated through growing numbers of new businesses around Cambridge and the attraction of the city region to inward investment.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
1	The proposed vision is broadly supported but could be improved. It is important that CNFE is not viewed in isolation from planned strategic developments. There is clearly the potential to reinforce the strategic importance of the greater north Cambridge area, in particular, the potential for a positive relationship between CNFE area and the proposed Waterbeach New Town should be emphasised in the vision because of the potential for new homes and jobs in close proximity and the potential for new sustainable infrastructure to benefit both developments.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
1	The vision is supported, but reference should be made of existing businesses within the area. Their continued success is of prime importance and it will be vital to ensure new development does not impinge on existing developments.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
1	We support the vision but seek a better balance of land uses to effectively allow for the delivery of the vision and objectives set out. This will allow the full extent of the opportunity to be realised for the benefit of Cambridge.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
1	Whilst developing the brownfield site, the masterplan should safeguard a route for a road across into Fen Road Chesterton either via a new level crossing or a bridge over the railway, to link across at an appropriate point in the road system on the other side, avoiding residential areas already developed by Travellers there. Whilst there is currently no plan to fund such a route, this will be needed later. The aim to accommodate a new Household Waste Recycling Centre here is misguided and the current site at Butt Lane is much more suitable.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
1	<p>TCE support the overall vision for CNFE as an employment led, mixed use neighbourhood. However, we would like to see a greater emphasis on the area being developed further as an internationally recognised business, research and development cluster. Cambridge Business Park, the Science Park and the St. Johns Innovation Centre already create the character of this part of Cambridge and this should not be diluted by the AAP.</p> <p>Facilitating and encouraging research and development and high tech uses will enhance the 'critical mass' of the cluster and create further opportunities for collaboration and innovation, enhancing the city's reputation as a world leader for research and development.</p> <p>Whilst it is appropriate to have complementary and supporting uses (including housing), the focus should be on high quality business uses.</p> <p>However, any proposals to intensify the use of the area must address current access and infrastructure difficulties. If these matters, (particularly highway access), cannot be fully addressed, the area does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate further significant development.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
1	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q2. Do you support or object to these objectives and how would you improve them?			
2	RLW supports the proposed development objectives as an appropriate means of articulating the broad development principles for the area that will assist in guiding delivery of the vision for CNFE. RLW strongly support Objective 3 (maximisation of employment opportunities) and Objective 6 (creation of an accessible and well-connected neighbourhood) as being key to securing the over-arching objective.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
2	Complex scheme - higher ambitious/ coherent manner needed as hotch potch not acceptable. Objectives need strengthening to reflect scale/ density of development necessary to attract momentum. Specific goals are key - to: * achieve relocation/ reconfiguration of water treatment plant * provide substantial new employment opportunities * provide residential development on a sufficient scale - more vibrant/ highly sustainable * consider denser utilisation/ regeneration (eg Science Park) * create connectivity between Science Park, city centre, NE/E Cambridge, villages, beyond * enable preparation of detailed, phased master plan - a clearer vision underpinning redevelopment of overall area - including integration of denser developments - enhanced viability and associated quality	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
2	Further objective needed which highlights potential interface of site not only with immediate neighbourhood but also with more distant locations which can access it through sustainable travel modes.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
2	Natural England supports the vision and objectives of the plan to enhance and protect the natural environment, including local wildlife sites and existing and proposed open spaces . We are pleased that the Plan will promote the creation of a network of green spaces and corridors, incorporating ecological mitigation and enhancement and measures to manage surface water.	Natural England (Janet Nuttall) [1009]	
2	The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of objective 7.	The Wildlife Trust BCNP (Miss Sian Williams) [1071]	
2	Overarching objectives are supported. Some of these uses would not normally be located next to each other -suggest Proposed Objective 2 be amended in such a way that uses are located in a compatible way: 'Proposed Objective 2: Provide a mix of land uses in locations where they are compatible, and at densities that make best use of this highly sustainable location and regeneration opportunities'. Objective 8 be amended, or a separate Objective set up to cover this issue: 'Encourage a low carbon lifestyle; the minimisation of waste both during construction and occupational phases of development; and addressing climate change'	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
2	Objective 6: Links across the railway to Fen Road, and the foot/cycle bridge across the River Cam to link to Abbey are very important. Special attention should be given to a direct route for cyclists from Abbey to the station; a long bridge may well save money in the long run?	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
2	It is important that the objectives acknowledge there is a need to ensure that there is an integration between new planned development and existing development. Objective 1 should be amended to reflect this issue.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
2	So long as there is no movement of the sewage works to another site, I support these proposals. However, they should absolutely not be used as an excuse for saying that the sewage works need moving.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
2	I fully support all aims, as per my initial assessment. I believe the area of the old Park & Ride and the Driving Range should be pedestrianised with parking underneath and new bus stops located on the new boulevard, in addition to the existing ones on Milton Road and the new ones at the station itself.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
2	The important issues have been identified	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
2	The objectives are ambitious; they do not appear to be based on fully researched realistic outcomes. We would suggest that CNFE AAP should focus most particularly on what is deliverable in next five years.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
2	Proposed Objective 1 Support. Proposed Objective 2 Support. Proposed Objective 3 Support. Proposed Objective 4 Support. Proposed Objective 5 Support. Proposed Objective 6 Support. Proposed Objective 7 Support. Proposed Objective 8 Support.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
2	Whilst supporting the Objectives when considering maximising the employment opportunities it is important that in parallel provision is made for affordable housing and schools	Nicky Morland [5636]	
2	I support all these objectives with 2 & 3 the most important.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
2	I support all the Objectives 1-8 but feel that (once the Sewage Works has been removed) this should be translated into a new residential neighbourhood incorporating low-energy housing, community buildings, primary school and shops all linked primarily by foot/cycle paths through plenty of open green space, with bus and road links around the edges of the site.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
2	Brookgate support the proposed objectives, however they should be improved as follows. Objective 2 should include a specific reference to 'high' densities rather than just 'densities' given the highly sustainable nature of the CNFE location. Specific and explicit reference should be made to residential land uses both within Objective 2 and the wider development objectives. The objectives are currently too generic and must provide greater clarity, given that they will be central to the implementation of the AAP. Brookgate propose redevelopment Option 2a, appended to this submission. Reference to this redevelopment option should be made within the proposed development objectives.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
2	<p>1. We support the broad objectives for the new development within the boundary of the Area Action Plan.</p> <p>2. It is important to ensure an appropriate relationship between each of the land uses set out in the four options.</p> <p>3. It is vital that the consequences of staged development are assessed in terms of the impact upon the neighbouring land uses.</p> <p>4. References to "neighbourhood" should not simply relate to the new residential areas near the station, but all uses within the plan area.</p> <p>5. We are concerned about the proximity and impact of any proposed "Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility" to existing buildings on the St John's Innovation Park .</p> <p>6. We recommend that Proposed Objective 1 be amended to read: "Deliver a place that fosters a range of new developments which are integrated into the wider community and where appropriate land use relationships are secured between new and existing development."</p>	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
2	The proposed objectives are supported but could be improved. Firstly, consistent with the proposed vision, the contribution of CNFE to the wider regeneration and growth agenda of Cambridge is important and could be further emphasised in the proposed objectives. Secondly, given the scale, importance and proximity of Waterbeach New Town, it would be beneficial to include reference to the objective of ensuring a well-co-ordinated and integrated approach between the two developments. Finally, direct reference to maximising the potential of the new railway station should be made.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
2	The objectives are supported, but there is a lack of emphasis on the integration of existing businesses and these should not be adversely affected by the changes. This is vaguely hinted at in Objective 1, but should be further highlighted.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
2	<p>Objective 2 - could include a specific reference to residential to provide support for better balance of land uses.</p> <p>Objective 5 - Reference to mixed use development should be included; zoning approach could work against well designed buildings.</p> <p>Objective 6 - Stronger connections required to wider area for effective integration. Highly zoned mono use land blocks works against the objective for a well-integrated neighbourhood.</p> <p>Objective 8 - Requires a mixed community - current imbalance of land uses could increase carbon footprint, encourage unsustainable travel behaviour and add to emissions.</p>	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
2	Objective 6: Links across the railway to Fen Road, and the foot/cycle bridge across the River Cam to link to Abbey are very important. Special attention should be given to a direct route for cyclists from Abbey to the station.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
2	<p>TCE broadly support the objectives identified for the AAP area. As set out above, we would like to see more clarification on the quality and type of employment uses proposed for the AAP area within these objectives. It is important to ensure that the current business research and development and technology function is not diluted.</p> <p>It would be useful to identify 'character areas' to confirm the established nature of different parts of the AAP area.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
2	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q3. Do you support or object to the current area identified for the AAP?			
3	The AAP boundary is defined in the respective draft Local Plans for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire and therefore in procedural terms any amendments may be problematic and should only be contemplated if there are clear and convincing merits in so doing.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
3	The eastern boundary of the AAP is hard up against the railway line. This limitation constrains opportunities for the provision of residential development, as well as accessible and high quality open space and transport links that increase the permeability of the site, particularly to the north and east. The eastern boundary should be re-drawn to include land either side of Fen Road and up to the River Cam, with the proviso that development in that area should not compromise Green Belt principles	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
3	Some finessing of the wording is needed to detail the wider transport infrastructure that future employers in this part of the City will be able to access.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
3	The 'physical and visual envelope' in point (iv) makes reference to the 'screening landscape alongside the A14 to the north' and the 'highway environment along Milton Road to the west' both of which are supported as they show the level of screening already in place in parts of the CNFE AAP area currently identified. This existing screening should be taken into account for any waste application that should come forward on the Anglian Water site. Support from economic development perspective. The relationship to the Traveller and Gypsy site should be explored in order to protect the site and associated access.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
3	St Johns Innovation Centre and the other business premises on that 'teardrop' site and Cambridge Business Park do not need redevelopment or intensification. They should be left out of the AAP or have policies applied that recognise this.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
3	The St John's Innovation land should be included within the CNFE provided that there are no more onerous conditions or policies applied to the CNFE plan area.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
3	Given that I do not support any proposal to relocate the sewage works, I can see no point in including the sewage works in the area of interest.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
3	Relocate Travellers to create wonderful riverside district of 4000+ houses. More money for Council from tax revenues, a better environment for people living in East Chesterton and a much more coherent and sensible use of ultra-prime real estate.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
3	Let's not do it piece meal and lose the overall integration possibilities.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
3	I support the reasons given for the inclusion of areas specified in the plan	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
3	Area make sense	Hamilton Froeba [5630]	
3	The area identified for the AAP is concurrent with the Draft Local Plans.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
3	The deliverability within a reasonable timeframe of the AAP is important in this regard and given the potential significant scale of the AAP, focus should be on those aspects most likely to be delivered.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
3	Coherent area for development	Nicky Morland [5636]	
3	The area needs rejuvenation and should improve the North side of the City. I'm unsure if this is mentioned in the document but the area between the rail line and the river should also be considered for re-development. This is potentially the best land left in Cambridge to redevelop and shouldn't be ignored.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
3	The area needs sensible rejuvenation	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
3	Geographically this is entirely logical.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
3	I support the current area identified by the AAP including the Cambridge Science Park and Chesterton Sidings Triangle	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
3	Support, subject to the proposed boundary extension Option B.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
3	The current AAP includes the St John's Innovation Park. Provided that the St John's site is acknowledged to have potential for further development - "plot intensification" as termed within the options - then inclusion of the St John's innovation Park is appropriate provided that no more onerous conditions or policies are applied to this plan area than to those which fall outside it. The St John's Innovation Park should have the same opportunity to create new and additional floorspace as would the Cambridge Business Park under the AAP.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
3	The boundary needs to include the area to the East of the railway (Fen Road). There are serious issues with the current road access to this area, through Chesterton and across the level crossing. So it is very important to consider whether a new access can be provided from Cowley Road. This would have a big impact on the development of the rest of the area, so it is vital that this is considered as part of the main plan.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
3	The current defined area is supported but the option of amending the boundary to achieve the vision and objectives should not be dismissed, providing this can be done within the Local Plan context.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
3	The identified area is supported, however see answers to questions 4 and 5 below. The identified area is supported, however see answers to questions 4 and 5 below. Question 4 Response: An extension of the Area to include the Science Park is supported as this would provide comprehensive redevelopment principles to both sites, which are adjacent, benefit from the same transport hub, and share similar problems of access. Question 5 Response: The extension to include Option B is supported to provide additional land to the station area and improve cycle access and permeability in the area generally.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
3	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
3	St Johns Innovation Centre and the other business premises on that 'teardrop' site and Cambridge Business Park do not need redevelopment or intensification. They should be left out of the AAP or have policies applied that recognise this.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
3	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q4. Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option A - The Cambridge Science Park?			
4	We do not support extension of the AAP boundary to include the Cambridge Science Park, both in procedural terms (see Question 3) and because this is felt to be unnecessary. Whilst the continued success and evolution of the Science Park is fully supported, it is noted in the Issues and Options consultation document that proposal Policy E/1 of the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan would facilitate this in any event.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
4	The inclusion of the Cambridge Science Park enables the formulation of guiding principles and development management policies to help shape the intensification of development within the business park including the consideration of its connectivity to the east of Milton Road.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
4	No explicit need to include the Science Park. Not clear why CRC is included.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
4	If redevelopment guidance for the Science Park is necessary, a separate AAP should be prepared at the appropriate time. The two areas are different in their nature with the Science Park being virtually wholly for employment uses (primarily high-tech and R&D) whilst a mix of uses is proposed for CNFE. In addition, the Science Park's status and image as a significant brand in itself should warrant its own AAP. If a combined AAP is undertaken, it may hamper implementation of the CNFE proposals as developer interest is likely to be focused on the Science Park.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
4	I would like to see more control over intensification of uses on the Cambridge Science Park, with mature trees retained, and the consequences for traffic on Milton Road considered alongside the intensification around the new station.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
4	It is difficult to see the direct relevance of the Science Park to the significant development opportunities that exist further to the east.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
4	I am neutral regarding inclusion of Science Park in the consultation area.	Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900]	
4	Replace buildings 2 to 24b at the Science Park with medium density development with carbon-neutral, radical, sustainable development.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
4	The development has to take account of the wider economic area.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
4	This area should be included	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
4	Sufficient policy controls already exist for the Cambridge Science Park.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
4	No. The Science Park is recognised globally in its own right, is well managed, and it is likely that its owners will seek to maximise opportunity without the need to be part of the CNFE AAP. It is unlikely that large scale redevelopment would be driven by including it in the AAP.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
4	Areas need to be cohesive	Nicky Morland [5636]	
4	I'd rather the project focused on the east of Milton road first as the science park is already hugely succesful.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
4	One area at a time	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
4	This will confuse the issue, the Science Park is established and virtually fully developed so the AAP could have little impact on the Science Park parting from constraining development until it is enacted.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
4	It is important that new policies can be developed to PROTECT the existing mature trees, open space and landscape of the Cambridge Science Park.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
4	The existing situation at Cambridge Science Park is markedly different to that at CNFE. Whilst it is important that the regeneration of the CNFE results in the area becoming a fully integrated and joined up part of Cambridge, the inclusion of the Science Park would require a dilution of the aims set out in the proposed AAP vision and objectives. The Science Park is more suited to coverage by the generic Local Plan, whilst the CNFE requires a specific and tailored set of aims and objectives to achieve its successful regeneration and redevelopment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
4	We do not see the direct relevance of the Science Park to the significant development opportunities that exist further to the east. We accept that traffic entering and leaving the AAP area will affect traffic in and out of the Science Park, but we are unsure why its inclusion is relevant. This is particularly the case when a policy in the new emerging South Cambridgeshire Local Plan already supports additional floorspace on the Science Park site.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
4	This objection is made on behalf Trinity College, Cambridge as the owners and custodians of the Cambridge Science Park (CSP). The inclusion of CSP in the APP would be as a 'bolt on' to the otherwise clear and main function of the document with regard to CNFE. The CSP is a very different entity to CNFE; it is as an existing facility, the CNFE is a regeneration development. Trinity College is supportive of the CNFE but there is no need to apply policies that are emerging as bespoke for CNFE as blanket policies to a wider area.	Trinity College, Cambridge [5679]	Bidwells (Adam Halford) [3390]
4	The Action Plan Area should be extended to include Cambridge Science Park and the triangular area south of Chesterton Sidings, as a minimum, in order to fully address site and station . The East Area Action plan options need to be placed in the context of the wider area to make them legible.	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
4	The inclusion of the Science Park (Option A) may be beneficial in the long-term in delivering a more sustainable and well connected development and in achieving Draft Policy E/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. However, the feasibility of this within the Local Plan context should be further explored and it is important that the inclusion of this area should not delay the proposed investment and development on the remainder of the CNFE area.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
4	An extension of the Area to include the Science Park is supported as this would provide comprehensive redevelopment principles to both sites, which are adjacent, benefit from the same transport hub, and share similar problems of access.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
4	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
4	We would like to see more control over intensification of uses on the Cambridge Science Park, with mature trees retained, and the consequences for traffic on Milton Road considered alongside the intensification around the new station. Perhaps the Science Park is a more suitable area for some residential development now?	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
4	<p>TCE support the suggested boundary for the AAP area. It is important to include the consented railway station within this boundary and the Guided Busway extension linking to the new railway station.</p> <p>TCE support the principle of extending the CNFE AAP area to include Option A.</p> <p>The Cambridge Science Park area should also be included on the basis that tenants on the Science Park will be utilising the new station once it has been completed and, therefore, these journeys will need to be taken into account within the transport modelling which will be undertaken as part of the evidence base.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
4	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q5. Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option B - The additional triangular area south of Chesterton Sidings?			
5	<p>The Triangle site is important in terms of facilitating pedestrian and cycle links to the south which is a critical component of delivering a sustainable transport strategy.</p> <p>This would no doubt be assisted by inclusion of the Triangle within the AAP area and if deemed necessary an amendment to the relevant Local Plan could be advanced through the current examination process to ensure consistency between these development plan documents. However if that is problematic procedurally, it will be important to ensure that the provision of cycle (and pedestrian) linkage is safeguarded by an alternative planning policy device.</p>	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
5	The triangular area to the south of the sidings should unquestionably be included within the boundary of the AAP. Doing so will underpin improvements in the CNFE's connectivity through the provision of a pedestrian/cycle access as part of the Chisholm Trail.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
5	Proposed Extension (B) is an important one we think and we support its inclusion in the AAP area as it will facilitate important cycle and pedestrian links to the south.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
5	The Wildlife Trust supports the extension of the boundary to include the Chesterton Siding Triangle, as this area is included in the site boundary for the new railway station, so should be included as part of the same unit. However, we would like to stress that in the approved station plans, this area is earmarked for species-rich grassland as part of ecological mitigation, and NOT for pedestrian/cycleways.	The Wildlife Trust BCNP (Miss Sian Williams) [1071]	
5	The inclusion of this land is supported; provided that it maintains or improves access to the new rail station and / or assists local pedestrian and cycle access.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
5	Link across the railway and river very important	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
5	We support the inclusion of this land in the circumstances where it is required for the development of the CNFE as a whole and particularly the new station.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
5	Ridgeons do not object to the principle of redevelopment set out within the AAP. Ridgeons however occupy a 1.9ha site that falls within the designated area. The site is identified for redevelopment. Ridgeons have confirmed that the site could only be released early from the terms of the lease if a replacement location for a Builder's Merchant store could be secured. More details are provided within the attached statement.	Ridgeons Ltd [5285]	Paul Belton (mr paul belton) [5284]
5	Of course it should be developed. This is just complete common sense.	Ben Cofield [5605]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
5	The development has to encompass the wider area.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
5	It seems sensible to include this	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
5	Yes, this would seem to be a logical extension and may give access to the adjoining communities.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
5	Logical to include	Nicky Morland [5636]	
5	I am very keen for the Chisholm trail to progress as quickly as possible.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
5	It should be made clear that this land be for attractive, direct active transport connection to the station and surrounding development.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
5	The Campaign fully supports extension of the CNFE AAP boundary to include the land identified as Chesterton Sidings Triangle. The plan should make clear that this land is reserved for an attractive and convenient active transport connection to the station and surrounding development delivering a key connection to the Chisholm Trail. It should be made clear that this land be for attractive, direct active transport connection to the station and surrounding development.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
5	Yes	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
5	It would be illogical not to include it.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
5	I support the extension of the AAP to include the Chesterton Sidings Triangle.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
5	The proposed vision for CNFE is to embrace opportunities to create a well-connected and vibrant place. Proposed Objective 6 is to create an accessible, permeable and well-connected neighbourhood and Objective 8 to encourage a low carbon lifestyle. The inclusion of this triangular area of land will help to facilitate a pedestrian/cycle access for CNFE as part of the Chisholm Trail and this opportunity should be embraced.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
5	We are unsure how the inclusion of this site will affect provision of the development near the station. If the intention is to secure a comprehensive delivery of the railway station and the important connections to the south, including the Chisholm Trail, then it would be sensible to secure consistency of approach by including it in the plan area.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
5	This is an important area for access to the new station.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
5	The Action Plan Area should be extended to include Cambridge Science Park and the triangular area south of Chesterton Sidings, as a minimum, in order to fully address site and station . The East Area Action plan options need to be placed in the context of the wider area to make them legible.	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
5	Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust support Boundary Extension Option (B) Chesterton Sidings Triangle as we believe it significantly enhances the green transport options for the Cambridge Northern Fringe.	Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust (Mr Mick Woolhouse) [5684]	
5	A comprehensive approach to the development including all areas necessary to deliver the vision and objectives is preferred. The inclusion of Chesterton Sidings Triangle is supported (if it can be done within the Local Plan context) to help deliver cycle/pedestrian access, for example as part of Chisholm Trail.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
5	The extension to include Option B is supported to provide additional land to the station area and improve cycle access and permeability in the area generally.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
5	Strongly supported. This will be the shortest, natural route for pedestrians and cyclists to reach the station from Chesterton, and also -- when the cycle bridge planned next to the railway bridge has been built as a part of the Chisholm Trail Cycleway -- for cyclists from Abbey and Fen Ditton.	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
5	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
5	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q6. This area is planned to change significantly over coming years. What do you think would be a good new name for this part of Cambridge?			
6	Turnstone does not have a strong view on this.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
6	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
6	Science Park East	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
6	Cambridge North should be the name of the station, and there is no doubt about that. When people arrive the announcer should say "You are arriving at Cambridge North, please alight for Science and Business Parks". That's it, there should be no debate. It is logical, clear and I cannot even fathom another choice. Not named after anyone, not Chesterton, just Cambridge North. Therefore, the district could also be called Cambridge North. The other side of the railway could be Fen Meadows, as per my other comments.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
6	Extend the name of Science Park - world wide brand name and function	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
6	Chesterton Paradox.	Mr Leon Bovett [5612]	
6	Cambridge Science and Industry or Chesterton Northeast The first to emphasise the employment opportunities, the second the housing possibilities.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
6	No view other than it should not be driven by an individual landowner.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
6	Cambridge North Any name not starting Cambridge detracts from the location - for example who would know that an area call something like Great Keighton is in Cambridge. North gives an immediate location. The area name should match the station name	Nicky Morland [5636]	
6	Its simple and the science park is already well known and established	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
6	a. Cambridge Science Park Station	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
6	Cambridge North	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
6	Chesterton Junction.	Ian Tyes [5652]	
6	Cambridge Business park. it has a good symmetry with Cambridge Science Park.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
6	Brookgate propose that the area should be named Cambridge Park.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
6	Waste of Money Development.	B Fuller [5685]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
6	Cambridge Fen Innovation Gateway (following the name of the station or vice versa).	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
6	C. Cambridge North Station	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
6	Milton Parish Council thinks the station should be called Cambridge North Station	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
6	We support the change in the name to Cambridge North or North Cambridge, to reflect the wider area.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q7a. Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Cambridge Science Park Station?			
7a	In relation to the train station it is suggested it should not be called Cambridge Science Park Station, nor Cambridge Fen Station. However beyond that Turnstone does not have any strong views.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
7a	Subject to Member consideration at Committee in March 2015 although the Science Park was the UK's first science park and has world-wide recognition. None of the other suggestions come close in terms of recognition for those who are not local.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7a	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7a	Subject to Member considerations at Committee in March 2015 - although the Science Park was the UK's first science park and has world-wide recognition. None of the other suggestions come close in terms of recognition for those who are not local.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7a	It is confusing. Cambridge Science Park is 1/2 mile West of here, and already has a stop called Cambridge Science Park on the busway. People arriving by train will be surprised that the Science Park is so far away.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
7a	"Cambridge Science Park" indicates one of the major destinations relevant to people travelling to this place. However, there are other destinations, so I feel "Cambridge North" is marginally preferable.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
7a	Cambridge North. There can be no other logical option. Please call it Cambridge North. Then, if and when Addenbrookes gets a station, that will be Cambridge South, and Cambridge will be Cambridge Central. It's a simple solution, so only Cambridge North please!!!	Ben Cofield [5605]	
7a	Cambridge North. There can be no other logical option. Please call it Cambridge North. Then, if and when Addenbrookes gets a station, that will be Cambridge South, and Cambridge will be Cambridge Central. It's a simple solution, so only Cambridge North please!	Ben Cofield [5605]	
7a	Cambridge Science Park - work brand name.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
7a	brand name	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
7a	The Science and Business Park's are world-renowned centres of technological and business excellence. In my opinion, the new station will benefit from a name-based affiliation.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
7a	It clearly identifies the location of the new station. The Cambridge Science Park is the best known of the groups of offices in this area (which also include the Business Park and St John Innovation Centre) and is often referred to as representing all of them. The new railway station is already widely referred to by this name.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
7a	It is what we are already calling it	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
7a	This station is not on the Science Park and is the name is misleading. The station is closer to the St Johns Innovation Centre and Cowley Road	Mrs Irene Page [5628]	
7a	Strongly Object. The station isn't just for the Science Park and with new developments in the planned area who is to say what else will be there in the future - biotech park, something entirely new. Other mixed development etc. It doesn't locate it for anyone other than those associated with the Science Park	Nicky Morland [5636]	
7a	a. Cambridge Science Park Station	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
7a	Cambridge Science Park Station is in common use already I am in favour of staying with this name. Cambridge North next preference.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
7a	Support for Questions 7A, 10 and 11. Object to Questions 12 and 13.	Bidwells (Mr Andrew Scott) [5645]	
7a	Support Q 7A.	Bidwells (Mr Patrick Stanton) [5646]	
7a	Should only be Cambridge North	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
7a	It is already 'known' as that.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
7a	I object to this name for the station because it will be meaningless in geographical terms to most visitors and because the station is not at the Science Park.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
7a	The CNFE area is not located in close proximity to the Science Park and naming the new station Cambridge Science Park Station would be misleading, resulting in poor legibility.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
7a	Trinity College, Cambridge would support the use of the name 'Cambridge Science Park Station'.	Trinity College, Cambridge [5679]	Bidwells (Adam Halford) [3390]
7a	It's nowhere near the Science Park.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
7a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
7a	Object - The station is not at the Science Park.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
7a	TCE object to the new station being named 'Cambridge Science Park Station'. As we have set out in previous representations, this name is misleading and would be confusing, given that the location of the station will be divorced from Cambridge Science Park, approximately 1km away.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q7b. Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Chesterton Interchange Station?			
7b	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7b	Unimaginative	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
7b	It isn't particularly in Chesterton and isn't really an interchange.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
7b	Cambridge North. There can be no other logical option. Please call it Cambridge North. Then, if and when Addenbrookes gets a station, that will be Cambridge South, and Cambridge will be Cambridge Central. It's a simple solution, so only Cambridge North please!!!	Ben Cofield [5605]	
7b	Nobody from outside Cambridge will know where it is from this name.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
7b	Clunky and gives the wrong impression	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
7b	Think how people search for stations online now. Using anything other than something starting Cambridge won't show up when a search for Cambridge is entered	Nicky Morland [5636]	
7b	Dislike this suggestion. It is not an interchange, it will be a new destination.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
7b	Cambridge North only	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
7b	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
7b	I object to the name Chesterton Interchange Station because it is misleading; omitting the town of Cambridge and implying that this will be an interchange with other railway lines, which it is not.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
7b	The new station will not be an interchange and the name does not accurately reflect the nature of either the new railway station or the wider CNFE area.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
7b	Doesn't sound at all inviting.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
7b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
7b	Object	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
Q7c. Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Cambridge North Station?			
7c	Support name of Cambridge North Station	Mr Rodney Adams [1078]	
7c	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7c	Unimaginative	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
7c	Savills Planning Team in Cambridge are instructed on behalf of St John's College, Cambridge to submit responses to the Issues and Options Report on the CNFE having regard to the College's landholdings and land interests at St John's Innovation Park west of Cowley Road and east of Milton Road. We consider that Cambridge North Station would be the best name of the alternatives provided. Another option that might be worth considering is Cambridge Science Parks as the term "science park" is a generic term.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
7c	Naming the Development and new Railway Station: Cambridge North Station	Histon & Impington Parish Council (Miss Chelsea Presland) [2418]	
7c	Cambridge North Station.	Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900]	
7c	"Cambridge North" is the most objective description of where the station will be.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
7c	Cambridge North. There can be no other logical option. Please call it Cambridge North. Then, if and when Addenbrookes gets a station, that will be Cambridge South, and Cambridge will be Cambridge Central. It's a simple solution, so only Cambridge North please!!!	Ben Cofield [5605]	
7c	Cambridge North Station.	Mr Leon Bovett [5612]	
7c	Cambridge Science Park Station more clearly identifies the location of the new station and it is already widely known as Cambridge Science Park Station.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
7c	Cambridge North Station	Stagecoach (Andy Campbell) [5623]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
7c	I could live with this	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
7c	This encapsulates the whereabouts of the Station and gives a better idea to those who are unfamiliar with the layout of Cambridge.	Mrs Irene Page [5628]	
7c	Cambridge North Station. This describes what it will be and if at a later date a new station is proposed beside Addenbrookes Hospital, there could logically be Cambridge North, Central and South Stations.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
7c	Clear where this station is and doesn't just indicate it is a station for the Science Park only. Like other stations announcements / signs can be Cambridge North for A, B and whatever is developed have to start any name with Cambridge to aid online searching	Nicky Morland [5636]	
7c	Cambridge North tells everyone where the station is.	mrs Jill Tatham [5640]	
7c	Cambridge North Station	Mr Robert Cox [5641]	
7c	Cambridge North is my next preference after Cambridge Science Park Station.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
7c	Support 7C - Cambridge North Station.	Mr Gustavo Milstein [5647]	
7c	Cambridge North	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
7c	I think the station should be called Cambridge North Station	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
7c	Brookgate instead propose that the new station be named as Cambridge Park Station and the existing City station be named as Cambridge Station. This will ensure that the area is legible, particularly given the high volume of tourists who visit the area.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
7c	We consider that Cambridge North Station would be the best name. If "science park" emerges as part of this consultation as a key descriptor, we contend that it should be used in the plural - "Cambridge Science Parks" - in recognition of proximity of several relevant campuses.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
7c	Yes, this name actually makes sense.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
7c	This name is suited to giving the area a higher profile.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
7c	Support - Cambridge North Station identifies the station as being in Cambridge and geographically to the north.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
7c	As the closest development to the station, it could be called Cambridge Business Park Station. However, we consider that a less specific name, tied to the wider geographical area that it serves is more inclusive and more appropriate. Therefore, we support the re-naming of the new station and view that Cambridge North Station (or North Cambridge) is the most appropriate name.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
7c	Cambridge North Station	Doug Whyte [5711]	
7c	Cambridge North	Silke Scheler [5712]	
7c	Cambridge North Station.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
7c	Cambridge North Station.	Dominic Reber [5716]	
Q7d. Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Cambridge Fen Station?			
7d	In relation to the train station it is suggested it should not be called Cambridge Science Park Station, nor Cambridge Fen Station. However beyond that Turnstone does not have any strong views.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
7d	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7d	Beside Fen Road at Chesterton Fen, near Fen Ditton, and at the junction to Fen Drayton.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
7d	It won't be in the fens once stuff has been built round it	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
7d	Cambridge North. There can be no other logical option. Please call it Cambridge North. Then, if and when Addenbrookes gets a station, that will be Cambridge South, and Cambridge will be Cambridge Central. It's a simple solution, so only Cambridge North please!!!	Ben Cofield [5605]	
7d	The new station is not currently known by this name and it does not make clear which part of Cambridge it is in.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
7d	I don't like this	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
7d	Not Fen area. Gives no idea where it is located.	Nicky Morland [5636]	
7d	Should be Cambridge North	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
7d	I object to the name Cambridge Fen Station because it is misleading as the station will not be in the Fen.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
7d	The name is not representative of the station's location within the urban fabric of Cambridge and undermines the proposed Vision which states that CNFE will be 'wholly integrated into the fabric of Cambridge'.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
7d	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
7d	Object - the station will not be in the Fen.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
Q7e. Do you have any other suggestions for a name for the proposed new railway station?			
7e	Subject to Member considerations at Committee	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7e	None.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
7e	Cambridge North. There can be no other logical option. Please call it Cambridge North. Then, if and when Addenbrookes gets a station, that will be Cambridge South, and Cambridge will be Cambridge Central. It's a simple solution, so only Cambridge North please!!!	Ben Cofield [5605]	
7e	I would like the new railway station to be named Cambridge Science Park Railway Station.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
7e	No	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
7e	Milton.	Ian Tyes [5652]	
7e	No - I have no other names to suggest.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
7e	Brookgate proposes that the new station should be named Cambridge Park Station and the existing City station be named as Cambridge Station. This will ensure that the area is legible, particularly given the high volume of tourists who visit the area.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
7e	Cambridge. Why have a station here.	B Fuller [5685]	
7e	Cambridge North Station is perfectly correct, but indeed a bit dull. Cambridge Fen Station is indeed inaccurate. Perhaps Cambridge Fen Gateway Station then?	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
7e	Milton.	John Coston [5713]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q8. Do you	have any comments on the Site Context and Constraints, and what other issues and constraints should be taken into account in the preparation of the Area Action		plan
8	<p>RLW agrees with the analysis of the various constraints affecting the CNFE site, including the mapping of these (such as odour and noise) within Figure 5.</p> <p>In particular it is noted that the odour issues associated with the water recycling centre had previously led to any aspiration for delivery of residential development being abandoned, in the context of the previous round of development plan documents. Figure 5 appears to show, based on the odour contours, that only a small proportion of the site, towards the southern boundaries, would be suitable for residential (C3) uses, at less than 1.5 OUE per cubic metre. It is evident that much of this part of the site would be required for provision of a car park to serve the new station, or is currently in open space use (allotments, and a Site of Local Conservation Importance), further limiting scope for residential development.</p> <p>It is considered that, having identified these significant constraints, the implications of these for the mix and extent of particular land uses are not outlined sufficiently explicitly, nor appropriately reflected within the development options. In this connection we would highlight that whilst there is reference to the railway line in para 6.16 (Infrastructure), there is no mention of the station itself. This is a key element of the infrastructure to serve both CNFE and the wider area and should be added to the text at this point.</p>	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
8	<p>Sport England are concerned that the document does not adequately address the issue of the existing golf driving range within the area covered by the Action Plan. Sports facilities should be protected from development unless suitable alternative facilities are being provided, or unless it can be demonstrated through a robust assessment of facility provision that there is a clear surplus of this type of facility within the catchment area. This policy requirement is set out in Para. 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Sport England's planning policy objectives, which can be accessed here: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/aims-and-objectives/</p>	Sport England (Mr Philip Raiswell) [210]	
8	<p>6.9. - There is the potential through the redevelopment of the site to enhance the First Public Drain. This could be in terms of the surface water mitigation, ecological or aesthetic values. This could be achieved through a number of possible hydrogeological improvements.</p>	Environment Agency (Mr Adam Ireland) [645]	
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for housing uncertain on this site against competing land uses - Need to reflect all transport modes - Odour issues for WRC key - Relocation of non-conforming uses is desirable - Open space needs careful thought - Density strategy is key and I 	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
8	<p>Whilst we welcome the inclusion of this facility [household recycling facility], we are concerned that at present the new entrance to serve this facility is in very close proximity to the Jane Coston Bridge and crosses protected verge land. Such issues, alongside permeability into the site by pedestrians and cyclists, still need careful consideration. The Household Recycling Centre will be the only facility in the Cambridge area and must continue to be taken into account in future scenarios. Support the redevelopment of the area. With the new station, busway and proximity to A14 and A10, the site is better linked than others on the Cambridge fringe.</p>	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
8	<p>1. Serious public money needs to be invested. 2. Inaccessible location 3. Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential 4. Power line would need to be removed. 5. Relocation of stagecoach needed. 6. New station could increase traffic. 7. Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area. 8. Transport links would need to be improved.</p>	Dr Anthony J Cooper [1885]	
8	<p>In 6.10 you say "there are no recorded instances of groundwater flooding within CNFE". Milton Parish Council was always concerned with the high water table South of the A14, and flooding on Chesterton Sidings and Fen Road Chesterton area. The very important First Public Drain provides for the whole of NE Cambridge (from Huntingdon Road eastwards), and Orchard Park, not just "the surrounding area".</p> <p>Please consider safeguarding the old surface water drain under the sidings (and existing railway) straight through to Camside Farm, which could be a cheaper route for a sewage connection under the railway to Fen Road residents.</p>	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
8	The issue of land ownership and a commitment of land owners to bring forward land remains a critical feature of the Plan. Whilst the presence of Anglian Water is important it is the case that development can still proceed nearby where appropriate mitigation measures are put in place.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
8	The sewage works should be regarded as "in place" and not to be moved.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
8	Look again at relocation of the water recycling centre and Waste	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
8	I am supporting this on the grounds that, given the existing constraints, the planning department focus on cycle and pedestrian infrastructure and priorities this. Most notably, to ensure the new area is easy and safe to get to by bike - be it by those cycling from the city, or coming in from Milton and other surrounding villages. This is crucial, if the council is to limit increased vehicular congestion.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
8	Proposed site is encompassed by the statutory safeguarding aerodrome height consultation plan. The main concern of the MOD is to ensure tall structures do not disrupt or inhibit air traffic operations on site. On reviewing the proposed Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan, the proposed area falls within the 15.2m height consultation zone. This means no development should exceed 15.2m.	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MRS LOUISE DALE) [5616]	
8	Making Network Rail's private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton railway sidings running along the north side of the Business Park into a public footpath and cycleway would help to meet these objectives.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
8	Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton railway sidings running along the north side of the Business Park is currently a wasted asset. It should be made into a public footpath and cycleway for pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from the new railway station. This would also enable the Crown Estate to install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park to shorten the walk between offices on the Cambridge Business Park and the new railway station.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
8	Additional thought should be given to the possibility of inconvenience caused to local residents by inconsiderate parking by users of the new rail station. Implications of increased use of Fen Road should also be considered	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
8	Would the regeneration of the AAP site for residential, office and R&D purposes be the most advantageous way to provide employment opportunities on this site for those as described in paragraph 6.4 of the consultation document, adjacent "disadvantage communities"? If the site is largely unsuitable for dwellings both in terms of costs to mitigate contamination and odour issues why would it be conceivable that developments such as restaurants and caf��s would be viable?	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
8	Protection of the waste uses seems contrary to some aims of the AAP. The Transport Strategy could possibly be too insular. Greater focus needed on access to the wider region. Public transport needs to adequately serve people travelling from west and south west of Cambridge if additional car journeys are to be reduced. What is the relationship between any new local centre and the new station? Housing is dependent upon the Water Recycling Centre relocation. What is the transport impact of people commuting to/from CNFE? The use of this area for higher density, tall buildings is supported.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
8	There seems to be a lot about improved car, Guided Bus, bicycle and pedestrian accesswhat about local buses?	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
8	1) The Sewage Works should be removed permanently from the site to permit a greater proportion of residential development where the ground conditions permit. 2) Milton Road is already at capacity, so direct access to and within the site should be prioritised for pedestrians, cyclists and users of the guided bus (to discourage use of cars).	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
8	1) The Sewage Works should be removed to permit a greater proportion of residential development where the ground conditions permit. 2) Milton Road is already at capacity. Direct access to and within the site should be prioritised for pedestrians, cyclists and users of the guided bus (to discourage use of cars). 3) Aggregate lorries should be restricted to the northern perimeter. 4) Surface water runoff should be controlled to avoid flooding commercial premises and residences in Fen Road. 5) Buildings on the site should be no taller than three floors. 6) There should be NO ugly/massive/inhuman 'statement' or 'gateway' buildings on the site.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
8	Cambridge International Airport has lodged formal safeguarding maps with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The safeguarding map shows that the area to be covered by the CNFE Area Action Plan falls within the area hatched green on the safeguarding map. Any development proposed with a maximum height in excess of 15 metres above ground level (AGL) requires consultation with the Airport. The site is also within 2.5 nautical miles of the airport and as such falls within the Air Traffic Zone (ATZ) which is controlled by the Air Traffic Controllers at Cambridge International Airport.	Marshall Group of Companies (Mr Richard Oakley) [5663]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
8	<p>The transport network is a key constraint in bringing forward development at CNFE. The Milton Road corridor and A14 Milton Interchange currently operate at capacity during peak travel periods. The CNFE has the potential to become highly sustainable due to the new railway station, extended Guided Busway and pedestrian/cycle enhancements, however highway capacity remains a significant constraint requiring further investigation with a mitigation strategy developed as part of any future development proposals.</p> <p>Contamination should not be overstated and seen as a barrier to development. The current odour maps do not reflect Anglian Water's proposed WRC upgrades and should be re-visited.</p>	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
8	<p>We are concerned by the environmental impact of neighbouring land use, and in particular by the possible retention of the Anglian Water site in its present form but with the addition of a new Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility. We cannot support a strategy which would make the relationship even worse than it is at present. We object strongly to the siting of such a new recycling centre as shown in the four options.</p>	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
8	<p>Consideration of CNFE in the context of both existing and proposed new developments will be vital to ensure a well-coordinated and integrated development. The lack of mention of other strategic developments as part of the context is a significant omission.</p>	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
8	<p>No comment on stated issues, but the absence of any information about traffic and junction layout is disappointing as it is impossible to assess the relative impacts of the options on existing developments within the AAP area</p>	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
8	<p>The Household Waste Recycling Centre could be relocated in an alternative location to avoid it being a constraint and give greater opportunity to create a place of real character.</p> <p>We would anticipate further evidence base research being undertaken in order to fully explore and understand other potential constraints including ground conditions.</p>	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
8	<p>In 6.10 you say "there are no recorded instances of groundwater flooding within CNFE". Milton Parish Council was always concerned with the high water table South of the A14, and flooding on Chesterton Sidings and Fen Road Chesterton area. The very important First Public Drain provides for the whole of NE Cambridge (from Huntingdon Road eastwards), and Orchard Park, not just "the surrounding area".</p> <p>Please consider safeguarding the old surface water drain under the sidings (and existing railway) straight through to Camside Farm, which could be a cheaper route for a sewage connection under the railway to Fen Road residences.</p>	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
8	<p>During the determination of the railway station application, TTP Consulting on behalf of TCE engaged with the County Council regarding the Transport Assessment submitted with the application and requested further information relating to the modelling which had been undertaken. TTP recommended that the transport modelling did not fully account for the wider development, and felt that the number of trips by sustainable modes had been overestimated. The County Council did not provide this information and their concerns have not been addressed.</p> <p>During the meeting on 23 January, CCC advised that an updated evidence base including sensitivity testing and transport modelling is being undertaken in parallel with the AAP being developed. TCE support this and are of the view that transport modelling of the wider development area and mitigation strategies/new road infrastructure will be crucial in the development of the AAP. As such, transportation is rightly identified as a key site constraint. Until this modelling data is available and understood, there is no benefit in progressing the AAP further.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
8	I do not think this should go ahead unless as part of the scheme a cycle footway is provided on land Network Rail own along side Cowley Road (to the south of Cowley Road). The scheme needs a safe route for cyclists and pedestrians. The Cowley Road footpath as proposed would have the entrances across it.	Jane Coston [5715]	
Q9. Do you support or object to the Development Principles (A to P)? Please add any comments or suggestions.			
9	RLW Estates broadly support the development principles as an appropriate articulation of the proposed objectives for the CNFE AAP. In line with our comments on the vision we question two aspects: 2C does not give adequate emphasis to the employment-led priority for the area and appears to give too much encouragement to residential uses; 3G gives unqualified support for difficult uses (aggregates and waste) without recognising their potential to compromise the quality of the development achievable.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
9	Objective 1a, which argues for adaption over time, is a recipe for a piecemeal approach which lacks the coherence and critical mass needed to maximise the potential the area has to contribute to the future of the City and South Cambs.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for development to be high quality and exemplar - Highest density should not be at transport hub - Relocation of non-conforming uses desirable - Aggregates railhead should be relocated if possible - All transport modes to be embraced and recogn 	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
9	The Wildlife Trust supports principle M, in particular the recognition of the importance of biodiversity features being part of a well-connected network. As watercourses are included, we suggest a change to "...a network of green and blue spaces..." We also suggest removing the word "attractive" as this is a very subjective idea and not relevant to benefitting biodiversity.	The Wildlife Trust BCNP (Miss Sian Williams) [1071]	
9	Support Principle G. Care needed with Principle L to how this can be delivered alongside existing and planned mineral and waste activity to avoid conflict. Additional development principle needed to ensure essential services /infrastructure retained or provided such as Household Recycling Centre. Support objective 1, but amend option B to read "By creating a sustainable, cohesive and inclusive area by ensuring there is appropriate support, improving access to jobs, homes, open space, leisure facilities and other services within the development and to the wider community". This is supported but would benefit from "health" added to address deprivation in/around Chesterton.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
9	7.1F "where possible" accommodate seems too loosely worded. This will depend on cost - can we ask the developer to provide the same facilities at a limited % extra cost to where they are now, at least for a limited time? The risk is that the light industrial users there now will not be able to afford to stay, but where else in Cambridge can they go?	CIr Hazel Smith [2300]	
9	It is important that the opportunities identified for the CNFE reflect the need to maximise employment opportunities and the St John's Innovation Park must play a role in this approach.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
9	If they are left as they are then there is a real risk that they will be used to "justify" moving the sewage works to a greenfield site. The existing investment in the sewage works is vast, not only in the works themselves but also in all the piping that already runs towards them, and existing surrounding land use has taken their presence into account already.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
9	Not G - relocate.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
9	Seems ok	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
9	These are all laudable objectives and will enhance the area for all. Wouldn't it be more straight forward to refer to the "water recycling centre" by the name by which we locals know it: Sewage Works?	Mrs Irene Page [5628]	
9	The Development Principles are a holistic range of positive planning text; they attempt to provide solutions to some of Cambridge's complex and serious issues associated with affordable housing, lack of quality office space, a mix of employment opportunities and open space deficiencies. This attempt to provide a development for everyone results in a lack of focus.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
9	Support development principles.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
9	I am keen for this to go ahead	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
9	In principle	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
9	Points 2 & 3 are the most important.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
9	A. Current planning mustn't be overturned by commercial interests. B. Yes - leisure facilities/ open space. No to commercial/industrial. D. Guided busway should retain pedestrian/cycle paths, trees and hedges. Land beside the Cowley Road ditch should be retained as green space. E - More housing, less industrial use. G. No - Sewage works should be moved. H - No - a sustainable community should be developed. I - No - I require human-scale, attractive buildings, fit for purpose with green public space between them, not a 'gateway' of overbearing buildings and draughty, overshadowed streets. J - Cyclists/pedestrians should have priority. Cars should use the periphery.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
9	Brookgate supports the proposed development principles subject to the following amendments. Objective 2 should be amended to make explicit reference to high densities given the highly sustainable location of CNFE. Specific reference should also be made to the provision of residential development within CNFE, given that 'providing new homes to meet the pressing needs of the local community' is identified as one of the key opportunities for the CNFE area at para. 1.13 of the proposed AAP.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
9	We have referred already to the need for the strategy to reflect plot densification, including on the St John's Innovation Park. Maximising employment opportunities (Objective 3) should include existing developments as well as brownfield regeneration sites.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
9	The over-arching principles are broadly supported but could be improved. There is significant economic potential to promote the wider Cambridge North area including Cambridge Northern Fringe and A10 corridor such as the Research Park and Waterbeach New Town.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
9	They expand on objectives, but access and traffic must be fully addressed.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
9	<p>See attachment [below]</p> <p>Question 9 Response</p> <p>Principles C and D do not make any reference to residential under Objective 2. Principle C is too commercially focussed and could work against the need for balanced mix of uses to deliver the most sustainable place that is well integrated with adjoining communities and provides real benefit to those communities. A principle relating to the new residential community envisaged within the AAP area would provide better balance.</p> <p>Objective 5 / Principles I and J - Reference to mixed use development should be included; zoning approach could work against well designed buildings.</p> <p>Objective 6 / Principles K and L - Stronger connections required to wider area for effective integration. Highly zoned mono use land blocks works against the objective for a well-integrated neighbourhood.</p> <p>Objective 8/ Principle P - Requires a mixed community - current imbalance of land uses will increase carbon footprint, encourage unsustainable travel behaviour and add to emissions.</p>	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
9	<p>Support objective 3 : Principals E,F and G to maximise the Employment opportunities of the area.</p> <p>It is important to support existing business by relocating them into areas suitable for their business activities. In particular the provision of a replacement aggregates rail head to replace the existing rail head lost by the development of the new station is paramount to the continued supply of aggregates for development of both the local and wider Cambridgeshire area.</p>	Frimstone Ltd. (Mr Peter Dawes) [5708]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
9	<p>Principle A - D: TCE broadly welcomes the principles to deliver sustainable development on the site by way of an employment led, mixed use area (subject to consideration of our comments under 'vision') above. TCE supports the inclusion of R&D and similar uses within these principles to ensure that the existing character of the area is not diluted. TCE also supports the principle of locating higher density development in close proximity to the transport hubs, subject to consideration of access and the existing townscape and landscape.</p> <p>Principle E - G: TCE, subject to highways access issues highlighted above, support these principles to maximise employment opportunities, but would like to see further emphasis on the B1(b) uses, including high tech and R&D uses to reinforce Cambridge North as global leader in R&D and technology.</p> <p>Principle H: TCE welcomes the addition of a new local centre within the AAP area which will meet the needs of existing and future workers and residents.</p> <p>Principles I - P: TCE supports the development of the AAP area in a sustainable manner, protecting the natural environment and encouraging sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>However, in planning the future of the area, aspirations must be tempered with realism. For example, justifying development capacity on the basis of unrealistic or overly ambitious assumptions on use of sustainable modes of transport is not acceptable and will be counterproductive.</p> <p>TCE supports the proposed design principles which should be of a high quality and at an appropriate scale.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
9	9) Objective 3 shouldn't get highest priority.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q10. Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 1? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.			
10	CambridgePPF strongly objects to Option 1 (see response to Options 3 & 4) as it does not offer a sufficiently ambitious vision for this vitally important site	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
10	This option is underwhelming and should be the least favoured of all of those being considered. It does not maximise the opportunity for a vibrant new employment-led development and maintains the status quo to a very substantial degree save for localised redevelopment of specific plots.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
10	Support Q 10	Mr Rodney Adams [1078]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
10	<p>With the available information, this is the preferred option.</p> <p>This option focuses on redevelopment of available land retains existing businesses and the WRC whilst creating a new area for businesses.</p> <p>This doesn't affect the on-going operations of the WRC and allows for possible expansion, to meet growth beyond that identified in the emerging Local Plan to 2031.</p> <p>This also allows for a HWRC to be accommodated and this would be a compatible use with the WRC. Anglian Water supports the proposal to locate the HWRC on its land. The exact location would need to be the subject of further investigation.</p> <p>At the present time, with the current available information, this is the preferred option as it is deliverable and viable.</p>	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
10	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure transport impacts are not severe. This applies to the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway, the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks. Needs to be reflected in viability work.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
10	Options 1 and 2 hardly seem worth the bother and cannot be said to really regenerate the area - they aren't a strategic vision.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
10	I would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour- nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. No residential development, underexploits the potential for improvement. Not enough green space - even office developments need "lungs".	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
10	The new Household Waste Recycling Centre here is misguided: people will bring bulky waste by car anyway, and the current site at Butt Lane is much more suitable.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
10	<p>St John's College object to the lack of designation within Option 1 which fails to acknowledge the potential for "plot densification" on the Innovation Park. This is inconsistent with the approach taken to Cambridge Business Park and SQW Consultants Report.</p> <p>The College also objects to the proposed new Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility being location on the Anglian Water site having regard to the nature and character of the uses on the Innovation Park.</p>	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
10	Histon & Impington Parish Council support Option 1 : Lower level of redevelopment Object to options 2 , 3 and 4	Histon & Impington Parish Council (Miss Chelsea Presland) [2418]	
10	Support option 1.	Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900]	
10	Probably not the best option, but viable as a solution, with no obvious problems.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
10	Northern access road is a given, but the current Cowley Road should be pedestrianised. This would allow for future development on the sewage works itself. There should be new pedestrian access points to the Business Park, to make it more cohesive with the new area. Nuffield Road can stay as it is, but the access to it should be via Milton Road, not its present arrangement, and therefore the guided bus extension should be a road for all users, with bollards leading after Nuffield Road to the station.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
10	Whilst I support the creation of a new pedestrianised boulevard on the existing Cowley Road, low level development would be a wasted opportunity. On the attached map, I feel that we could easily accommodate buildings of up to 20 storeys, though feel that a minimum of 8 storeys would be appropriate.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
10	Option 3 is preferred.	Mr Leon Bovett [5612]	
10	Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through the middle of my property. With the planned expansion of public transport as part of the City Deal, how do you propose we achieve this without a bus depot? If we are to be relocated who pays for the building for the new bus depot?	Stagecoach (Andy Campbell) [5623]	
10	It seems appropriate to begin small and grow to the eventual maximum level of development. This allows a natural impetus to be carried forward if the sewage works can eventually be relocated.	Mrs Irene Page [5628]	
10	The redevelopment details outlined in Option 1 provide for what is likely to be the most realistic outcome in the extent of development opportunity, given land ownership, land use and infrastructure delivery constraints associated with AAP site. The omission of residential development within Option 1 would indicate the option is failing in some of its key objectives in creating a sustainable community. The juxtaposition of areas which host very differing use classes will be difficult to control in terms of noise, odour and vibration, therefore, the B1 provision should not feature B1(b) uses.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
10	Definitive line between odour zones defining uses within the CNFE. The AAP should consider individual applications on merit. The odour footprint should be updated. Access road serving the B2 uses to the north of Cowley Road could be separate from the B1 use, possibly with access from the Milton Road end avoiding "B1" use. The relocation of the station car park with a multi-storey car park could allow residential development in AAP, maximising density, improving the site's sustainability and allowing some employees to live locally, helping to meet the intended target of reducing car use by employees within the City.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
10	Support Q10	Mr Robert Cox [5641]	
10	I would prefer this area is dealt with properly, ie option 4 Maximum Level of Redevelopment.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
10	Support for Questions 7A, 10 and 11. Object to Questions 12 and 13.	Bidwells (Mr Andrew Scott) [5645]	
10	Support for Q10	Bidwells (Mr Patrick Stanton) [5646]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
10	<p>Support Q10</p> <p>I support Options 1 and 2 because they leave open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site).</p> <p>None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.</p> <p>This is a great opportunity for providing the City or Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.</p>	Mr Gustavo Milstein [5647]	
10	<p>All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation.</p> <p>The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away - a covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). Similarly, a taxi rank should not be any closer than 100 metres to allow space for ordinary and guided buses.</p>	P Verbinnen [5650]	
10	Parts of only	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
10	Support option 1.	Ian Tyes [5652]	
10	It is not doing enough and is not worth the effort.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
10	4) The HWRC should STAY at Butt Lane.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
10	Option 1 proposes a lower level of development on a brownfield site which is situated in a highly sustainable location. This represents inefficient use of the land and does not accord with the NPPF which seeks to maximise the use of previously developed land (para.111). Furthermore, Option 1 does not propose any new residential development or a local service hub and will not provide a mix of land uses at densities that make best use of the site. Option 1 does not therefore accord with the development objectives identified to guide the delivery of the vision for the CNFE.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
10	<p>This option relates to the lower level of development whereby Anglian Water remains in situ. Its presence in has a major bearing on potential adjacent land uses.</p> <p>We have two main concerns.</p> <p>First, St John's Innovation Park does not benefit from the proposal for plot densification applicable to the Cambridge Business Park. Current density at the St John's Innovation Park is lower than that of the Business Park. The key and the plan need amending to ensure that plot densification also applies to the St John's Innovation Park. This will be consistent with the Councils' own consultants, SQW, who in their supporting documentation at paragraphs 1.229 and 1.34 confirm that the potential exists to introduce more employment floorspace on the area within the Innovation Park.</p> <p>Secondly, the "Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility" referred to in Option 1 requires a definition in Appendix 3 (Glossary of Terms).</p> <p>We are concerned to see Option 1 include such a facility close to offices at the St John's Innovation Park, alternative locations exist which would be more appropriate for siting such a facility. A recycling centre is inappropriate in close proximity to high technology offices and buildings.</p>	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
10	It is very important to improve the access to the new station, since the current environment along Cowley Road is very unwelcoming, especially for pedestrians. Option 1 would get this done quickly.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
10	If, at the current time, it is not feasible to move - or contain to an extent that makes the area habitable - the water recycling centre, then this option would be appropriate as it leaves provisions for sensible future development of the water recycling site. This development could include a major new 'green' area, relating to Fen Road, the river and Milton Country Park. This is a great opportunity for providing the City of Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help to re-balance the current trend to over-development.	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
10	Support lower level redevelopment.	B Fuller [5685]	
10	<p>There are no strong preferences on the options but the overarching objective to create a transformative gateway with a strong employment focus should remain consistent.</p> <p>Option 1 (Lower Level of Redevelopment) is unlikely to deliver the full potential of the CNFE area and associated developments in the Greater Cambridge area. It would limit the development potential, the infrastructure and connectivity improvements and the role of the new station. It could be considered as an early phase of the development but greater ambition is required to deliver a transformational gateway regeneration scheme.</p>	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
10	<p>Leaves significant area of underused land with non-conforming use (WWTW) which constrains development. Object to Household Recycling Centre indicative position.</p> <p>The lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.</p>	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
10	Stagecoach's preferred option is option 1 : The lower level of redevelopment. This allocates the area occupied by Stagecoach as an existing industrial and sui generis use (bus depots fall into the latter category).	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
10	As noted on P35 the scale of development means that option 1 does not deliver successful regeneration of the wider area, maximise sustainable urban living opportunities or suitable density of development required to exploit the significant investment in the transport. No opportunity for urban living.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
10	<p>Object</p> <p>We would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. No residential development, underexploits the potential for improvement. Not enough green space - even office developments need "lungs".</p>	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
10	<p>Overall, TCE supports the high level options for redevelopment of the site (options 2-4) only if the detailed evidence base work/studies demonstrate that these development options will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors. These concerns are set out as follows.</p> <p>Mix of uses: A mix of uses is proposed for the site including residential uses, a mix of B class/employment uses, new open space, a local centre and the aggregates/railhead sidings use. TCE broadly supports this approach subject to concerns about access and infrastructure, but would like to see inclusion of wording to the effect that the primary function of this area is to be the leading R&D/technology quarter/destination in Cambridge. Any activity to dilute this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area would be a loss/step backwards, given its regional/national status. Whilst it is appropriate to have supporting and complementary uses, larger-scale developments should not be permitted.</p> <p>TCE supports the identification of CBP as offices/R&D with potential for intensification.</p> <p>Linkages: TCE broadly supports the principle of promoting sustainable transport and movement through the idea of improving permeability and access to key routes, although TCE object to public access and new walkways being provided through CBP as shown within development options 2-4. For security and health and safety reasons, the general public cannot have access to and through CBP.</p> <p>However, TCE would like to see improved pedestrian and cycle access between the new railway station and the CBP, for both the occupiers and their customers/visitors. This should be identified and supported in the AAP. Potential options for improving access from CBP to the Station have been previously worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information.</p> <p>Landscaping: TCE also supports the inclusion of hard and soft landscaping with the AAP area. However, it should be noted that a comprehensive landscaping scheme within CBP has been implemented and this is a matter for TCE. It is worth mentioning that TCE are implementing a Sustainability Action Plan at CBP which includes improving the landscaping/green corridors, promoting biodiversity areas, promoting green travel and other such initiatives. TCE also broadly support the aspiration for a 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road, which would tie in well with the aforementioned initiatives.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
10	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
10	I find all proposed options to be too restricted with the use of space. A mix of residential use, offices and industry would be preferable to give it a more natural feel. For example, leave the Nuffield Road industrial area and more residential use development further north. Also consider a more modular approach that allows to develop toward a future goal, but doesn't depend on things (like moving the water recycling centre) from the get go.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
10	The usual mess, more houses, more cars blocking an already problem area for cars on to the A14 or in to Cambridge.	R Richardson [5714]	
Q11. Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 2? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.			
11	CambridgePPF strongly objects to Option 2 (see response to Options 3 & 4 in full text) as it does not offer a sufficiently ambitious vision for this vitally important site.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
11	This option is little better than Option 1, in fact it is arguably poorer, because it 'sacrifices' commercial land for more residential land when the emerging Local Plan is not dependent on such development coming forward.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
11	Support Q 11	Mr Rodney Adams [1078]	
11	<p>This option is similar to Option 1 but notably includes the introduction of residential development around the proposed railway station and Nuffield Road.</p> <p>This proposed residential area near Nuffield Road falls partly within the 1.5 OUE per cubic metre contour as illustrated in the odour modelling contours on Figure 5 - Major Constraints. As specified in Appendix 3 of H4 Odour Management: How to comply with your environmental permit, within this contour there is a high risk of loss of amenity to the proposed residential development which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. The proposed local centre should also be assessed against this contour line.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan also contains Policy CS31 covering Wastewater Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas. This policy states, inter alia:</p> <p>Where new development is proposed within the Safeguarding Areas involving buildings which would normally be occupied, the application must be accompanied by an odour assessment report. The assessment must consider existing odour emissions of the waste water treatment works at different times of the year and in a range of different weather conditions.</p> <p>Planning permission will only be granted when it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be adversely affected by the continued operation of the existing waste water treatment works.</p> <p>Subject to the above, the remaining aspects of this option do not affect the on-going operations of the WRC and allows for expansion, if required, to meet growth beyond that currently identified in the emerging Local Plan to 2031.</p> <p>This option also allows for a Household Waste Recycling Centre to be accommodated and this would be a compatible use with the WRC. Anglian Water supports the proposal to locate the HWRC on its land. The exact location of it would need to be the subject of further investigation.</p> <p>Subject to the removal of the proposed residential development within the 1.5 odour contour, Anglian Water supports this option.</p>	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
11	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of City Deal. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway), the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks. This will need to be reflected in viability work.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
11	Options 1 and 2 hardly seem worth the bother and cannot be said to really regenerate the area - they aren't a strategic vision.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
11	I would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour- nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. I approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
11	The new Household Waste Recycling Centre here is misguided: people will bring bulky waste by car anyway, and the current site at Butt Lane is much more suitable.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
11	As with Option 1, the College objects to the proposed new Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility being identified on the Anglian Water site having regard to the nature and character of the Innovation Park. Option 2 fails to acknowledge the potential that St John's Innovation Park has in the context of "plot identification". This is inconsistent with the policy approach taken to Cambridge Business Park and SQW Consultants.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
11	Option 2 fails to acknowledge the potential that St John's Innovation Park has in the context of "plot identification". This is inconsistent with the policy approach taken to Cambridge Business Park and SQW Consultants.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
11	Histon & Impington Parish Council support Option 1 : Lower level of redevelopment Object to options 2 , 3 and 4	Histon & Impington Parish Council (Miss Chelsea Presland) [2418]	
11	Object to option 2.	Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900]	
11	Ridgeons do not object to the principle of redevelopment set out within the AAP. Ridgeons however occupy a 1.9ha site that falls within the designated area. The site is identified for redevelopment. Ridgeons have confirmed that the site could only be released early from the terms of the lease if a replacement location for a Builder's Merchant store could be secured. More details are provided within the attached statement.	Ridgeons Ltd [5285]	Paul Belton (mr paul belton) [5284]
11	This is probably the best use of the area consistent with not moving the sewage works.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
11	Northern access road is a given, but the current Cowley Road should be pedestrianised. This would allow for future development on the sewage works itself. There should be new pedestrian access points to the Business Park, to make it more cohesive with the new area. Nuffield Road can stay as it is, but the access to it should be via Milton Road, not it's present arrangement, and therefore the guided bus extension should be a road for all users, with bollards leading after Nuffield Road to the station.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
11	Option 3 is preferred.	Mr Leon Bovett [5612]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
11	Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through the middle of my property. With the planned expansion of public transport as part of the City Deal, how do you propose we achieve this without a bus depot? If we are to be relocated who pays for the building for the new bus depot?	Stagecoach (Andy Campbell) [5623]	
11	The delivery of this quantum of development would be more likely to allow for the development principles outlined in the Issues and Options paper to be implemented. The land uses section of the analysis table does not take into account the loss of the golf driving range. The delivery of the development proposed will be subject to the delivery of the necessary infrastructure upgrades such as the Milton Road interchange. There is significant doubt on whether these will all be in place on time to meet with the residential, office and R&D sector demands.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
11	Definitive line between odour zones defining uses within the CNFE. The AAP should consider individual applications on merit. The odour footprint should be updated. Access road serving the B2 uses to the north of Cowley Road could be separate from the B1 use, possibly with access from the Milton Road end avoiding B1 use. The heavy goods vehicle access route is understandable but may not be deliverable. The deliverability of the eastern proposed B2, B8 and Sui Generis uses are unsure as this area is in multiple ownerships and legal interests. The principle is supported and the dedicated heavy goods vehicle access route could be a positive provided that the landowners can agree suitable terms. The relocation of the station car park further north within the site together with a multi-storey car park could possibly allow greater residential development to be included in this scheme, maximising the site's sustainability. The Guided Busway makes it difficult to fully integrate the Nuffield Road and Trinity Hall Industrial Estates with the rest of the CNFE area. The multiple ownerships and legal interests make this challenging to deliver.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
11	Makes best use of area within constraint of moving the Sewage works at a high costs.	Nicky Morland [5636]	
11	Support Q11	Mr Robert Cox [5641]	
11	I would prefer this area is dealt with properly, ie option 4 Maximum Level of Redevelopment.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
11	Support for Questions 7A, 10 and 11. Object to Questions 12 and 13.	Bidwells (Mr Andrew Scott) [5645]	
11	Support for Q11.	Bidwells (Mr Patrick Stanton) [5646]	
11	Support Q11 I support Options 1 and 2 because they leave open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site). None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces. This is a great opportunity for providing the City or Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.	Mr Gustavo Milstein [5647]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
11	<p>All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation.</p> <p>The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away - a covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). Similarly, a taxi rank should not be any closer than 100 metres to allow space for ordinary and guided buses.</p>	P Verbinnen [5650]	
11	parts of only	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
11	Object to option 2.	Ian Tyes [5652]	
11	This or option 3 should be the one to select.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
11	4) The HWRC should STAY at Butt Lane.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
11	Brookgate support some aspects of Option 2, however an alternative Option 2a is proposed and is appended to this submission. Residential development, particularly near the station is supported as is the proposed increase in Offices/R & D with associated job creation and the development of a local centre. The proposed increase in informal open space provision is also supported but could be improved. Option 2 proposes a more balanced mix of land uses and maintains the potential for early delivery, however there remains scope to further improve upon the efficiency of the use of the land.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
11	<p>As with our response to Q10, we maintain that the St John's Innovation Park should be considered as having the same potential for the intensification of employment provision as has been identified for the Cambridge Business Park, namely plot densification.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed location of the Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility remains in the same location as shown in Option 1. We reiterate our strong concerns about the appropriateness of such a facility in that location, having regard to the proximity to offices and research activities at the St John's Innovation Park.</p>	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
11	We can see how providing residential accommodation on the site is beneficial, given the City's priority to build housing, without mitigation works to the water recycling centre, however, it is not clear that this would be an attractive place to live - and therefore we are not convinced that this option is appropriate at this time.	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
11	<p>There are no strong preferences on the options but the overarching objective to create a transformative gateway with a strong employment focus should remain consistent.</p> <p>Option 2 (Medium Level of Redevelopment) is most likely should Option 3 not be feasible or viable (particularly the rationalisation of the Water Recycling Centre (WRC). From the information provided it appears to strike a good balance between delivery and ambition however it is not without its own constraints.</p>	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
11	<p>Leaves significant area of underused land with non-conforming use (WWTW) which constrains development. Object to Household Recycling Centre indicative position.</p> <p>The lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.</p>	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
11	Options 2 ,3 and 4 identify the area currently occupied by the Stagecoach Depot as areas for proposed industry, storage and sui generis uses. Stagecoach does not support any of these options, as they potentially result in the loss of the bus depot with site identified for re-provision.	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]
11	As noted on P37 the scale of development means that option 2 does not deliver successful regeneration of the wider area, maximise sustainable urban living opportunities or suitable density of development required to exploit the significant investment in the transport. Sub-optimal opportunity for urban living.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
11	The provision of a re configured aggregates railhead and sidings is supported to replace the existing aggregates railhead lost by the development of the new station. The replacement of this railhead is paramount to the continued supply of aggregates for development of both the local and wider Cambridgeshire area. The provision of a new Heavy Goods Vehicle access is supported to provide a more efficient, direct and safe access to the railhead and other industrial areas.	Frimstone Ltd. (Mr Peter Dawes) [5708]	
11	Object We would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. We approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
11	<p>Overall, TCE supports the high level options for redevelopment of the site (options 2-4) only if the detailed evidence base work/studies demonstrate that these development options will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors. These concerns are set out as follows.</p> <p>Mix of uses: A mix of uses is proposed for the site including residential uses, a mix of B class/employment uses, new open space, a local centre and the aggregates/railhead sidings use. TCE broadly supports this approach subject to concerns about access and infrastructure, but would like to see inclusion of wording to the effect that the primary function of this area is to be the leading R&D/technology quarter/destination in Cambridge. Any activity to dilute this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area would be a loss/step backwards, given its regional/national status. Whilst it is appropriate to have supporting and complementary uses, larger-scale developments should not be permitted.</p> <p>TCE supports the identification of CBP as offices/R&D with potential for intensification.</p> <p>Linkages: TCE broadly supports the principle of promoting sustainable transport and movement through the idea of improving permeability and access to key routes, although TCE object to public access and new walkways being provided through CBP as shown within development options 2-4. For security and health and safety reasons, the general public cannot have access to and through CBP.</p> <p>However, TCE would like to see improved pedestrian and cycle access between the new railway station and the CBP, for both the occupiers and their customers/visitors. This should be identified and supported in the AAP. Potential options for improving access from CBP to the Station have been previously worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information.</p> <p>Landscaping: TCE also supports the inclusion of hard and soft landscaping with the AAP area. However, it should be noted that a comprehensive landscaping scheme within CBP has been implemented and this is a matter for TCE. It is worth mentioning that TCE are implementing a Sustainability Action Plan at CBP which includes improving the landscaping/green corridors, promoting biodiversity areas, promoting green travel and other such initiatives. TCE also broadly support the aspiration for a 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road, which would tie in well with the aforementioned initiatives.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
11	<p>Object.</p> <p>I find all proposed options to be too restricted with the use of space. A mix of residential use, offices and industry would be preferable to give it a more natural feel. For example, leave the Nuffield Road industrial area and more residential use development further north. Also consider a more modular approach that allows to develop toward a future goal, but doesn't depend on things (like moving the water recycling centre) from the get go.</p>	Silke Scheler [5712]	
11	<p>The usual mess, more houses, more cars blocking an already problem area for cars on to the A14 or in to Cambridge.</p>	R Richardson [5714]	
11	<p>Like the idea of including "open space" / green areas. The heavy use / popularity of Milton Country Park shows that these spaces are highly valued. Note: The Science Park has lost a lot of its green space over the years. Slightly concerned about "intensive" use of land (option 3 & 4).</p>	Dominic Reber [5716]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q12. Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 3? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.			
12	This is our second preference option. We support it as a reserve option in the event that Option 4 is not deliverable. Reconfiguring the water treatment plant as proposed will greatly improve the development potential of the overall site, but not as optimally as Option 4.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
12	A better option than 1 or 2 but density approach is flawed.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
12	Support Q 12	Mr Rodney Adams [1078]	
12	<p>This shows a higher level of development and proposes significant changes to the WRC to materially reduce the site area it occupies. Anglian Water wish to highlight the following considerations that will make this option a significant challenge to deliver:</p> <p>Anglian Water has invested approximately Â£20 million in the last 18 months at Cambridge WRC to support the proposed growth in the Cambridge area to 2031.</p> <p>Recent upgrades to Cambridge WRC allow for opportunities for development proposed in the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Plan to be realised by, allowing the HWRC to be accommodated on land within the WRC.</p> <p>This option would represent significant operational risk to the WRC, as it is essentially a relocation and contraction within the existing site. The costs associated with this option due to the technical requirements of moving parts of the operations whilst maintaining serviceability are likely to be significant, potentially greater than the cost of relocating to a new greenfield site. This is supported in table 7.1 of the SQW Employment Options Study Report evidence base which demonstrates that this option is not viable.</p> <p>Growth on the site - A contraction of the operations could also present a potential constraint for expansion to accommodate future growth above and beyond that already proposed. Pursuing this option would also prevent option 4, a full relocation, from being undertaken for the foreseeable future.</p>	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
12	To conclude, Option 3 is not supported due to the significant viability concerns and the highlighted concerns about the transport impacts.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
12	Option 3 is probably the most sensible as Option 4, while the most desirable as it frees up for area, will be heavily constrained by efforts to relocate the Water Recycling Centre.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
12	I would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. I approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
12	The new Household Waste Recycling Centre here is misguided: people will bring bulky waste by car anyway, and the current site at Butt Lane is much more suitable.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
12	Whilst this option 3 acknowledges the role that the Innovation Park can make in terms of plot identification, it is the case that this option compounds the College's concerns by shifting the proposed new Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility westwards closer to the Innovation Park. There is a lack of clarity as to what this new facility will entail but in any case we cannot see the merits of moving such a facility close to the Innovation Park.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
12	Histon & Impington Parish Council support Option 1 : Lower level of redevelopment Object to options 2 , 3 and 4	Histon & Impington Parish Council (Miss Chelsea Presland) [2418]	
12	Object to option 3.	Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900]	
12	I object to both options 3 and 4 . I believe that it would not be a wise move to relocate the Water Recycling Centre and it would appear that no other site has been put forward to replace it.	Mrs Laurie Woolfenden [4583]	
12	Ridgeons do not object to the principle of redevelopment set out within the AAP. Ridgeons however occupy a 1.9ha site that falls within the designated area. The site is identified for redevelopment. Ridgeons have confirmed that the site could only be released early from the terms of the lease if a replacement location for a Builder's Merchant store could be secured. More details are provided within the attached statement.	Ridgeons Ltd [5285]	Paul Belton (mr paul belton) [5284]
12	Whether this option is a good idea depends entirely on whether there is a satisfactory technical solution for "compressing" the sewage works into the much smaller area without using ANY land elsewhere, and at reasonable cost without having to farm out the modification of the sewage works to some independent commercial entity who may or may not deliver it (cf the guided busway and all its problems). On the whole I doubt that this option is viable.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
12	No need to relocate the sewage works currently. Use my attached plan for now, and in 6 or 7 years when the work is finished, we can address that in the future. The northern access road must be completed in order to facilitate further growth.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
12	We support this option as it will be more considered than 1 and 2. Rushing through plans will not help anyone. We are particularly keen to see industrial traffic moved away from Cowley Road.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
12	Option 3 is preferred. I prefer option 3 as I think the area will benefit more from strategic long term transformation. Option 4 seems unlikely to occur, so focus effort on achievable solution. Most important thing is sufficient parking and traffic measures to access train station by car.	Mr Leon Bovett [5612]	
12	Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through the middle of my property. With the planned expansion of public transport as part of the City Deal, how do you propose we achieve this without a bus depot? If we are to be relocated who pays for the building for the new bus depot?	Stagecoach (Andy Campbell) [5623]	
12	The reconfiguration of the Waste Water Recycling Centre site is not realistic within the plan period. The land currently within the Waste Water Recycling Centre identified for re-use would be heavily contaminated and costs of remediating that land would not be attractive to investors given that the returns gained from the development would be for B2 and/or B8 Uses. The delivery of this quantum of development could allow for the development principles outlined in the Issues and Options paper to be implemented. The land uses section of the analysis table does not take into account the loss of the golf driving range.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
12	<p>The improved links with Cambridge Business Park are good but need improving by integrating with the wider CNFE. The heavy goods vehicle access route is understandable but difficult to deliver as it serves other land owners not sit owner (City Council). The principle is supported if landowners can agree suitable terms and it can better serve B2/B8 uses.</p> <p>This option should allow greater residential development: maximising the density; improving the sustainability aspects of the area; increasing the possibility of some employees not travelling to work by car, helping to meet the intended target of reducing car use by employees within the City. The odour footprint should be updated.</p> <p>The Guided Busway makes it difficult to fully integrate the Nuffield Road and Trinity Hall Industrial Estates with the rest of the CNFE area. The multiple ownerships and legal interests make this challenging to deliver.</p>	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
12	Support Q12	Mr Robert Cox [5641]	
12	I would prefer this area is dealt with properly, ie option 4 Maximum Level of Redevelopment.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
12	Support for Questions 7A, 10 and 11. Object to Questions 12 and 13	Bidwells (Mr Andrew Scott) [5645]	
12	Object to Q12	Bidwells (Mr Patrick Stanton) [5646]	
12	Object to Q12	Mr Gustavo Milstein [5647]	
12	<p>All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation.</p> <p>The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away - a covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). Similarly, a taxi rank should not be any closer than 100 metres to allow space for ordinary and guided buses.</p>	P Verbinnen [5650]	
12	Object to option 3.	Ian Tyes [5652]	
12	This or option 2 should go forward.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
12	I support Options 3 or 4 - as both offer reduction or removal of the sewage works from the site. The HWRC should STAY at Butt Lane.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
12	The Parish Council objects to Option 3 as it is not clear that the sewage works can provide sufficient capacity and how any increase in capacity if needed, would be handled or located.	Fen Ditton Parish Council (Mr Vince Farrar) [5662]	
12	Marshall Group Properties Ltd objects to Redevelopment Option 3 on the basis it assumes that reconfiguration of the Water Recycling Centre onto a smaller site, with more indoor or contracted operations. As noted in the summary of the option this is "subject to technical, financial and operational deliverability." Our view at the present time is that this is unproven.	Marshall Group of Companies (Mr Richard Oakley) [5663]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
12	Brookgate have serious concerns regarding the viability and deliverability of Option 3, which is reliant upon the upgrading and reduction in area of the Water Recycling Centre. This is a significant issue and the deliverability of Option 3 is therefore questionable. Early deliverability will be impracticable and meeting the CNFE vision of a comprehensively planned area will be difficult due to the likelihood of some parts of the development coming forward significantly later than others. More significant highway works will also be required due to the increased quantum of development providing further viability and deliverability issues.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
12	<p>1. The presence of the Anglian Water site will still mean that the edge of the new development area will be formed by appropriate employment uses. Further B1 and research and development uses would complement the area around the St John's Innovation Park as well as those uses on the Cambridge Business Park. New residential space around the station and on Nuffield Road would create a better balance of activities and increase the sustainability credentials in this part of the City.</p> <p>2. It is important that one major objective of the Plan - to maximise employment opportunities - is afforded across the existing employment areas within the CNFE and this is entirely consistent with the findings in the SQW report. We fail to understand why the Innovation Park has not been identified for plot intensification with Options 1 and 2</p> <p>3. Option 3 is worse than Options 1 and 2 because under this option the facility shifts westwards and even closer to the Vitrum building on the St John's Innovation Park. It is inappropriate to have this use in close proximity to B1 offices and research and development uses as a result of noise, dust and other environmental impacts. We object strongly to such an industrial use being located in close proximity to high technology uses</p>	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
12	The Water Recycling Centre is a blight on the area and its surroundings. Anything to reduce its impact would be very welcome. However I would be concerned if attempting this meant it took longer to improve the area nearer the station.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
12	Evidence has not been provided to illustrate that the Water Recycling Centre could be suitably contained to make the site an attractive area to live. Subject to this, we would support the proposal for a mixed use site. The current zonal planning of the residential areas as shown on the plan need additional design. It seems a shame not to pull the green protected open space over the busway and give the whole area around the station room to become a series of attractive public spaces relating to the new residential uses.	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
12	There are no strong preferences on the options but the overarching objective to create a transformative gateway with a strong employment focus should remain consistent. Option 3 (Higher Level of Redevelopment) is supported but it is imperative to confirm that the rationalisation of the water recycling plant is feasible, viable and would not delay development on the remainder of the site.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
12	<p>Object to indicative location of Household Recycling Centre.</p> <p>Partially support as reduces area covered by WWTW, but proposes B2/B8 uses adjacent to Vitrum Building / St Johns Innovation site.</p> <p>The lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.</p>	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
12	Options 2 ,3 and 4 identify the area currently occupied by the Stagecoach Depot as areas for proposed industry, storage and sui generis uses. Stagecoach does not support any of these options, as they potentially result in the loss of the bus depot with site identified for re-provision.	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
12	<p>The imbalance between residential and employment uses coupled with the focus on industrial and storage development will not lead to the successful regeneration of the wider area. Transport investment not exploited. Appropriate scale of urban living not supported.</p> <p>Waste water consolidation does not provide for enhanced balance of uses and delivery of place that supports sustainable urban living with well balanced mix of uses. Uses proposed will not allow for a viable rationalisation.</p>	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
12	<p>The provision of a re configured and enlarged aggregates railhead and sidings is supported to replace the existing aggregates railhead lost by the development of the new station. The replacement of this railhead is paramount to the continued supply of aggregates for development of both the local and wider Cambridgeshire area.</p> <p>The provision of a new Heavy Goods Vehicle access is supported to provide a more efficient, direct and safe access to the railhead and other industrial areas.</p>	Frimstone Ltd. (Mr Peter Dawes) [5708]	
12	<p>We would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. We approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable.</p>	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
12	<p>Overall, TCE supports the high level options for redevelopment of the site (options 2-4) only if the detailed evidence base work/studies demonstrate that these development options will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors. These concerns are set out as follows.</p> <p>Mix of uses: A mix of uses is proposed for the site including residential uses, a mix of B class/employment uses, new open space, a local centre and the aggregates/railhead sidings use. TCE broadly supports this approach subject to concerns about access and infrastructure, but would like to see inclusion of wording to the effect that the primary function of this area is to be the leading R&D/technology quarter/destination in Cambridge. Any activity to dilute this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area would be a loss/step backwards, given its regional/national status. Whilst it is appropriate to have supporting and complementary uses, larger-scale developments should not be permitted. TCE supports the identification of CBP as offices/R&D with potential for intensification.</p> <p>Linkages: TCE broadly supports the principle of promoting sustainable transport and movement through the idea of improving permeability and access to key routes, although TCE object to public access and new walkways being provided through CBP as shown within development options 2-4. For security and health and safety reasons, the general public cannot have access to and through CBP. However, TCE would like to see improved pedestrian and cycle access between the new railway station and the CBP, for both the occupiers and their customers/visitors. This should be identified and supported in the AAP. Potential options for improving access from CBP to the Station have been previously worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information.</p> <p>Landscaping: TCE also supports the inclusion of hard and soft landscaping with the AAP area. However, it should be noted that a comprehensive landscaping scheme within CBP has been implemented and this is a matter for TCE. It is worth mentioning that TCE are implementing a Sustainability Action Plan at CBP which includes improving the landscaping/green corridors, promoting biodiversity areas, promoting green travel and other such initiatives. TCE also broadly support the aspiration for a 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road, which would tie in well with the aforementioned initiatives.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
12	<p>Object.</p> <p>I find all proposed options to be too restricted with the use of space. A mix of residential use, offices and industry would be preferable to give it a more natural feel. For example, leave the Nuffield Road industrial area and more residential use development further north. Also consider a more modular approach that allows to develop toward a future goal, but doesn't depend on things (like moving the water recycling centre) from the get go.</p>	Silke Scheler [5712]	
12	The usual mess, more houses, more cars blocking an already problem area for cars on to the A14 or in to Cambridge.	R Richardson [5714]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q13. Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 4? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.			
13	This is our first preference Option. Removal of the water treatment plant from the site would maximise development potential and improve air quality conditions both on the site and elsewhere in the vicinity. We recognise that much work will be needed to make this option deliverable and urge the local authorities and Anglian Water to work together to find solutions that would allow it to be achieved.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
13	To be preferred to Options 1 and 2 but flawed on some of the density assumptions.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
13	Not sure	Mr Rodney Adams [1078]	
13	<p>This envisages the complete relocation of the WRC to an alternative location. It is important to highlight the regulatory framework in which the water industry operates:</p> <p>The services provided to Anglian Water's customers and the prices that they pay are regulated primarily by Ofwat. The regulatory system for infrastructure investments operates on five-yearly cycles called Asset Management Plan (AMP) periods.</p> <p>With Cambridge WRC there are no operational or regulatory reasons to justify relocation. Anglian Water is unable to include such relocation in its business plan.</p> <p>There accordingly remains considerable uncertainty regarding the viability of relocation of the WRC proposed in this option. In addition, there is the further uncertainty and complexity inherent in finding an alternative location for the WRC and the technical measures to relocate an operational WRC, which could take a minimum of ten years. However, if this option is pursued, Anglian Water will co-operate with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council to identify solutions to these issues. It should be noted, that in order for the AAP to be supported as sound, there should be sufficient certainty that this option is deliverable prior to the proposed submission, currently programmed for Autumn 2015.</p>	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
13	Option 4 is not supported due to the significant viability concerns, previous experience of the difficulties of trying to move water recycling centres, concern that subsidy would be needed to move the water recycling centre and the highlighted concerns about the transport impacts.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
13	Option 3 is probably the most sensible as Option 4, while the most desirable as it frees up for area, will be heavily constrained by efforts to relocate the Water Recycling Centre.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
13	The new Household Waste Recycling Centre here is misguided: people will bring bulky waste by car anyway, and the current site at Butt Lane is much more suitable.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
13	Whilst option 4 identifies plot densification on the Innovation Park, it continues to show a new Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility closer to the former. This is unacceptable in the context of protecting the nature and character and activities being carried out on the Innovation Park.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
13	Histon & Impington Parish Council support Option 1 : Lower level of redevelopment Object to options 2 , 3 and 4	Histon & Impington Parish Council (Miss Chelsea Presland) [2418]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
13	Object to option 4.	Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900]	
13	I object to both options 3 and 4. I believe that it would not be a wise move to relocate the Water Recycling Centre and it would appear that no other site has been put forward to replace it.	Mrs Laurie Woolfenden [4583]	
13	Ridgeons do not object to the principle of redevelopment set out within the AAP. Ridgeons however occupy a 1.9ha site that falls within the designated area. The site is identified for redevelopment. Ridgeons have confirmed that the site could only be released early from the terms of the lease if a replacement location for a Builder's Merchant store could be secured. More details are provided within the attached statement.	Ridgeons Ltd [5285]	Paul Belton (mr paul belton) [5284]
13	I strongly object to moving the sewage works to a different site, for the following reasons: a) Huge investment has already been made into the existing site - not only in the site itself but into all the piping connections to and from the site; and b) Moving it would be likely to use up good greenfield site elsewhere, and destroying greenfield with a sewage works is every bit as bad as destroying it with buildings.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
13	No need for this for now, we can provide all the housing we need at Cambridge North and Fen Meadows, but can look at relocation in 7+ years' time, or even 15+ years' time. It is not necessary with the plan I have attached.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
13	Let's think strategically and holistically.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
13	Option 3 is preferred. I prefer option 3 as I think the area will benefit more from strategic long term transformation. Option 4 seems unlikely to occur, so focus effort on achievable solution. Most important thing is sufficient parking and traffic measures to access train station by car.	Mr Leon Bovett [5612]	
13	Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through the middle of my property. With the planned expansion of public transport as part of the City Deal, how do you propose we achieve this without a bus depot? If we are to be relocated who pays for the building for the new bus depot?	Stagecoach (Andy Campbell) [5623]	
13	If option 4 is not possible due to the difficulties of re-siting the waste management facility, then this is the second best option in my opinion.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
13	This seems to maximise housing provision and open spaces and is therefore my preferred option. If option 4 is not possible due to the difficulties of re-siting the waste management facility, then this is the second best option in my opinion.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
13	The relocation of Waste Water Recycling Centre site is not realistic within the plan period. The Waste Water Recycling Centre would be heavily contaminated and costs of remediating that land would not be attractive to investors. The delivery of this quantum of development could allow for the development principles outlined in the Issues and Options paper to be implemented. The development outcome would be for 630 dwellings in an area which would provide for 27,600 jobs. This is not considered to be a sustainable balance of homes to jobs.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
13	<p>The improved links with Cambridge Business Park are good but need improving by integrating with the wider CNFE.</p> <p>The heavy goods vehicle access route is understandable but difficult to deliver as it serves other land owners not sit owner (City Council). The principle is supported if landowners can agree suitable terms and it can better serve B2/B8 uses.</p> <p>This option should maximise residential development: maximising the density; improving the sustainability aspects of the area; increasing the possibility of some employees not travelling to work by car, helping to meet the intended target of reducing car use by employees within the City. The odour footprint should be updated.</p> <p>The Guided Busway makes it difficult to fully integrate the Nuffield Road and Trinity Hall Industrial Estates with the rest of the CNFE area. The multiple ownerships and legal interests make this challenging to deliver.</p>	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
13	Support Q13	Mr Robert Cox [5641]	
13	This would allow the area to be looked at/redeveloped properly without any restrictions.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
13	Support for Questions 7A, 10 and 11. Object to Questions 12 and 13.	Bidwells (Mr Andrew Scott) [5645]	
13	Object to Q13	Bidwells (Mr Patrick Stanton) [5646]	
13	Object to Q13	Mr Gustavo Milstein [5647]	
13	<p>All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation.</p> <p>The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away - a covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). Similarly, a taxi rank should not be any closer than 100 metres to allow space for ordinary and guided buses.</p>	P Verbinnen [5650]	
13	Parts of only	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
13	Object to option 4.	Ian Tyes [5652]	
13	This is too ambitious and will never happen. the cost of moving the sewage works is unlikely to give a development profit and where would the sewage works go?	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
13	I support Options 3 or 4 - as both offer reduction or removal of the sewage works from the site. The HWRC should STAY at Butt Lane.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
13	The Parish Council objects to Option 4 due to the lack of clarity on the location of a new sewage works.	Fen Ditton Parish Council (Mr Vince Farrar) [5662]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
13	<p>Marshall Group Properties Ltd objects to Redevelopment Option 4 on the basis it assumes relocation of the sewage treatment works.</p> <p>At the present time is that this is unproven, and until such time as a feasible site has been identified and has a real prospect of delivery, the AAP should not assume further land can be made available for development.</p>	Marshall Group of Companies (Mr Richard Oakley) [5663]	
13	<p>Brookgate have serious concerns regarding the viability and deliverability of Option 4, which is entirely reliant upon the relocation of the Water Recycling Centre offsite. The viability of this relocation is unknown and there are significant technical, financial and operational constraints. Furthermore, an alternative site has not been identified. The proposed mix of land uses is unbalanced and Option 4 will not facilitate early delivery. Due to some parts of the site coming forward later, piecemeal development would be likely to occur, contrary to the proposed CNFE vision of a comprehensively planned area.</p>	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
13	<p>If relocation is undertaken a more comprehensive view can be taken on appropriate development proposals. CNFE is rightly identified largely for employment uses, with the more residential themes being located in and around any new railway station.</p> <p>Since the Cambridge Business Park has been specifically identified for densification, it is entirely appropriate that the St John's Innovation Park is equally identified. No meaningful difference arises between the two sites in terms of their ability to accommodate additional employment floorspace.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed household waste recycling centre/inert recycling facility has been positioned in the north-western corner of the (former) Anglia Water site. We cannot see how such a use is compatible with adjacent B1 offices and research and development uses on one of the most important research parks in Cambridge.</p> <p>Alternative locations exist across the land area within the CNFE.</p>	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
13	<p>The Water Recycling Centre is a blight on the area and its surroundings. Relocating it would be the best possible outcome. However I would be concerned if attempting this meant it took longer to improve the area nearer the station.</p>	Mr David Collier [5680]	
13	<p>Evidence has not been provided to illustrate that moving the Water Recycling Centre is financially viable. If this evidence were provided, we would support the proposal for a mixed use site, with more housing meeting the Cities objectives - subject to the issues raised in our 'overarching concerns' about connectivity being addressed. There could be more residential included in this option. Our comments on options three about design of the residential area also relate to this option. The current zonal planning of the residential areas as shown on the plan need a more detailed urban design framework.</p>	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
13	<p>We absolutely support the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 4 as we believe the density has to be maximised in order to make the development as efficient as possible. We also support the associated need to relocate the water recycling centre and in principle any general improvement to the treatment works.</p>	Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust (Mr Mick Woolhouse) [5684]	
13	<p>There are no strong preferences on the options but the overarching objective to create a transformative gateway with a strong employment focus should remain consistent. Option 4 (Maximum Level of Redevelopment) is likely to encounter more delivery risks associated with the potential relocation of the WRC (identifying a site, funding and timing) and this could impede the overall development.</p>	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
13	<p>Object to indicative location of Household Recycling Centre - which should be located further to the east within B2/B8 uses not adjacent to Offices/R&D</p> <p>The lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.</p> <p>Support removal of WWTW and proposed B1/R&D uses opposite St Johns Innovation Centre.</p>	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
13	Options 2 ,3 and 4 identify the area currently occupied by the Stagecoach Depot as areas for proposed industry, storage and sui generis uses. Stagecoach does not support any of these options, as they potentially result in the loss of the bus depot with site identified for re-provision.	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]
13	<p>This provides for an exacerbated imbalance between residential and employment uses and coupled with the focus on industrial and storage development will not lead to the successful regeneration of the wider area. Transport investment not exploited.</p> <p>Appropriate scale of urban living not supported.</p> <p>Sub-optimal (unviable) land uses provided on valuable site provided by WWTW relocation.</p> <p>The new condition created and inappropriate emphasis of B2/B8 uses within City boundary does not maximise the opportunity created by the complete re-location of the WWTW.</p>	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
13	<p>We would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. We approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable. Option 3 is a stepping-stone to this option and could be an interim solution. Further housing could be added later.</p>	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
13	<p>Overall, TCE supports the high level options for redevelopment of the site (options 2-4) only if the detailed evidence base work/studies demonstrate that these development options will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors. These concerns are set out as follows.</p> <p>Mix of uses: A mix of uses is proposed for the site including residential uses, a mix of B class/employment uses, new open space, a local centre and the aggregates/railhead sidings use. TCE broadly supports this approach subject to concerns about access and infrastructure, but would like to see inclusion of wording to the effect that the primary function of this area is to be the leading R&D/technology quarter/destination in Cambridge. Any activity to dilute this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area would be a loss/step backwards, given its regional/national status. Whilst it is appropriate to have supporting and complementary uses, larger-scale developments should not be permitted. TCE supports the identification of CBP as offices/R&D with potential for intensification.</p> <p>Linkages: TCE broadly supports the principle of promoting sustainable transport and movement through the idea of improving permeability and access to key routes, although TCE object to public access and new walkways being provided through CBP as shown within development options 2-4. For security and health and safety reasons, the general public cannot have access to and through CBP. However, TCE would like to see improved pedestrian and cycle access between the new railway station and the CBP, for both the occupiers and their customers/visitors. This should be identified and supported in the AAP. Potential options for improving access from CBP to the Station have been previously worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information.</p> <p>Landscaping: TCE also supports the inclusion of hard and soft landscaping with the AAP area. However, it should be noted that a comprehensive landscaping scheme within CBP has been implemented and this is a matter for TCE. It is worth mentioning that TCE are implementing a Sustainability Action Plan at CBP which includes improving the landscaping/green corridors, promoting biodiversity areas, promoting green travel and other such initiatives. TCE also broadly support the aspiration for a 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road, which would tie in well with the aforementioned initiatives.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
13	Maximum Level of Redevelopment.	Doug Whyte [5711]	
13	<p>Object.</p> <p>I find all proposed options to be too restricted with the use of space. A mix of residential use, offices and industry would be preferable to give it a more natural feel. For example, leave the Nuffield Road industrial area and more residential use development further north. Also consider a more modular approach that allows to develop toward a future goal, but doesn't depend on things (like moving the water recycling centre) from the get go.</p>	Silke Scheler [5712]	
13	The usual mess, more houses, more cars blocking an already problem area for cars on to the A14 or in to Cambridge.	R Richardson [5714]	
13	Slightly concerned about intensive use of land	Dominic Reber [5716]	

QUESTION			
NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q14.	Are there alternative redevelopment options you think we should have considered? For example, do you think the redevelopment options should include more residential development, and if so to what extent?		
14	<p>RLW Estates does not wish to comment in detail on Options 1 - 4. However, consistent with our earlier comments we wish to highlight the principles which we believe should underpin the selected strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The priority should be to optimise the development of the area as a high quality employment hub; * The new station should be recognised as a key piece of infrastructure to support this role; * Provision of all sustainable transport modes (including walking and cycling) must be encouraged and safeguarded, both to serve CNFE itself and as part of the wider strategy for the Ely corridor, including Waterbeach new town; * Careful consideration should be given to the potential to relocate or re-configure constraining uses so as to enhance the overall objectives. If that is not possible the land use strategy will need to reflect how best to accommodate them whilst minimising any prejudicial impacts. <p>As regards the last of these points RLW Estates notes that Option 4 is entirely dependent upon relocation of the Water Recycling Centre off-site, with no certainty that this is either viable or deliverable. It is acknowledged within the consultation document that no alternative sites for this facility, which is itself regarded as a vital item of infrastructure for the Greater Cambridge area, have yet been identified. Furthermore it is noted that exercises aimed at finding an appropriate alternative location in the relatively recent past were unsuccessful, and on this basis this option must be considered unlikely to be deliverable, potentially risking the regeneration of this area as a whole. That does not, though, preclude the possibility of reconfiguring and modernising the Water Recycling Centre to reduce its negative impacts on development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, given the constraints clearly in evidence, and in line with our responses to earlier questions, it is not considered that additional residential development would be feasible.</p> <p>Moreover this could not be achieved without diluting the employment focus for the area in accordance with Local Plan policy.</p>	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
14	<p>As indicated in our responses to Questions 12 and 13, Turnstone consider that the key is that the CNFE is developed as an exemplar commercial-led employment site at a density that is appropriate to this edge of City location. That implies a mixture of densities but adopting the higher densities envisaged in Options 3 and 4, but appropriately sited. Densities should be graduated so that highest density parcels are delivered within the centre of the site and where it connects with existing commercial sites such as Cambridge Business Park, Cambridge Science Park and St John's Innovation Park.</p>	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
14	<p>I think we need more car parking space on the the site if this project is going to reduce traffic on the M11 going south, the A14 going east and west and the A10 going north. The whole idea is to get people on to the main railway for the long journey.</p>	Mr Rodney Adams [1078]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
14	<p>The inclusion of residential development needs careful consideration given the Water Recycling Centre (Options 1-3), strategic aggregates railheads (Options 1-4) and waste uses (Options 1-4). Residential development is sensitive to development like the Water Recycling Centre e.g. odour. These facilities and proposed waste management uses, have consultation / safeguarding areas designated by adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. These Areas seek to prevent essential existing / planned facilities being prejudiced. If residential development is proposed it should be located away from these uses, and demonstrate that existing and allocated waste management / aggregate facilities will not be prejudiced.</p>	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
14	<p>Has proper investigation into adequacy of water supply in general for new developments been determined?</p> <p>Plan doesn't seem coherent about road access. Question of linkages to the A14 from Fen Road.</p> <p>I support provision of open space. I'd support it at a higher level than shown in any of the Options.</p> <p>Cycle routes should also be better joined up to create safer cycling. The question of bridges and river crossings in Chesterton should be addressed as part of this plan.</p> <p>There's too much student housing in Cambridge. I would not support further student housing here.</p>	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
14	<p>I would like to see the Waste Water Treatment Centre moved away or significantly modernised to stop any odour- nuisance to neighbours. The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road. I approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable. Option 3 is a stepping-stone to this option and could be an interim solution. Further housing could be added later.</p>	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
14	<p>Whichever option 1-4 is chosen, priority should be given to improving the smelliest parts of the Wastewater Treatment Plant's operation, which now seems to be the open storm tanks that smelly water goes into when it rains hard after a long dry spell. This type of weather will become more common, and there seems to be no justification for having these tanks open to the air. They should be covered and the air extracted should be scrubbed so that the smell is removed.</p>	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
14	<p>The new Household Waste Recycling Centre here is misguided: people will bring bulky waste by car anyway, and the current site at Butt Lane is much more suitable.</p>	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
14	<p>We consider that other options should be identified which include plot identification for the St John's Innovation Park and the relocation of the new Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility on a location on the southern periphery of the Anglian Water landholding or at least to an alternative location further away from the existing employment area at the Innovation Park.</p>	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
14	<p>I believe that there should be no housing development. The area should be kept for business / commercial uses (in addition to new station).</p> <p>I am neutral regarding inclusion of Science Park in the consultation area.</p> <p>The opportunity should be taken to allow for a new road from Fen Road to Milton Road. Expensive to build a bridge! But crazy in long term to direct commercial traffic from Fen Road through Chesterton to access A14 / A10.</p>	Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
14	Any development of residential accommodation on this site beyond that in options 1 to 3 would be inappropriate in view of: a) the odour problems; and b) the undesirability of making the population of Cambridge even bigger than it already is.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
14	Much more residential required as we will possibly have an over supply once CB1 is finished, and I cannot imagine there will be enough potential tenants to fill all of those buildings. New orbital bus route for Cambridge. All reliant on link roads to Fen Ditton and Wadloes Road.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
14	Please see the attached map for the common sense initial redevelopment. I propose having office buildings along the new access road to block smell from the residential buildings, along with significant planting. Fen Meadows should be created to the south of the railway lines, creating 4000+ houses and a new secondary school, at the expense of 100 Traveller families, who will need to be relocated.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
14	The mix looks optimal	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
14	I prefer option 3 as I think the area will benefit more from strategic long term transformation. Option 4 seems unlikely to occur, so focus effort on achievable solution. Most important thing is sufficient parking and traffic measures to access train station by car.	Mr Leon Bovett [5612]	
14	Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through the middle of my property. With the planned expansion of public transport as part of the City Deal, how do you propose we achieve this without a bus depot? If we are to be relocated who pays for the building for the new bus depot?	Stagecoach (Andy Campbell) [5623]	
14	The redevelopment of the AAP site should not consider the relocation or reuse of any of the Waste Water Recycling Centre as this is undeliverable due to remediation and relocation costs, land ownership, service demands and the level of committed investment by the operator. The AAP site should focus on a more appropriate mix of uses which reflect the constraints and market potential and can be genuinely delivered against a background of substantial infrastructure requirement and uncertainty.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
14	These have been considered in the response to questions 10 to 13 above.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
14	<p>I strongly recommend a slip road off the A14 in to any new development.</p> <p>Here are my comments regarding the Cambridge Northern Fringe development, after visiting the Milton Community Centre exhibition on the 19th January. A major concern to Milton residents would be the extra traffic generated through the village and also at the roundabout. Particularly if, in the future, the Cambridge Rowing lake and Waterbeach housing developments proceed. Extra roads to alleviate traffic congestion into and around Milton are essential, in my view.</p> <p>See attached a possible idea/solution that could be constructed to help the above developments.</p> <p>Basically a slip road off the A14 directly into the new North Fringe development running parallel to the railway line. Traffic from Huntingdon would come off at Horningsea and re-join the A14 to then use the slip road into the Station area. Newmarket traffic would just come off the A14.</p> <p>If the Cambridge Rowing lakes go ahead then maybe a slip road into that as well. An alternative would be to construct a new roundabout to feed both the Northern Fringe and also the Rowing lakes.</p>	Mr Robert Cox [5641]	
14	<p>The Campaign questions the apparent mutual exclusivity between residential and employment uses within the redevelopment options. We feel it advisable to plan for a balance between these two uses as this balance will reduce the need for travel at the development. Reducing the trips needed reduces private car use and provides increased opportunities for walking and cycling. A balance in the development's uses will also reduce the tidal nature of the trips that are generated, lessening the impact on the transport network.</p>	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
14	<p>Undertaking low and medium development can be done immediately without the need to wait for AW to relocate (something which is not viable). There is an immediate demand for BI(c), B2, B8 space within the city and without this site being developed immediately these occupiers will be forced to leave the city. Moving occupiers from Clifton Road, The Paddocks etc will also free up Brownfields sites for residential within the city. Cowley Road is the only site for them within Cambridge.</p>	Bidwells (Mr Patrick Stanton) [5646]	
14	<p>I support Options 1 and 2 because they leave open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site).</p> <p>None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.</p> <p>This is a great opportunity for providing the City or Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.</p>	Mr Gustavo Milstein [5647]	
14	<p>More affordable residential housing with green spaces, shops, banks, post office etc</p>	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cambs United Football Ground - New road along side A14 to access site from the north. - P&R like shuttle bus from Milton P&R. - Left turn lanes on A14 / A10 roundabout bypassing roundabout. 	Ian Tyes [5652]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
14	Brookgate propose Option 2a, an enhanced medium level of redevelopment. Option 2a would facilitate a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased Offices/RD provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. Option 2a facilitates the more efficient use of the land, with a balanced mix of land uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable. The submitted plan provides further detail.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
14	First, the development potential of land at the St John's Innovation Park should be recognised in terms of increasing employment floorspace consistent with the Plan's objectives to maximise employment opportunities. Secondly, the household waste recycling centre and inert recycling facility should be relocated either on the southern periphery of the Anglian Water landholding or at least to a location further away from the existing employment area at the St John's Innovation Park. The current options as drafted are inconsistent with the activities carried on at the St John's Innovation Park and with its standing in the business and research communities.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
14	An alternative way of presenting the proposals would be to view the water recycling centre and aggregate works as landscapes which could be re-claimed as open spaces when it does become feasible for them to down size or move - developing the rest of the site to allow for this. The proposals do not extend far enough from the boundary of the site, or appear to aspire high enough. This lack of creative vision could result in an area not - lacking in identity and dominated by vehicular traffic - which would be a missed opportunity.	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
14	You should consider the impact on the one lane road in to Cambridge from Milton Roundabout to Cambridge. The A10 Corridor, as your people call it, can't be widened and with the prospect of housing at Waterbeach Barracks, even more traffic will travel along the corridor to Milton, to get to the A14 / M11. So building along Cowley Road and on the water treatment area will only add to a really congested A10 in to Cambridge. Just have the station and nothing else.	B Fuller [5685]	
14	No further residential development is supported - this should be an area mainly comprising commercial/scientific development.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
14	Any adopted policy for the Cambridge Northern Fringe East area must acknowledge the presence and importance of the Stagecoach Bus Depot and any polices for this area must allow for its retention or must be contingent upon the identification of a suitable and deliverable relocation site. Without such provision, this would seriously impact on the ability of Stagecoach to operate a bus service serving Cambridge and surrounding rural areas which would have major implications for the delivery of a sustainable transport strategy in Cambridge and surrounding rural areas.	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]	Stagecoach (Mr Tim Miles) [5695]
14	Yes. Promotion of sustainable urban living that fully realises the potential of planned infrastructure investment demands a re-appraisal of the balance of uses between employment and residential. More residential development should be incorporated. There is potential for greater mixing of land uses at higher densities to optimise development potential and create a more vibrant community with greater levels of activity throughout the day and evening. This approach has greater potential to deliver the vision of a vibrant and successful mixed use neighbourhood as envisaged.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
14	<p>Whichever option 1-4 is chosen, priority should be given to improving the smelliest parts of the Wastewater Treatment Plant's operation, which now seems to be the open storm tanks that smelly water goes into when it rains hard after a long dry spell. This type of weather will become more common, and there seems to be no justification for having these tanks open to the air. They should be covered and the air extracted should be scrubbed so that the smell is removed.</p>	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
14	<p>Overall, TCE supports the high level options for redevelopment of the site (options 2-4) only if the detailed evidence base work/studies demonstrate that these development options will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors. These concerns are set out as follows.</p> <p>Mix of uses: A mix of uses is proposed for the site including residential uses, a mix of B class/employment uses, new open space, a local centre and the aggregates/railhead sidings use. TCE broadly supports this approach subject to concerns about access and infrastructure, but would like to see inclusion of wording to the effect that the primary function of this area is to be the leading R&D/technology quarter/destination in Cambridge. Any activity to dilute this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area would be a loss/step backwards, given its regional/national status. Whilst it is appropriate to have supporting and complementary uses, larger-scale developments should not be permitted.</p> <p>TCE supports the identification of CBP as offices/R&D with potential for intensification.</p> <p>Linkages: TCE broadly supports the principle of promoting sustainable transport and movement through the idea of improving permeability and access to key routes, although TCE object to public access and new walkways being provided through CBP as shown within development options 2-4. For security and health and safety reasons, the general public cannot have access to and through CBP.</p> <p>However, TCE would like to see improved pedestrian and cycle access between the new railway station and the CBP, for both the occupiers and their customers/visitors. This should be identified and supported in the AAP. Potential options for improving access from CBP to the Station have been previously worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information.</p> <p>Landscaping: TCE also supports the inclusion of hard and soft landscaping with the AAP area. However, it should be noted that a comprehensive landscaping scheme within CBP has been implemented and this is a matter for TCE. It is worth mentioning that TCE are implementing a Sustainability Action Plan at CBP which includes improving the landscaping/green corridors, promoting biodiversity areas, promoting green travel and other such initiatives. TCE also broadly support the aspiration for a 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road, which would tie in well with the aforementioned initiatives.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
14	<p>Please look at the car park development. this will be a priority. It should not be 600 capacity (as it is proposed), but 6,000 car park. Otherwise residents of the surrounding area will be effected.</p>	Doug Whyte [5711]	
14	<p>I find all proposed options to be too restricted with the use of space. A mix of residential use, offices and industry would be preferable to give it a more natural feel. For example, leave the Nuffield Road industrial area and more residential use development further north. Also consider a more modular approach that allows to develop toward a future goal, but doesn't depend on things (like moving the water recycling centre) from the get go.</p>	Silke Scheler [5712]	
14	<p>14) 11-13 are too divided in to use of space, a more natural mix of residential, offices and industrial would be better. Also, re-use as much of what is already there as possible.</p>	Silke Scheler [5712]	
14	<p>The usual mess, more houses, more cars blocking an already problem area for cars on to the A14 or in to Cambridge.</p>	R Richardson [5714]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
14	Slightly concerned about "intensive" use of land (option 3 & 4).	Dominic Reber [5716]	
Q15. Do you support or object to the proposed approach for place and building design, and why?			
15	Turnstone is content that the general approach, whereby what will in due course be adopted Local Plan design policies, will be used for the AAP area, is both sound and logical.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
15	Consideration needs to be given to the type of use and the context of the site when setting out the requirements for place and building design, this will be particularly important for waste uses that could be adjacent to the A14 where existing screening and the surrounding uses should be taken into account.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
15	I agree that around major transport interchanges, density should be the highest. In my first diagram, heights are typically 8 to 12 storeys, with a couple of feature buildings, in the styles of another attachment. In the second, if full redevelopment goes ahead after relocation of the sewage works, we could go to 25+ storeys, if someone is prepared to build it.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
15	Think of the project as a mini smart city with therefore a high occupancy density.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
15	In principle	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
15	It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types of use and the quantum of each use that would be required to make the site deliverable/viable. It is accepted that the Draft Local Plan policies should form the baseline for the development of AAP specific policies.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
15	High density development requires sufficient open space for people to be able to be able to relax, get outside and exercise as they do not necessarily have their own personal space to undertake such activity. Good quality design in this respect is very important to cater for a range of uses. Careful design to ensure that the tall buildings set close to the road do not create a corridor of brick and concrete without sufficient landscaping or open space to break this up.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
15	In principle	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
15	Too much unknown detail to comment at this stage but it should be high quality design with similar objectives to the University's North West Cambridge site.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
15	Brookgate strongly support the aspiration to create a place with real character and quality and support the principle of a basic urban design strategy which sets out key design parameters such as access, scale and distribution of uses. Brookgate are however concerned that developing and agreeing a detailed design strategy for all the CNFE sites with all stakeholders is not deliverable due to the diverse landholdings. Brookgate therefore suggest a design led approach which defines the detailed urban design parameters on the CB4 site which can then inform the future phases of the CNFE area	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
15	A bespoke approach is required here to respond to the significance of the opportunity, the magnitude of investment and the particular constraints. This can be guided by the Cambridge Local Plan Proposed Submission.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
15	No clear explanations, which means meaning will be defined later.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q16. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on densities, and why?			
16	No, whilst Turnstone consider that there is plainly scope for higher density development on the CNFE site, for reasons that are stated, it objects to the assertion that this is "especially around the proposed new railway station interchange". There is simply no logic to this assertion and the 'arrival' at this new station is wholly unlike the arrival one would expect or anticipate having at the Central Cambridge train station where the CB1 development is emerging.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
16	Support from an economic development perspective	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
16	We support an approach which provides a design led approach reflecting the different land uses and viabilities within the CNFE.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
16	This is too vague and waffly, and gives too much scope for developers to profit by building excessively dense buildings. I would prefer something along the lines of "Densities should mirror those in other existing parts of Cambridge excluding e.g. the high density development around Woodhead Drive, and the ridiculous tall building at the junction of Hills Rd and Cherry Hinton Rd."	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
16	Please review attachments for my theories on densities.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
16	Exploit the foot print capabilities through height.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
16	I support the higher density needed to enable more houses and employment opportunities. However, I am concerned about the impact on traffic.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
16	It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types of use and the quantum of each use that would be required to make the site deliverable / viable. It is accepted that the Draft Local Plan policies should form the baseline for the development of AAP specific policies.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
16	Support. It is important to optimise density in City like Cambridge given the pressures on land and desire to reduce travel. This is not a City centre location though and so although density should be high, it should reflect the surrounding edge of city location, allowing for things such as open space and cycle/pedestrian routes to reflect contemporary provision in these respects.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
16	Current developments around Cambridge Station are too dense and high to be implemented in this area.	Nicky Morland [5636]	
16	Against tall buildings so against multi-storey	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
16	Seems OK.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
16	I object to the proposal because it uses such ridiculous language and defines nothing. I quote, "The overall densities to be provided following a design-led approach reflecting the sustainable location and especially around the proposed new railway station interchange. The required density for employment and residential uses on a given site will need to have regard to its wider context, demand and supply consideration, viability and other policies of this plan. Does this mean - We'll think about what is needed and appropriate, and build accordingly?	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
16	Brookgate support the proposed design-led approach on densities.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
16	The Plan proposes a design-led approach consistent with location, different land uses, viability and other policies. We support the Councils' approach, which does not seek to impose general densities across sites with numerous disparate factors affecting density, which should be left to the design stage. At the Science Park, the application of percentage coverage figures and densities has been rejected recently in favour of a more sensible design-led approach, which looks critically at the site and its surroundings rather than applying a general density across a large site.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
16	Design led approach supported.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
16	We support the high density approach to respond to the transportation investment. A bespoke approach is required to respond to the particular conditions, within and adjoining the site.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
16	TCE supports the approach on densities subject to consideration of access and impact on existing uses and the existing townscape.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
16	No clear explanations, which means meaning will be defined later.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q17. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on tall buildings and skyline, and why?			
17	Yes, following the approach that will be taken in the Local Plan is sound and logical.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
17	Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping. Support from an economic development perspective	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
17	English Heritage has raised objections the Tall Buildings and Skyline Policy in the local plan and will be seeking amendments to it through the current examination in public (see out letter of 30 Sept 2013). While it might be logical for the issue of tall buildings and skyline to be dealt with in accordance with the eventual policy that emerges from the examination in public, English Heritage believes it is premature to agree at this stage to dealing with this matter in accordance with policy as set out in the Submission version of the Local Plan.	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]
17	It is the context of the buildings and the surrounding areas that should be the key criteria of assessing the acceptability of building heights within the CNFE. A list of criteria would be appropriate to provide the policy context for development proposals coming forward.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
17	The referenced documents aim to protect the existing skyline, which is a good thing.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
17	Please see attached documents for proposed building heights.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
17	Let's be innovative and not constrained by policy.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
17	I would prefer no buildings to be built higher than 6 storeys. I would consider buildings higher than 6 storeys in this area to be excessive.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
17	I would consider buildings higher than 6 storeys in this area to be excessive.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
17	It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types of use and the quantum of each use that would be required to make the site deliverable / viable. It is accepted that the Draft Local Plan policies should form the baseline for the development of AAP specific policies	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
17	Support	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
17	No higher than 6 storeys	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
17	Option C. Cambridge has a strange aversion to tall buildings which can make much more efficient use of land and add a dramatic and eye catching aspect to a development. With the fens to the north tall buildings will not affect the view of Cambridge and will add a feature to the skyline.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
17	Brookgate are in support of the principle that the CB4 site and all CNFE future phases should be based on a landscape and visual assessment and have regard of the Tall Buildings and Skyline Policy.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
17	Developments within CNFE AP area will need to be in accordance with Policy 60 and Appendix F of the Adopted Local Plan, which is currently at Examination stage. Within the CNFE Plan area, we consider it appropriate for the Local Plan criteria to apply; applicants should be expected to provide a clear justification for tall buildings within any submitted Design and Access Statement. If the Councils acknowledge the potential of plot densification on and around the St John's Innovation Park (for which we argue throughout this submission) the acceptability of building heights in the area should be assessed in the context of existing structures and the nature and use of surrounding areas.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
17	We support the addition of tall buildings (over six storeys) on this site.	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
17	Consideration of building heights should be part of a site specific masterplanning exercise and should take account of all the relevant considerations.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
17	Bespoke approach to the area needs to be established within the AAP. We support higher density development in this location, responding to transport investment.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
17	TCE supports the approach to tall buildings, in accordance with adopted Local Plan policies. TCE further supports the inclusion of additional policies relating to tall buildings in this location. However, this is on the basis that the policy wording is to the effect that the existing building form is taken into consideration.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
17	No clear explanations, which means meaning will be defined later.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q18a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on building heights, and why?			
18a	This option will not maximise the development potential of the site nor allow for the creation of a sustainable and successful urban community.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
18a	Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping. Support an approach which continues the scale and form of development of the Cambridge Business Park perhaps allowing the opportunity to create a single taller landmark building around the new station (subject to the above).	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
18a	Unfortunately there is no evidence base included with the document to explain the impact that the varying heights of buildings might have on designated heritage assets to the south west, south and east of this site. It is therefore difficult to objectively comment on the potential impact of 16 metre, 24 metre or taller buildings. However, it is likely that new buildings of similar heights to those on the existing Cambridge Business Park would not adversely impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets.	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]
18a	It's necessary to restrict the height of buildings in order not to damage the general feel of the area. I definitely don't want it turning into somewhere with a "large city" feel.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
18a	4 storeys is a waste of land. There are no views to protect, so therefore building heights should be unrestricted and developers should be allowed to build as tall as possible, as long as it is good design, rigorously enforced.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
18a	It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types of use and the quantum of each use that would be required to make the site deliverable / viable. It is accepted that the Draft Local Plan policies should form the baseline for the development of AAP specific policies.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
18a	Ideally buildings at this level though probably will not be economic for developers	Nicky Morland [5636]	
18a	CB1 consists of very tall buildings which have a dwarfing effect on the 'Historic Centre' of Cambridge effectively making it into a ghetto. Developments of this kind at other points on the margins would emphasise this effect. What we really need are buildings for human beings which make them feel part of a community rather than constantly threatened by over-powering edifices. As for tall 'land-mark buildings', there are quite enough of these in other parts of the city (the Mark, Botanic House, Fire Station) - why not give us something which encourages a sense of well-being and belonging: human sized?	ZoÃ« Conway Morris [5638]	
18a	I live in the area and do not wish to see Cambridge further destroyed by terrible planning decisions.	ZoÃ« Conway Morris [5638]	
18a	Cambridge has a strange aversion to tall buildings which can make much more efficient use of land and add a dramatic and eye catching aspect to a development. With the fens to the north tall buildings will not affect the view of Cambridge and will add a feature to the skyline.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
18a	Any buildings should reflect the principles described in The Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission which recognise that outside the centre, buildings in Cambridge are mainly 2-3 residential storeys high. I would not wish the CNFE area to become a windswept wasteland of tall buildings with unattractive, shadowed, urban space between them.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
18a	Building heights in Option A (heights up to 16m) may be acceptable, but Options B (heights up to 24m) and C (including "significantly taller forms of development") in particular have potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations. In order to ensure that any development principles established through the AAP are deliverable and compatible with the safe operation of the airport, Marshall Group requests that the joint Councils (or any prospective developer) engages early with the Airport to ensure any building heights proposed are compatible with airport operations, including the operation of cranes throughout the development.	Marshall Group of Companies (Mr Richard Oakley) [5663]	
18a	Brookgate object to Option A as the proposed limitation to four commercial floors prevents a development with higher densities which takes advantage of the sustainable location. The proposed limitation also prevents the creation of landmark buildings which help articulate the overall appearance, define nodes and aid legibility and orientation	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
18a	Consideration of building heights should be part of a site specific masterplanning exercise and should take account of all the relevant considerations.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
18a	Matching the site with the surroundings is key to protect the landscape and to preserve the friendly feel of the area.	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
18a	Does not maximise opportunity	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
18a	Milton Parish Council objects to the proposal to build up to 4 commercial storeys*(16m) because the guidance on tall buildings recognises that outside the city centre almost all of the buildings are mainly two storey and sometimes three storeys high.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
18a	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q18b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on building heights, and why?			
18b	This option will not maximise the development potential of the site nor allow for the creation of a sustainable and successful urban community.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
18b	Any proposals will need to take into account the restrictions placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport, which includes height of buildings. In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
18b	Unfortunately there is no evidence base included with the document to explain the impact that the varying heights of buildings might have on designated heritage assets to the south west, south and east of this site. The new station is located in the southeast corner of the site and tall buildings in the vicinity of this station would have an increased potential to adversely impact on the character and appearance of the Cambridge central conservation area to the south and the Fen Ditton conservation area to the east and the setting of listed buildings within both conservation areas.	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]
18b	Mixed use development of up to six commercial storeys would allow employment objectives of maximising opportunity to be addressed and create more flexibility within the overall masterplanning of CNFE.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
18b	Allowing six-storey buildings would damage the feel of the area.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
18b	6 storeys is a waste of land. There are no views to protect, so therefore building heights should be unrestricted and developers should be allowed to build as tall as possible, as long as it is good design, rigorously enforced.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
18b	This would be less intrusive than option C	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
18b	It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types of use and the quantum of each use that would be required to make the site deliverable / viable. It is accepted that the Draft Local Plan policies should form the baseline for the development of AAP specific policies	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
18b	Option B or Option C would be acceptable and would optimise density across the site.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
18b	May be the balance between the impact (including traffic, community etc) with developer needs (pay back)	Nicky Morland [5636]	
18b	Cambridge has a strange aversion to tall buildings which can make much more efficient use of land and add a dramatic and eye catching aspect to a development. With the fens to the north tall buildings will not affect the view of Cambridge and will add a feature to the skyline.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
18b	Building heights in Option A (heights up to 16m) may be acceptable, but Options B (heights up to 24m) and C (including "significantly taller forms of development") in particular have potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations. In order to ensure that any development principles established through the AAP are deliverable and compatible with the safe operation of the airport, Marshall Group requests that the joint Councils (or any prospective developer) engages early with the Airport to ensure any building heights proposed are compatible with airport operations, including the operation of cranes throughout the development.	Marshall Group of Companies (Mr Richard Oakley) [5663]	
18b	Brookgate support this approach as it permits a development of higher densities appropriate for this highly sustainable location and permits the articulation of nodal points, vistas and landmark buildings to aid legibility and orientation.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
18b	<p>18.1 Option B suggests that mixed use development of up to six commercial storeys (24 metres) would allow development to be intensified and create more flexibility in the overall CNFE master plan, with new landmark buildings around the new station and other key "nodal" points.</p> <p>18.2 We consider that this option provides the opportunity to make best use of limited resources within existing employment areas of the CNFE. Maximum building height need not invariably be restricted to six commercial storeys on every employment site identified in the CNFE, and it is important that the Planning Authorities acknowledge that flexibility will be required in order to maximise employment opportunities - an important objective for the Plan area. One key test in the emerging Local Plan is an acknowledgement of site surroundings: Cambridge should exploit the limited resources of remaining development land to secure jobs and investment for a rapidly expanding population.</p>	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
18b	Consideration of building heights should be part of a site specific masterplanning exercise and should take account of all the relevant considerations.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
18b	Rather objecting. A 6-storey building or two of exceptional architecture composed well with the surroundings might be acceptable. Any number of large dull boxes or bricks sticking out here would be a scar in the green landscape and break the character of the city.	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
18b	Does not maximise opportunity	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
18b	Would destroy the feeling of that part of the city.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q18c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on building heights, and why?			
18c	This option will enable denser and taller development of high quality to create a modern vibrant imaginative city quarter. This would also contribute to the financial viability of Development Options 3 and 4. Equally, it will enhance the environmental quality of the area and surrounding existing neighbourhoods (especially Milton and Milton Country Park). Higher viability and critical mass are essential to achieve excellent master planning of the site and community benefits through development levies applied.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
18c	Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
18c	Unfortunately there is no evidence base included with the document to explain the impact that the varying heights of buildings might have on designated heritage assets to the south west, south and east of this site. Without a robust evidence base that clearly demonstrates the impact of buildings of varying heights, English Heritage could not support dealing with bulding heights and skyline in the manner set out in Option C.	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]
18c	Removing restrictions on building heights would create a free-for-all for developers interested only in their own financial gain, and hence result in the destruction of the character of the area currently typified by the Science Park.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
18c	As high as possible in this extremely well-connected area. If there is anywhere in the UK to build high, it is here.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
18c	Be innovative.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
18c	Presumably this would allow very tall buildings to be built which I do not favour.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
18c	It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types of use and the quantum of each use that would be required to make the site deliverable / viable. It is accepted that the Draft Local Plan policies should form the baseline for the development of AAP specific policies	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
18c	Option B or Option C would be acceptable and would optimise density across the site.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
18c	Agree with previous comment Removing restrictions on building heights would create a free-for-all for developers interested only in their own financial gain, and hence result in the destruction of the character of the area currently typified by the Science Park.	Nicky Morland [5636]	
18c	Round the station taller buildings will reduce sunlight for buildings further south and west	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
18c	Option C. Cambridge has a strange aversion to tall buildings which can make much more efficient use of land and add a dramatic and eye catching aspect to a development. With the fens to the north tall buildings will not affect the view of Cambridge and will add a feature to the skyline.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
18c	Option C.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
18c	Building heights in Option A (heights up to 16m) may be acceptable, but Options B (heights up to 24m) and C (including "significantly taller forms of development") in particular have potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations. In order to ensure that any development principles established through the AAP are deliverable and compatible with the safe operation of the airport, Marshall Group requests that the joint Councils (or any prospective developer) engages early with the Airport to ensure any building heights proposed are compatible with airport operations, including the operation of cranes throughout the development.	Marshall Group of Companies (Mr Richard Oakley) [5663]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
18c	Brookgate support this option. The highly sustainable location, relative distance to the historic core of the City and proximity to the A14 provides an opportunity to investigate higher densities and heights which in other locations in Cambridge would not support.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
18c	Although Cambridge has historically not been developed upwards it will be important to maximise the commercial value of this development and there is no immediate historic skyline that we feel must be protected.	Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust (Mr Mick Woolhouse) [5684]	
18c	Consideration of building heights should be part of a site specific masterplanning exercise and should take account of all the relevant considerations.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
18c	Strongly objecting. Cambridgeshire is not an industrial area and Cambridge is not urbanised enough to justify tall buildings. Allowing them here or indeed anywhere around would spoil the landscape and break the friendly, humane character of the city and its surroundings.	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
18c	Potential to maximise opportunity and make best use of location.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q18d. Do you have other comments on building heights?			
18d	This option will enable denser and taller development of high quality to create a modern vibrant imaginative city quarter. This would also contribute to the financial viability of Development Options 3 and 4. Equally, it will enhance the environmental quality of the area and surrounding existing neighbourhoods (especially Milton and Milton Country Park). Higher viability and critical mass are essential to achieve excellent master planning of the site and community benefits through development levies applied.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
18d	Turnstone takes the view that there is scope for different development densities and heights on different parts of the CNFE site. However, Turnstone take issue with the suggestion, repeated here in the AAP document, that there is scope for "occasional taller 'landmark' buildings around the new station" i.e. in excess of 6 storeys. Whilst it is considered that there may indeed be scope for taller 'landmark' buildings, the logic of placing any such buildings in a peripheral part of the wider CNFE site is not readily followed or agreed with.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
18d	Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
18d	Question 18 is concerned with building heights within the area to be covered by the AAP and is divided into 3 parts. Unfortunately there is no evidence base included with the document to explain the impact that the varying heights of buildings might have on designated heritage assets to the south west, south and east of this site. It is therefore difficult to objectively comment on the potential impact of 16 metre, 24 metre or taller buildings. However, it is likely that new buildings of similar heights to those on the existing Cambridge Business Park would not adversely impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets. But the new station is located in the southeast corner of the site and tall buildings in the vicinity of this station would have an increased potential to adversely impact on the character and appearance of the Cambridge central conservation area (and in particular the eastward arm that extends along the river corridor to the south of this site), the Fen Ditton conservation area to the east and the setting of listed buildings within both conservation areas. Without a robust evidence base English Heritage could not support either Option B or C that would permit a more flexible approach to the issue of building heights within the AAP.	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]	Historic England (David Grech) [1787]
18d	As high as possible in this extremely well-connected area. If there is anywhere in the UK to build high, it is here.	Ben Cofield [5605]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
18d	Proposed site is encompassed by the statutory safeguarding aerodrome height consultation plan. The main concern of the MOD is to ensure tall structures do not disrupt or inhibit air traffic operations on site. On reviewing the proposed Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan, the proposed area falls within the 15.2m height consultation zone. This means no development should exceed 15.2m.	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MRS LOUISE DALE) [5616]	
18d	No	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
18d	No.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
18d	These comments are provided on behalf of Marshall Group, which includes Cambridge International Airport. We understand that the area defined as Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) is located between the A14 to the North, the A10 Milton Road to the West, the Cambridge to Kings Lynn railway line to the east, and residential areas of Chesterton to the south. We also note that the consultation document seeks views on the potential to extend the boundary to include the Cambridge Science Park.	Marshall Group of Companies (Mr Richard Oakley) [5663]	
18d	CNFE is bounded by the railway line (east), the A14 (north), Milton Road (west) and Chesterton (south). The City Centre is 3.5km from the site. This physical context presents opportunities to investigate heights and densities which might not be supported in other Cambridge locations: taller buildings wouldn't impact on existing residential properties with regard to sunlight/daylight but could release significant development pressure from the historic city core and create an opportunity to define the NE corner of Cambridge with striking buildings visible from the A14. The AAP requires some form of masterplan in whole/part and this should inform building heights.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
18d	Consideration of building heights should be part of a site specific masterplanning exercise and should take account of all the relevant considerations.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
18d	We would advocate flexibility in this regard that aligns with the promotion of quality design and placemaking promoted in the AAP.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
18d	TCE supports the approach to tall buildings, in accordance with adopted Local Plan policies. TCE further supports the inclusion of additional policies relating to tall buildings in this location. However, this is on the basis that the policy wording is to the effect that the existing building form is taken into consideration.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q19. Do you support or object to the proposed approach and measures to integrate the area with the surrounding communities, and why?			
19	It is self-evident that this should be implemented from the design stage onwards.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
19	Yes, in principle, the approach is supported but it should be made clear that the "wider communities" are not limited simply to those which adjoin the CNFE area, or even be limited to North Cambridge or Cambridge alone. Rather it should be an objective to make this unique site accessible to people who might arrive by road or rail or by public transport and who might come from some distance.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
19	<p>When looking to integrate the area with surrounding communities, the integration of existing uses should also be considered, which includes minerals and waste uses.</p> <p>Add/amend text to bullets as below Access to appropriate support to ensure the development of cohesive community Informal and formal social spaces that support the needs of workers and residents.</p> <p>The proposals on integration with the wider community are supported in order to build a successful, healthy and vibrant community.</p>	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
19	This policy is appropriate in the context.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
19	I think there should be as many entrances as possible, including 2 new ones to the Business Park, a pedestrianised boulevard on the existing Cowley Road and links to a whole new area south of the railway line. See attached diagram. Fen Road should have improved access too, ideally as part of Fen Meadows, not a Traveller compound.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
19	Let's not create an island.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
19	This is especially important with regards to transport links. The surrounding areas should not be negatively effected by an increase in vehicular traffic. The linking between the new and existing infrastructure must be well thought out, with a particular focus on encouraging people to access the new site by sustainable modes of transport (by bike, bus or on foot) that are/ should be already in place by the time work begins on the new site.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
19	Only way to go	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
19	The surrounding community, which this iteration of the AAP has labelled as some of the most disadvantaged in the City, would be best integrated with the site by an increase in lower skilled employment and apprenticeship opportunities.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
19	Support.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
19	Says it all it should not be designed in isolation of the surrounding area and communities. For example, there is a need to balance the desire to integrate the new development with the wider city with the need to minimise any negative impacts on existing residents or occupiers.	Nicky Morland [5636]	
19	This redevolpment needs to tie into the existing community, unlike Arbury Park.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
19	Transport connection into the wider area is especially important. Active and public travel must be the focus in new developments to avoid increasing issues on the road network. Walking and cycling connections into the wider area must be of the highest quality. Avoid shared-used at all costs. Protected and efficient crossings for bike and foot must be provided at all the off-site junctions.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
19	<p>The Campaign supports the proposed approach and measures to integrate the area with the surrounding communities. For the Campaign, transport connections into the wider area are especially important. Active and public travel must be the focus in new developments to avoid increasing private motor traffic on the nearby road network. Walking and cycling connections into the wider area must be of the highest quality. The Campaign will not support shared-use facilities as these fail all people. Protected, direct and efficient crossings for bike and foot must be provided at all the off-site junctions.</p> <p>Transport connection into the wider area is especially important. Active and public travel must be the focus in new developments to avoid increasing issues on the road network. Walking and cycling connections into the wider area must be of the highest quality. Avoid shared-used at all costs. Protected and efficient crossings for bike and foot must be provided at all the off-site junctions.</p>	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
19	Yes	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
19	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
19	Brookgate fully supports the proposed approach. The site has the potential to become a distinct quarter in its own right but the physical linkages and thresholds need careful integration with the existing urban fabric. Benefits which can be delivered through the development of this site such as access to public transport, new amenity space, retail and local services and facilities should be available for the wider community.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
19	<p>One of the key objectives of the proposals should be to break down the bounded nature of the site. It would have been useful to illustrate in more detail, and give more importance to, any options that have been explored for the following - in terms of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle routes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improvements to the section of Milton Road adjacent to the area - improvements to, or new, connections into Milton from the site - connections over the railway - connections over the river - connections over the guided busway extension and cycle path to the South <p>If these have been explored and dismissed, then we should know why.</p>	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	
19	The proposed approach to integration with surrounding communities is supported but could be improved. It is fundamental to achieving a comprehensive scheme that the site is considered with regards to the wider context and the opportunities for enhancing the wider area, for example through sustainable connections between homes and jobs. This should be extended to include reference to connecting CNFE to planned new communities, most significantly given its scale and proximity to CNFE, Waterbeach New Town.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
19	Proposals must take account of existing development and not dominate it - must be appropriate in scale and use to ensure all benefit from new amenities.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
19	Support but this needs enhancement to more effectively integrate the area with surrounding communities and respond to existing needs that will aid integration.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
19	Integration with the surrounding area is important to delivering a successful new quarter for Cambridge. However, as set out above, this is subject to an acknowledgement that a number of sites within the AAP area contain commercial premises which cannot be accessible to the general public.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
19	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q20. Do you support or object to the proposed approach for employment uses, and why?			
20	CambridgePPF would like to see a mixed development with employment and substantial residential provisions.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
20	Generally Turnstone can support the proposed approach but consider that it should be acknowledged that employment uses at CNFE can include pure offices as well as hybrid buildings, and buildings aimed at particular sectors and technologies. Flexibility will be a key consideration and it will be important to ensure that CNFE can respond to developments in the market place and in the economy in an appropriate way.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
20	Support the intention to provide a range of unit types and sizes, hybrid buildings and laboratory space The potential of the CNFE to support the cluster of high technology and R&D development is noted. However, it is also one of the very few locations in the Cambridge area which accommodates B2, B8 and sui generis uses which support and provide essential infrastructure for the Cambridge area. This role is reflected in the Options and should not be diminished. There needs to be greater reference to middle level jobs not just a focus on high skill jobs as it currently reads.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
20	The specialist sectors which are indicated in terms of creation of new employment clusters in the CNFE are supported together with an approach which should look to the area delivering a flexible range of unit types and sizes including start ups and small and medium size enterprises (SMEs). Encouraging the variety of employment space together with the need for new office floorspace including commercial laboratory space are all component parts of delivering new employment on new areas of land as well as consolidating existing employment areas at the Cambridge Business Park and St John's Innovation Park.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
20	Fulfils the need to integrate with the wider area.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
20	If my first diagram is used, then employment should be office lead, however if diagram two is used in the event of relocation of the sewage works, then there could be a few changes to have manufacturing as required. The location for employment uses is about as good as it can be, from a transport perspective, and should therefore be encouraged, however not at the expense of residential development.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
20	Let's go for what we are good at.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
20	There should not be heavy industry in this area.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
20	Paragraph 9.15 highlights the precise issues with development of AAP site to meet current/future demands of R&D market. Paragraph 9.15 advises that due to issues associated with availability of specific sites and demand for space at that time some of the development could take place beyond 2031. We would contend that at current take up rates Cambridge will run out of suitable, available and deliverable R&D floorspace within next five years. The employment uses listed include office and R&D but is unclear if market research has been undertaken to support sectors listed.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
20	Agree with the policy approach proposed.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
20	Best options and coherent	Nicky Morland [5636]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
20	Support: Yes Comment: No heavy industry	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
20	Yes	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
20	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
20	A combination of commercial and residential uses which are likely to include offices and R & D uses should be provided in the CNFE area, with the mix being informed by both market conditions and successful place-making.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
20	We support the emphasis on specialist sectors indicated as the basis for the creation of new employment clusters in the CNFE. We also support an approach which sees the area delivering a flexible range of unit types and sizes, including facilities suitable for start ups and small and medium size enterprises, and commercial laboratory space. Variety of employment space will be critical in delivering new employment on new areas of land as well as consolidating existing employment areas at the Cambridge Business Park and St John's Innovation Park.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
20	The proposed approach is supported and there is a good opportunity to develop sustainable linkages between new homes and new jobs through strengthened connections between Waterbeach New Town and the employment opportunities at CNFE.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
20	Provides range of options reflecting Cambridge economy.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
20	Too much emphasis on employment uses and in particular B2 and B8 uses in Options 3 and 4.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
20	TCE are pleased to see inclusion of specific policies relating to employment uses. TCE support the principle of encouraging R&D and high tech uses and tenants.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
20	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q21. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on shared social space, and why?			
21	Turnstone supports the approach taken on this issue.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
21	Support but the viability of such leisure/social facilities may depend on which option/mix of options is selected and the pace of re-development. The concept of shared space is to be encouraged. The new community including businesses should be consulted on what type of shared space they would like.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
21	Appropriate given the context.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
21	Not just for workers but a destination for the whole city.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
21	Laudable.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
21	Good idea	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
21	Shared social spaces contribute to open innovation. It is highly questionable if an atmosphere of social interaction and open innovation could be fostered at a site which is heavily constrained through noise, odour, insects, vibration and HGV traffic. Open Innovation has become the 'best practice' approach to product and service development for R&D intensive businesses over the last ten years. Not the only but the most recent and perhaps most notable example of the approach as it applies to Cambridge has emerged since the Draft Local Plans' evidence base was prepared.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
21	Support. Given the potential extent of the AAP area, the focus should be on a well located local centre but may also require more localised provision as well.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
21	Appropriate for the area, anything more would impact on neighbourhood significantly	Nicky Morland [5636]	
21	Share social spaces	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
21	Share social space with green spaces especially	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
21	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
21	Brookgate support the provision of a local centre to provide shared social space. It should be of a sufficient size to provide a range of facilities and services and the proposed approach should make it clear that the centre is to serve CNFE businesses and residents. A local centre will increase the attractiveness of the area to business and residents and will significantly enhance the sustainability of the CNFE, reducing the need to travel from the area to access such facilities whilst fostering a strong new mixed use neighbourhood.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
21	Will provide valuable on site facilities.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
21	Greater potential here could be created by increased residential provision. The approach does not recognise that the local centre with shops and services could have an important role in serving the new residential community. It is currently stated that this is "primarily for the needs of the workers in the area";	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
21	TCE support the notion of shared social space which will allow collaboration between the tenants in the AAP area and provides a complementary eating/drinking hub for workers which is not available in this area at present.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
21	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q22a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why?			
22a	We object to Option A (reliance upon normal planning rules), as it is considered that the presence of significant constraints to residential development (primarily the odour levels in existence) and the objective of maximising employment development, means that it would be highly desirable for increased protective measures to prevent permitted change of use from office to residential or other uses.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
22a	Yes, Turnstone do not consider there to be any particular reason for protecting employment uses beyond normal planning rules. It is considered that the market will determine what is appropriate over time, and it is not considered very likely that there will be any great pressure to achieve non-commercial uses on sites in the CNFE.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
22a	Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported. The employment land should be protected as employment uses. There can be conflicts with some business uses and residential and therefore the master plan will have considered this, allowing change of use may have the effect of pepper potting residential dwellings within established employment areas potentially leading to social isolation.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
22a	When an area has been carefully considered at AAP level and facilities to support certain uses have been planned in, increasing residential uses at a later stage without the space for extra green areas, school places, parking, etc just leads to sub-standard development.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
22a	No Comment.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
22a	Don't understand the question	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
22a	The market should decide.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
22a	The land has not yet been re-developed and it would be counter-productive to introduce restraints which would result in a loss of flexibility at this stage. Commercial buildings will not be constructed for commercial use without an inbuilt and inherently long lifespan for such a use. Alternative uses will not therefore be forthcoming and additional policy restraint is not necessary.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
22a	AAP aims to create employment hub - this Option would allow piecemeal housing for which buildings not specifically designed and could lead to areas of isolated housing not compatible with in an employment area.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
22a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
22a	When an area has been carefully considered at AAP level and facilities to support certain uses have been planned in, increasing residential uses at a later stage without the space for extra green areas, school places, parking, etc just leads to sub-standard development.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
22a	An option is included to include specific policies and potentially article 4 directions to protect office space in this area from conversion to residential use under new permitted development rights. TCE do not support this. There is currently a great deal of demand for employment uses and related business uses ¹ and further control is not necessary at this stage.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
22a	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q22b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why?			
22b	We support Option B, the introduction of additional measures to prevent permitted change of use from office to residential or other uses as the presence of significant constraints to residential development (primarily the odour levels in existence) and the objective of maximising employment development make this highly desirable, as noted in our response to Question 22a.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
22b	Turnstone do not consider it strictly necessary to consider serving an Article 4 direction. Accordingly they would oppose this notion.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
22b	Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported. Support in order to protect new employment development from conversion to residential.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
22b	When an area has been carefully considered at AAP level and facilities to support certain uses have been planned in, increasing residential uses at a later stage without the space for extra green areas, school places, parking, etc just leads to sub-standard development. Any extra housing (as I mentioned at Q13) should be planned for in the masterplan as a later phase.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
22b	If there is greater need for residential than office or laboratory space, then that is what should happen, particularly as more office and lab space just boosts the need for residential space even further.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
22b	Employment must be coordinated with residential.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
22b	We need a mix of residential and employment opportunities.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
22b	No comment.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
22b	Option B. The flexibility to allow change of use to residential without planning permission was introduced to bring redundant commercial property back into beneficial use in areas where there was no demand for commercial property (or the commercial property did not meet market requirements and so was unlettable). Given the demand in Cambridge and that demand will be met by property designed to meet current tenant expectations, this will not apply on CNFE and so there should be a policy to protect new employment development (at least for a reasonable time period).	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
22b	Don't understand the question again	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
22b	This site should be business/commercial/high tech.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
22b	The land has not yet been re-developed and it would be counter-productive to introduce restraints which would result in a loss of flexibility at this stage. An Article 4 Direction could be introduced at a later date if it was deemed appropriate and necessary. Commercial buildings will not be constructed for commercial use without an inbuilt and inherently long lifespan for such a use. Alternative uses will not therefore be forthcoming and additional policy restraint is not necessary	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
22b	Appropriate to prevent piecemeal growth of housing in inappropriate locations.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
22b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
22b	When an area has been carefully considered at AAP level and facilities to support certain uses have been planned in, increasing residential uses at a later stage without the space for extra green areas, school places, parking, etc just leads to sub-standard development. Any extra housing (as mentioned at Q13) should be planned for in the masterplan as a later phase.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
22b	An option is included to include specific policies and potentially article 4 directions to protect office space in this area from conversion to residential use under new permitted development rights. TCE do not support this. There is currently a great deal of demand for employment uses and related business uses ¹ and further control is not necessary at this stage.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
22b	No.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q22c. Do you have any other comments on change of use from office to residential or other purposes?			
22c	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
22c	No.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
22c	Again don't understand the question	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
22c	No further comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
22c	New employment floorspace unlikely to be affected by PD rights in any case	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q23a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for Cambridge Science Park, and why?			
23a	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
23a	CSP is to be redeveloped and the whole area should be considered together.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
23a	Cambridge Science Park does not require to be included in the AAP; it has adequate policy direction and protection through the Draft Local Plans. To include the Cambridge Science Park within the boundary of the AAP risks that the AAP area will be seen as a success delivering increased employment floorspace by virtue of the science park's altering state; development which would happen regardless of the AAP being in place or not.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
23a	Option A Demand and commercial opportunity will drive intensification proposals and additional policy guidance for the Science Park is not considered necessary in the AAP.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
23a	Why not?	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
23a	The plan should not interfere with something that is already very successful.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
23a	Brookgate support Option A. Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy E/1 provides sufficient support for employment development and redevelopment to enable the continued development of high technology R & D clusters in the Science Park. There is no requirement for further policy guidance which would risk complicating proceedings for developers, potentially hindering the continued successful development of the Science Park.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
23a	Development at Cambridge Science Park (CSP) is covered by South Cambridgeshire District Planning Policies. These include matters of permitted use of development, car and cycle parking, quality of design, transport, landscape and sustainability. There is no reason to add a layer of policy for further development at the CSP; the existing and emerging planning policies give the Planning Authority the ability to assess and only permit high quality and sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework supports economic development and encourages its swift delivery. Adding a layer of unnecessary policy would not be in conformity to the NPPF.	Trinity College, Cambridge [5679]	Bidwells (Adam Halford) [3390]
23a	Applying policy guidance ensures cohesive approach over both sites, which are linked in employment use. One site may provide expansion opportunity for businesses on other, and should not have added restrictions/leniency.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
23a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
23a	CSP is to be redeveloped and the whole area should be considered together.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
23a	As set out above we support the inclusion of the Science Park within the AAP area. However, the issues related to the Science Park are not unique and there is no requirement for additional policy guidance for Cambridge Science Park. Site specific policies may be required to control the type and quality of development on opportunity sites within the AAP area.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q23b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for Cambridge Science Park, and why?			
23b	Support in order to protect the Cambridge Science Park from possible conversions and retain its essential character and attractiveness.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
23b	CSP is to be redeveloped and the whole area should be considered together. The environment of CSP's early phases with its now-mature trees should be treated carefully, so as not to lose the 'Park' concept.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
23b	Appropriate in the wider context.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
23b	Let's integrate with the wider economic area.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
23b	The whole area should have similar policies.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
23b	The intensification/densification of sites within the Cambridge Science Park should be judged against existing and emerging Local Plan policies and other material such as NPPF. The intensification of uses within the science park is a current and ongoing dynamic and the need to provide guidance is now. To delay providing guidance by placing it within this AAP would be too late. The Council should seek to address these issues through the Draft Local Plan which could be complemented by Supplementary Planning Guidance which could be relatively quick to produce, if it is considered necessary at all.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
23b	Yes	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
23b	The plan should not interfere with something that is already very successful.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
23b	Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy E/1 provides sufficient support for employment development and redevelopment to enable the continued expansion and intensification of high technology R & D clusters in the Science Park. There is no requirement for further policy guidance which would risk complicating proceedings for developers, potentially hindering the continued successful development of the Science Park.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
23b	The Cambridge Science Park (CSP) is an existing entity and is very different to a regeneration development. The bespoke policies being derived for the CNFE area through site-specific studies should not, and cannot, be so readily applied to CSP. Trinity College (as owners and custodians of the CSP) is supportive of CNFE but there is no need, nor is it appropriate, to apply policies that are emerging as bespoke for CNFE as blanket policies to a wider area.	Trinity College, Cambridge [5679]	Bidwells (Adam Halford) [3390]
23b	Provides level playing field across both sites.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
23b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
23b	CSP is to be redeveloped and the whole area should be considered together. The environment of CSP's early phases with its now-mature trees should be treated carefully, so as not to lose the 'Park' concept.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
23b	As set out above we support the inclusion of the Science Park within the AAP area. However, the issues related to the Science Park are not unique and there is no requirement for additional policy guidance for Cambridge Science Park. Site specific policies may be required to control the type and quality of development on opportunity sites within the AAP area.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q23c. Do you have any other comments on Cambridge Science Park?			
23c	Turnstone take the view and have stated elsewhere that it is not strictly necessary to include the Cambridge Science Park in the AAP. In light of this, there does not seem to be any reason in Turnstone's view as to why there should be a policy approach for the Science Park. It is perfectly possible for appropriate intensification at the Science Park to take place applying established planning policies.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
23c	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
23c	No.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
23c	Cambridge Science Park is a well-established entity which contains existing clusters of high technology R & D developments. It does not have the same regeneration needs as the CNFE area and is an employment area only, rather than a mixed use neighbourhood as identified in the proposed vision for the CNFE. Brookgate do not consider that it is necessary or appropriate to attempt to share policies between the CNFE area and the Science Park with Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy E/1 already providing clear guidance for the continued development of the Science Park.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
23c	If the Science Park is included within the AAP then Option B would be preferred to allow for the concentration and intensification of technology and R&D uses. Inclusion within the AAP area could also help facilitate improvements to the pedestrian environment and connections from existing employment sites to the new railway station. However, the AAP should be responsive to evidence on market demand and viability so that there is sufficient flexibility to cope with future economic changes.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
23c	Cambridge Science Park is part of CNFE and should be considered as part as part of a combined area.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
23c	The Science Park has significant potential for future enhancement and connections with the rest of the area and the wider surroundings. To exclude it risks stagnation and uncoordinated future development in the Science Park that could be detrimental or conflict with the CNFE area. The inclusion of the Science Park could also facilitate a more coordinated approach to the use of Section 106 and CIL funding across the area.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
23c	Science Park should be independent.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q24a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?			
24a	As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
24a	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
24a	Good environmentally, suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
24a	Given a choice between residential accommodation and more employment, the preference should be for residential accommodation, as more employment just boosts the need for more housing even further.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
24a	Support, IF access if from Milton Road.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
24a	Option A would result in no change to the current land use provisions. This is supported on the basis that the industrial land uses are important to the City functionality and that there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
24a	Option A The access issues are clearly of concern to local residents and any improvement in this would be welcomed. It is challenging however, given the varied ownership and legal interests on these industrial estates. It seems that either a wholesale change to residential is required or the status quo.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
24a	Support Option B.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
24a	No comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
24a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
24a	Good environmentally, suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
24a	Support.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q24b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?			
24b	As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
24b	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
24b	Good environmentally, suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
24b	Sensible.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
24b	Object for reasons stated in 24a. Response to Question 24a: Option A would result in no change to the current land use provisions. This is supported on the basis that the industrial land uses are important to the City functionality and that there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
24b	It would make for better zoning.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
24b	No comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
24b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
24b	Good environmentally, suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
24b	No.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q24c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?			
24c	As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
24c	Support this option in order to provide a better environment for residents in the Nuffield road area.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
24c	Good environmentally, suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
24c	Object for reasons stated in 24a. Response to Question 24a: Option A would result in no change to the current land use provisions. This is supported on the basis that the industrial land uses are important to the City functionality and that there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
24c	Support since Cambridge needs accommodation especially for key workers but with the access to the accommodation which directly from Milton Road. This will reduce traffic in Green End Road and Nuffield Road	Nicky Morland [5636]	
24c	I agree	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
24c	We support Option B, it would result in better zoning.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
24c	Good location for residential accommodation.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
24c	No comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
24c	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
24c	Good environmentally, suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
24c	Object.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q24d. Do you have any other comments on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road?			
24d	Turnstone does not object per se to the possibility of some or all of the Nuffield Road estate being redeveloped for housing if that is considered locally to be a more appropriate use for the area having regard to access constraints. Turnstone however notes that it is not essential to develop this land for housing and the City Council is not reliant on it to meet its housing targets in the emerging Local Plan.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
24d	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
24d	We need to be aware of additional traffic as part of this development	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
24d	No.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
24d	With extra housing well back from the road and provided with adequate parking facilities and green spaces	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
24d	No comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
24d	There is no strong preference on the Nuffield Road options but there are two comments: (i.) a flexible mix may be most appropriate to allow the market to respond but avoid the redevelopment of the site for 100% residential given the opportunity of this site to attract employment generating uses in this location. (ii.) The site adjoins the proposed guided busway route and has good accessibility on foot to the new station, therefore it would logical to locate more intensive employment uses on the site.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
24d	Potential for relocation of uses beyond the AAP boundary should also be considered as creates a greater opportunity for the area.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
24d	This should only be considered if there are no other options. Moving the businesses will be expensive, so leave them there and build the residential area somewhere else.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q25. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on wider employment benefits, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for policies and proposals that could be promoted through the AAP to support local jobs for local people and reduce barriers to employment in the wider area.			
25	Turnstone is supportive of the overall approach that the Council is taking here.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
25	Support proposed approach, however, should include reference to apprenticeships to ensure opportunities for all avenues into work and skills development. Support the aspiration to provide training and employment opportunities for local people if it can realistically be delivered. The policies regarding local employment are supported, access to employment is a key wider determinant of health and local employment should be encouraged to cater for local residential development.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
25	It is common sense.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
25	Could help be given to employers to aid the setting up of apprenticeships?	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
25	The policy aims are not consistent with the overall vision of the use classes which will dominate the AAP area, however, if the AAP area refocused its attention to creating a more intense and purposeful industrial hub then the outlined approach is agreeable.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
25	The proposed approach is supported. This should also reflect the significant training and apprenticeships opportunities that the employment use here could generate, both during construction and afterwards. Cambridge Regional College will be very accessible from this site by Guided Bus or cycling along the Busway.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
25	Definitely and offer of apprenticeships	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
25	Local Plans should not interfere at this level, it is for the market supported by central Government policy to worry about these issues.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
25	Whilst the overall objectives within the proposed approach are supported in principle, Brookgate consider that the ability to provide training and employment opportunities for local people and local procurement may not always be possible or appropriate for all businesses, particularly those within the R&D sector operating within an international market context and reliant on attracting the best international talent. It is considered that bespoke solutions to maximise economic and employment benefits should be secured as part of individual applications rather than through a generic and inflexible policy approach. This will ensure better outcomes tailored to individual circumstances without stifling innovation.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
25	The AAP cannot be a panacea to resolve Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire employment problems. Whilst local training opportunities, especially apprenticeships etc. should be encouraged it is not a role of the planning system to impose such obligations upon developers.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
25	Would expect this to potentially go beyond current provisions.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
25	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q26a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on hotel and conference facilities, and why?			
26a	As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water does not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Anglian Water consider potentially sensitive development that might include hotel and conferring centre and student accommodation within this 1.5 odour contour line as unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings and would advise caution in considering any such proposal.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
26a	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
26a	I would like to see a hotel here, or 2 hotels, and consider a mixed-used area essential.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
26a	Let existing accommodation plans take account of the project.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
26a	An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
26a	Hotel and conferences facilities	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
26a	I support Option C.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
26a	The development of the new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel in this location and this should be recognised in the CNFE AAP. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and easily accessible location for a hotel to serve business users associated with the large number of existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. The proposed vision for the CNFE states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
26a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
26a	No.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q26b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on hotel and conference facilities, and why?			
26b	As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water does not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Anglian Water consider potentially sensitive development that might include hotel and conferring centre and student accommodation within this 1.5 odour contour line as unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings and would advise caution in considering any such proposal.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
26b	If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated. Support either option B or C but may depend on whether development of a hotel at the entrance to the Science Park goes ahead. Any provision allocation in the AAP needs to be kept flexible if no demand materialises.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
26b	I would like to see a hotel here, or 2 hotels, and consider a mixed-used area essential. We should most certainly consider conference accommodation, as people would more than likely use this hotel than central ones, meaning less traffic and easier access for residents of East Anglia.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
26b	An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
26b	Important to provide hotel facilities in this development	Nicky Morland [5636]	
26b	Should be included	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
26b	I support Option C.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
26b	Support, however subject to viability conference facilities could also be provided. The development of the new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel in this location. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and accessible location for a hotel to serve business users associated with the large number of existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. The proposed vision for the CNFE states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
26b	Would support business uses on CNFE and Science Park.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
26b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
26b	TCE support the provision of a hotel and/or conference facilities within the mixed-use development of land around the proposed new railway station, on the basis that this would be a supporting use with the focus remaining on employment and office floor space.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
26b	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q26c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on hotel and conference facilities, and why?			
26c	As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water does not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Anglian Water consider potentially sensitive development that might include hotel and conferring centre and student accommodation within this 1.5 odour contour line as unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings and would advise caution in considering any such proposal.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
26c	If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
26c	Essential to have at least one hotel with conference facilities, as it can be hard to get a central location for a conference, plus it would reduce traffic movements in the city centre.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
26c	An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
26c	This would be logical and enhance the area.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
26c	Support, however the provision of conference facilities should be subject to viability. The new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel and conference facility. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and accessible location for a hotel and conference centre to serve business users associated with existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. This accords with the proposed CNFE vision which states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
26c	Option C, provision of hotel and conference centre close to the station, is supported as part of the mix.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
26c	Would support business uses on CNFE and Science Park.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
26c	Having both available will be a natural addition to the rail station serving businesses located both here and at the Science Park, allowing their visitors to stay away from the city centre during the business hours, and especially to avoid contributing to traffic by travelling to/from there in the rush hour.	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
26c	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
26c	TCE support the provision of a hotel and/or conference facilities within the mixed-use development of land around the proposed new railway station, on the basis that this would be a supporting use with the focus remaining on employment and office floor space.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
26c	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q26d. Do you have any other comments on hotel and conference facilities?			
26d	Turnstone takes the view that there could well be scope and demand for a hotel within the CNFE area. It is not clear however why this would need to be situated "around the new railway station" and there could be perfectly sound reasons why it should be located more centrally within the CNFE area and not to one side by the station.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
26d	If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
26d	We consider that a hotel use within any part of the CNFE subject to its siting and relationship to other land uses would be appropriate and there should be no geographical limitation as to where such facilities could be provided.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
26d	No.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
26d	There is a currently proposed hotel and conference facility on the Science Park in addition to several other hotels within close proximity at Orchard Park, Impington and Quy. This will be driven by demand in the market and if sufficient demand, should be considered.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
26d	Not so sure about hotel being to near station	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
26d	No further comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
26d	The CNFE plan suggests either resisting any hotel uses within any part of the Plan area or encouraging a hotel as part of mixed use development of land around the railway station. Subject to its siting and relationship to other land, we consider that a hotel in any part of the CNFE would be appropriate and that there should be no geographical limitation on where such facilities should be provided. If the mixed-use development area around the railway station has higher land use potential (and an hotel therefore cannot form part of that development) but an alternative location can be found elsewhere, the Plan should not prevent it. Whether the hotel specifically forms part of the mixed use development around the Railway Station is not important in our view; what does matter is that provision be made for an hotel in a location which will serve the whole of the Cambridge Northern Fringe East and the wider area.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
26d	Allowance could be made within the AAP for this use but flexibility should be maintained. The location of the hotel/conference facilities do not need to be specified at this stage.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q27. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on housing mix, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for the types and sizes of houses that should be included within the CNFE area.			
27	Turnstone does not object outright to housing being delivered at CNFE but is somewhat indifferent to whether there is a need for it and whether it should be pursued. It should certainly not be pursued to anything exceeding the level indicated in the current version of the AAP. If there is to be housing flexibility of tenure should be accepted including affordable housing.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
27	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated. The need to ensure a balanced housing mix is supported. A mix of house types and tenures can help community cohesion and help maintain a healthy development.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
27	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated. The need to ensure a balanced housing mix is supported. A mix of house types and tenures can help community cohesion and help maintain a healthy development.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
27	As per my diagram attached, I believe a highly mixed development would be the most sustainable. I would have a mix of high rise for commuters, student, Council, and an entire new area of low rise, called Fen Meadows on the south side of the tracks. This would be the ideal situation.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
27	The mix reflects society's structure.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
27	There should be mainly affordable housing - or inexpensive let properties. Could a small percentage be some form of co-operative housing? Shared dwelling with a mixture of personal and shared living space?	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
27	To create a truly sustainable community it will be necessary to provide a mix of dwelling types which will result in a range of family units.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
27	Support. The type and size of affordable housing should be informed by the City Council's Housing Policy.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
27	Definitely	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
27	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
27	Would like to see a mix of 40% affordable and remainder market housing.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
27	Brookgate object to the proposed approach on housing mix. There is no reference to PRS within the proposed approach and it is not explicitly recognised. The significant increase in demand for PRS needs to be accounted for and its provision actively encouraged within the AAP. Constraints on the CNFE site must be recognised and a realistic housing mix provided. PRS will play an important role in achieving this outcome.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
27	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
27	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q28. Do you support or object to the proposed use of Cambridge City Council's affordable housing requirements for the whole of the CNFE area, and why?			
28	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated. Affordable housing requirements should be subject to viability and development will need to mitigate a range of services such as education and transport.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
28	40% affordable housing should apply.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
28	As per my diagrams, I would rather see a mixture of high-quality Council housing and student accommodation, rather than affordable housing, although it would be possible to include both, however I feel to make developments as attractive as possible to developers, we need to allow them to make reasonable profits on extremely high quality buildings, not like the mess we have at CB1, which, including The Triangle, is a real mess and embarrassment to Cambridge.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
28	Let the market function policy free.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
28	Or even increase the amount to 50% affordable or more. Affordable = less than 4x average Cambridge salary.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
28	No comment.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
28	Support. The CNFE should be treated in the same way as any other development and this supports a more balanced community as well as housing located by employment use.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
28	Yes and must be adhered to	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
28	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
28	40% affordable housing should be provided throughout the site.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
28	Subject to viability testing the policy should be applied as proposed. The very heavy infrastructure costs and brownfield nature of the land with associated remediation costs must be recognised and viability is of key importance. Brookgate support the City Council's affordable housing requirements which offer a graduated approach to affordable provision which differentiates between different scales of development. South Cambridgeshire policy is less flexible. Consideration should however be given to PRS developments where a different approach may be required, such as discounted market rents, off-site contributions toward affordable housing provision etc	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
28	Support subject to a detailed testing of viability to ensure delivery across a significant timeframe and meet the vision and objectives.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
28	40% affordable housing should apply.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
28	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q29a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on private rented accommodation, and why?			
29a	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated. Support, allow the market to deliver private rented accommodation rather than encourage it given the uncertain implications.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
29a	Agree.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
29a	Option A Private rented accommodation is market housing not Affordable Housing. There is no evidence to justify a planning policy intervention to warrant Option B.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
29a	As long as it is reasonable priced	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
29a	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
29a	Option A is our preferred option but Option A can also deliver excellent places to live with no adverse impacts on the economic/social mix of the future residential community. This is clearly demonstrated in numerous schemes across the country, such as East Village in Stratford and Clippers Quay in Salford, Manchester. We do not believe that detailed guidance is necessary as existing policies aim to deliver quality places to live. In addition, there is significant guidance already published that could be beneficially referenced by the authorities.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
29a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q29b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on private rented accommodation, and why?			
29b	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
29b	Housing, and affordable housing are at a premium here and houses must not be bought as an investment and kept empty.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
29b	I support Option A.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
29b	It will be important to ensure that properties in this area are not bought as investments and either left empty or rented out to commuters, which would lead to the area becoming an empty wasteland at weekends.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
29b	Option A is our preferred option but Option A can also deliver excellent places to live with no adverse impacts on the economic/social mix of the future residential community. This is clearly demonstrated in numerous schemes across the country, such as East Village in Stratford and Clippers Quay in Salford, Manchester. We do not believe that detailed guidance is necessary as existing policies aim to deliver quality places to live. In addition, there is significant guidance already published that could be beneficially referenced by the authorities.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
29b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
29b	Housing, and affordable housing are at a premium here and houses must not be bought as an investment and kept empty.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q29c. If you have any other comments on private rented accommodation please add them here.			
29c	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads, and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
29c	I am sorry but I do not understand this. I support the idea that inexpensive accommodation needs to be provided. Does this option mean there could be council houses? If so, I agree that could be a very good option.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
29c	It is essential there is affordable housing only - ideally with council house included but this could be wishful thinking	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
29c	The ability of PRS schemes to create quality places to live cannot be doubted, it is no different to any development in the built environment. It needs a clear brief, good design, delivery and collaborative working to make it successful architecturally and in urban design terms. Many authorities are developing PRS design guides to assist developers. The authorities may wish to follow a similar route, producing guidance in association with the developer as part of the AAP but the ULI UK residential council has recently produced "Build to Rent, A Best Practice Guide" which represents significant expertise in this area.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
29c	It is agreed that private market accommodation could play a greater role in delivering future housing needs in the Cambridge area. Whilst the intention of Option B is understood, it is important to allow the market to deliver this form of housing in response to demand. The range of planning policies allow for both the mix and the environmental conditions to be managed through the planning application process without additional polices in the AAP.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
29c	Allow flexible approach	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
29c	Don't care.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q30a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on student housing, and why?			
30a	As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water does not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Anglian Water consider potentially sensitive development that might include hotel and conferring centre and student accommodation within this 1.5 odour contour line as unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings and would advise caution in considering any such proposal.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
30a	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated. Support especially as the need for student accommodation in the area has yet to be made.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
30a	Paragraph 9.28 specifically states that the market has expressed an interest in student accommodation. Failure to acknowledge clear market signals does not accord with the advice of the NPPF.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
30a	Option A. If there is evidence of demand for student accommodation in this location or some of the proposals for the CNFE create such demand, then it would be sensible to make such provision. It is considered that as there are no educational institutions in the immediate vicinity, there would seem to be limited demand for student accommodation in this location. This location could also leave students isolated as there are limited facilities available unless there is significant provision on site within the AAP area.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
30a	No more please	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
30a	It is too far/remote from the Universities and substantial facilities.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
30a	I would support Option A or B (up to 20% student housing but no more.)	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
30a	The market has expressed an interest in the provision of student housing in the CNFE area and this need should be accommodated.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
30a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
30a	TCE broadly support the inclusion of student accommodation in the CNFE area; however, this must be as a complementary use with the focus being on employment and research and development uses, and any large scale developments should not be permitted.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
30a	No.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q30b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on student housing, and why?			
30b	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
30b	The setting of a limit on the provision of student accommodation appears to be sensible development control action. However, it will be complex to justify a limit and to enforce it	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
30b	I support Option A.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
30b	I would support Option A or B (up to 20% student housing but no more.)	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
30b	A limit should not be set on the amount of student accommodation that would be allowed in the CNFE area. This would result in an inflexible approach which could fail to meet market demand and unnecessarily restrict appropriate development/re-development in the CNFE area, potentially jeopardising both the supply of student accommodation within Cambridge and the successful creation of a mixed and balanced community at CNFE.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
30b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
30b	TCE broadly support the inclusion of student accommodation in the CNFE area; however, this must be as a complementary use with the focus being on employment and research and development uses, and any large scale developments should not be permitted.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
30b	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q30c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on student housing, and why?			
30c	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
30c	Let the market justify the demand.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
30c	Brookgate support proposed Option C. It would maintain a flexible approach to the provision of student accommodation within the CNFE area, reflecting the markets existing interest in the locality. The introduction of a new policy requiring student accommodation proposals to demonstrate how the benefits could outweigh possible negative impacts/mitigation of such impacts is a sensible safeguard which will not result in unnecessary restrictions being placed upon the CNFE area, whilst ensuring that student housing forms part of a balanced, well planned new community.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
30c	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
30c	No.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q30d. Do you support or object to the proposed Option D on student housing, and why?			
30d	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
30d	I support Option A.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
30d	Option D would restrict new student accommodation to specified locations only, resulting in a loss of flexibility for the evolution of the CFNE area. There is no need to impose such a restriction which could have a detrimental impact upon both the provision of student accommodation to meet market demand and upon sites which are safeguarded for student development, when alternative uses may be more appropriate. A new policy as suggested under Option C offers a more flexible approach which will result in student accommodation being developed in suitable locations	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
30d	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
30d	No.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q30e. If you have other comments on student housing please add them here.			
30e	Turnstone does not immediately see the rationale for student accommodation at CNFE. Typically student housing is provided more centrally in Cambridge, making it extremely accessible for the institutions attended by the students. CNFE should be focused on employment uses and other complementary uses that will aid the overall sustainability of the development.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
30e	If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
30e	There's too much student housing in Cambridge and would not support further student housing here.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
30e	None.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
30e	No further comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
30e	Flexibility is required at this stage	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
30e	This must be as a complementary use with the focus being on employment and research and development uses, and any large scale developments should not be permitted.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
30e	Student accomodation should be integrated so they won't all be in the same area.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q31. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on provision of services and facilities, and why? Please also add any other suggestions for provision of services and facilities.			
31	<p>The proposed approach to the delivery of supporting services is supported in principle. The location of facilities must have regard to other development in the locality, so potential amenity issues arising from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and the railheads are avoided and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>Supportive of this policy, especially regarding co-location of services for community, retail and leisure uses.</p> <p>The proposal on services and facilities are supported. Community facilities should be provided early in the development of the residential component of the development. Services and facilities should include community development.</p>	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
31	We need as many amenities on site as possible.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
31	Some regulation is necessary to provide a wider range of services especially from SMEs.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
31	Support. Balanced, sustainable community requires such services and facilities as do the employees working locally. It is considered important that these are not too fragmented across the CNFE as that could reduce their viability or contribution to extended opening hours and thus service provision.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
31	Assuming Community facilities includes education and health provision then consideration MUST be given early on to provision of schools and health centres where the accommodation is being increased.	Nicky Morland [5636]	
31	Education and health services must be provided especially as there is already one school in Nuffield Road and a Doctors's Surgery	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
31	The Science Park is a good example of this approach working.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
31	Provision of community facilities need to be allowed for in the original design and built as the development becomes occupied. Leisure/sporting facilities could be built at the northern and eastern edges of the site (as an acoustic barrier to the A14 and railway)	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
31	Brookgate support the proposed approach. In order for the regeneration of the CNFE area to be successful the required services and facilities must be provided. This will require collaborative strategies between key stakeholders and will be easier to achieve on sites such as CB4, where large areas can be brought forward by relatively few stakeholders, simplifying the planning and engagement process. The delivery of such services and facilities is essential to ensure the creation of a vibrant, mixed use neighbourhood, as set out in the proposed vision.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
31	Aims to provide appropriate measure at right time, and with effective management/maintenance.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
31	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
31	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q32. Do you support or object to the proposed approach for the new local centre, and why?			
32	Turnstone consider that any uses proposed on the CNFE site should be totally complementary to employment uses. Retail facilities of an appropriate scale would be an acceptable use, subject to commercial viability.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
32	Proposed new local centre in Options 2-4 is supported in principle. It is noted that it is proposed that this includes a residential element and other elements which will be used by people, and in Option 2 the local centre appears to lie partially within the odour zone which is not suitable for such a use. The location of the local centre must have regard to development existing or proposed in the locality, so that potential amenity issues arising from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and railheads are avoided and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
32	Residential flats will ensure the area is not dead in the evenings.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
32	Sensible, but lets not forget SMEs.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
32	In principle it is correct that a new local centre should be created to support the needs of a local community, however, it is not possible to make any informed decision on quantum, uses or location until the deliverability of the AAP area is further advanced.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
32	Support. The provision of such facilities together is likely to be more sustainable and viable.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
32	Provided it is tastefully done	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
32	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
32	Where there is residential development there must also be local shops and community facilities, including a doctor's surgery	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
32	Brookgate agree that a new local centre is essential to the creation of a vibrant, mixed use neighbourhood as set out in the proposed CNFE vision. It will act as both a focal point and a social hub for the CNFE area. There should be flexibility regarding its location along the Boulevard, positioning it around the station would ensure a highly accessible and sustainable location. It should include new retail provision to meet local needs and complement nearby centres as set out in objective 4 of the proposed development objectives. Employment and residential uses could be provided on upper floors.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
32	Providing sufficient services for immediate needs of community near station most suitable location to ensure maximum use.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
32	At this stage the approach is too rigid and could need adaptation if more residential is included. Thus location and form needs to be less specific.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
32	Residential flats will ensure the area is not dead in the evenings.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
32	TCE support the approach set out for the new local centre and welcome the proposals to include retail and other uses within this location. These new uses should be located in one area (as part of the local centre) so as not to dilute the existing office and employment functions of the CNFE area.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
32	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q33. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on open space standards, and why?			
33	We support the application of the relevant open space standards, but wish also to emphasise that the development must be integrated into the wider landscape through the improvement and development of green infrastructure beyond the currently identified site boundary. This should include the creation of a strategic accessible landscape/green space area along the River Cam Corridor and linking Milton Country Park (akin to developments to the south and west of Cambridge).	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
33	It is not considered the document adequately addresses the issues of formal open space provision for sport. It is considered that, depending on the number of residential units proposed, there will be a policy requirement to provide formal recreation space for outdoor sport to local policy standards. It is accepted that on a tight urban site such as this it may not be appropriate to provide such facilities on site, but provision should be made for suitable off-site provision to meet the need generated by the new residents of this area.	Sport England (Mr Philip Raiswell) [210]	
33	On the proviso that the emerging Open Space Standards, as set out in Policy 68 and Appendix I of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (proposed submission) only apply to residential development, Turnstone does not object to the approach that has been suggested. It must be clear, however, that the Open Space Standards should only apply to residential developments, and that questions of the appropriate quantum of open space related to commercial developments should be negotiated on a case by case basis.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
33	The approach to the provision of open space is supported in principle. Regard needs to be paid to amenity issues which may arise from other uses in the CNFE area, such as the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses and railheads which could give rise to dust, noise and odour. Open space needs to be located in a position where such matters will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated The policy to require open space is supported Access to open space is a key wider determinant of health.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
33	Support provision of open space in particular, which is not addressed in Option 1. Support a higher level than shown in any of the Options, given the huge benefits that open space provides to well-being and how crowded Cambridge is.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
33	Appropriate in the wider context.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
33	I broadly agree. In the area I have highlighted, which does not belong to Brookgate, the chief recreation area is the square bounded by the hotel, apartments and office. Let's call it Novi Square for now. This, together with the playing fields for the school, would provide sufficient space for Cambridge North. Fen Meadows would have its own provision. I would also recommend a park area near the station. If full redevelopment goes ahead, more parkland will be available, as per my other diagram.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
33	Sensible.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
33	Let's not have a concrete jungle. Open spaces will make the area more pleasant to work and live in. Encouragement of wildlife should be a default requirement, with a particular focus on providing habitat for birds, hedgehogs and bees.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
33	Open space should be maximised.	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
33	Support. Open space is very important in high density schemes and can also help to reduce the impact of tall buildings.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
33	None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces. This is a great opportunity for providing the City or Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.	Mr Gustavo Milstein [5647]	
33	The more the merrier!	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
33	No comment.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
33	Brookgate agree that the re-development of the CNFE area presents a range of opportunities to enhance the existing green infrastructure. There should however remain flexibility to allow the off site provision of certain open space typologies such as playing fields.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
33	Open space vital for health, relaxation and environmental enhancement - reflects existing standards elsewhere there parity providing sufficient space.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
33	The standards need to be defined in the context of the proposals and the wider context beyond the AAP area as promoted through enhanced connections to a variety of amenity spaces in the wider area.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
33	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
33	Like the idea of including "open space" / green areas. The heavy use / popularity of Milton Country Park shows that these spaces are highly valued. Note: The Science Park has lost a lot of its green space over the years. Slightly concerned about "intensive" use of land (option 3 & 4).	Dominic Reber [5716]	
Q34. Do you support or object to the proposed key transport and movement principles, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for key transport and movement principles to improve and promote sustainable travel in the area.			
34	RLW Estates generally support the transport and movement principles. However we consider that specific reference should be made to the new station and other gateways to the site (such as Milton Road and the Jane Costen Bridge - both as a key element of the sustainable transport infrastructure serving the area, and in terms of its contribution to the role which CNFE should play in fulfilling the wider growth strategy for the Cambridge area.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
34	We support the general principles described, but we are doubtful that the site can fulfill its development potential without the provision of direct access from the A14, and urge the local authorities to investigate this option in the near future.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
34	Turnstone is broadly supportive of the key transport and movement principles identified within the AAP. Turnstone consider however that there would be merit in expressly making reference to the significant role that could be played by the new railway station at the edge of the AAP area, and also to the Guided Bus, both of which clearly have scope to help meet the objective to minimise journeys to the site by private car.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
34	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
34	<p>Access to the new railway station at Chesterton could be significantly improved if Network Rail's private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton railway sidings running along the north side of the Business Park was made into a public footpath / cycleway.</p> <p>It would be more pleasant and convenient than the proposed route for Cowley Road up to the boundary of the current sidings, allowing for entrances to be installed on the north side of Cambridge Business Park and easier access for commuters.</p>	Raifuture East Anglia (Mr Paul Hollinghurst) [5037]	
34	<p>Of course! I would have new bus routes running through the area, new bus stops half way down the new Cowley Road (the old Cowley Road having been pedestrianised), a river taxi, car parking, and of course the guided bus, cycling and taxis. This should be the best-connected area in the city, if done well. We will need more crossings of the railway and river to assist in traffic flow.</p>	Ben Cofield [5605]	
34	<p>Let's focus on walking, public and cycles - car parking creates too much dead space.</p>	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
34	<p>Access to the new railway station would be significantly improved if Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton sidings along the north side of Cambridge Business Park was made into a public footpath and cycleway. It would be more pleasant than the foot/cycle path planned for Cowley Road and it would enable the Crown Estate to install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park to shorten the walk between offices on the Cambridge Business Park and the new railway station and encourage travel to the Cambridge Business Park by train.</p>	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
34	<p>The principles are sound and reflect the guidance of the NPPF on sustainable travel but radical solutions are likely to be required to enable appropriate road based access to the sites.</p>	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
34	<p>Support. Transport will be a key issue for this area given the pressures on capacity locally. Transport and improvements to infrastructure need to consider the whole CNFE AAP area so that any improvements needed reflect the future needs of the whole area and not individual land ownerships. Incremental improvements by various land owners based on demand and phasing related only to that land ownership should be resisted as that may lead to greater disruption over the period in which the CNFE is developed, both to those with the CNFE area and outside as offsite improvements are likely to be required.</p>	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
34	<p>Policy must also consider the needs of those who, whilst they might wish to, cannot cycle or walk. The cycle pressure groups are positive BUT it isn't a solution for everyone, especially older members of the community and the needs of all must be considered. Where cars are not an option good regular all day and evening public transport must be provided.</p>	Nicky Morland [5636]	
34	<p>Focus must be on public and active transport. Filtered permeability should be used throughout the development to create an attractive environment for cycling and walking. Similarly bus gates to provide efficiency for bus routes.</p> <p>Off site junctions must take cyclists and walkers into consideration - please avoid indirect, multi-stage crossings for these user.</p> <p>Cowley Road is an example of what needs to be avoided: poor shared-used that disadvantages active modes in preference to private motor traffic. The parallel Network Rail route should be opened as a high quality cycle and walking provision to resolve this issue.</p>	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
34	<p>Support the proposed key transport and movement principles and welcome the focus on sustainable transport. Focus on public and active transport.</p> <p>Filtered permeability (full access for sustainable modes, no through routes for motor vehicles) needed throughout to create an attractive environment for cycling and walking.</p> <p>Bus gates to provide efficient bus routes.</p> <p>Off-site junctions must consider cyclists and walkers avoiding indirect, multi-stage crossings for these users.</p> <p>Avoid current Cowley Road design that disadvantage active modes in preference to private motor traffic.</p> <p>Open up parallel Network Rail route as a high quality cycle and walking provision to resolve this issue.</p>	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
34	<p>One would hope that after so much publicity cyclists would be considered too and allowed a traffic free approach where the interaction with LGVs/buses is eliminated. This is the chance to prevent the distressing and needless deaths one sees so often in London and the cities.</p>	P Verbinnen [5650]	
34	<p>Yes and to provide bus transport to the station for local residents</p>	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
34	<p>No comment.</p>	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
34	<p>A pedestrian/cycle path should be provided, linking the Jane Coston Bridge with the Station.</p> <p>Good bus links must be provided for those who cannot walk or cycle.</p>	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
34	<p>The emphasis of the movement principles must be promotion of non-car and active modes of travel, delivering a highly accessible development. The principles must recognise that CNFE will generate additional vehicle trips. A key principle needs to include 'enhance the Milton Road corridor to ensure that traffic can move efficiently in appropriate locations'.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire CC Transport Strategy (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire) and associated strategic transport modelling significantly underestimates development opportunities in CNFE. The TSCSC recommendations (and proposed City Deal schemes) don't adequately address existing highway network constraints or consider measures required to unlock the full potential of CNFE.</p>	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
34	<p>Strongly support the focus on making transport safer and more sustainable. Developing a new area provides an opportunity to create safe and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists, which are sadly lacking in much of the rest of the city. Permeability (for these users) is very important to making the area attractive.</p>	Mr David Collier [5680]	
34	<p>The transport and movement principles are supported but could be improved. An additional principle should be included to help maximise the potential for sustainable links between CNFE and existing and planned communities. Suggested wording is as follows:</p> <p>"To ensure sustainable transport links are made with existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town"</p>	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
34	<p>All criteria necessary to ensure sustainability. However there must be a recognition that some staff and visitors to current and future uses will make journeys by car. The absence of any information about traffic and junction layout is a considerable omission as it is impossible to assess the relative impacts of the options on existing developments within the AAP area.</p>	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
34	<p>No additional comment</p>	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
34	The impact of the proposed transport interchange and the development of residential and commercial property on neighbouring villages has not been assessed. However there is a real potential cost to the neighbouring villages in terms of road usage and congestion as the CNFE development proposed will have a significant adverse effect in congestion, pollution and general loss of amenity. The plans need to be extended to include provision for better public transport and roads within a semi circular radius of 10 miles from west to East adjoining the CNFE site.	Cottenham Parish Council (Jo Brook) [5703]	
34	As set out in the Issues and Options report, TCE are of the view that transport modelling of the wider development area and mitigation strategies/new road infrastructure will be crucial in the development of the AAP. However, until this modelling data is available and understood, there is no benefit in progressing the AAP further. In addition, TCE do not support the proposals to allow public access through CBP as set out previously.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
34	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q35a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on modal share target, and why?			
35a	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
35a	Orbital bus, with new rail/river crossing to Wadloes Road Pedestrianised existing Cowley Road, with traffic rerouted on a new road adjacent to the sewage works Pedestrianised area around the new square (as featured on map) Buses running until midnight with stops on the new Cowley Road (B on map)	Ben Cofield [5605]	
35a	The modal share target set for of 24% car trips by 2031 is an aspirational target, it is not clear how this will be obtained or monitored, it should also be noted that there is an obvious funding gap in the Councils transport infrastructure plans. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF advises that Councils should be aspirational but realistic. Due to transportation infrastructure funding gaps it is doubtful if this target is realistic.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
35a	Option A. This may be challenging to deliver given the potential employment levels created here and the regional draw to such employment. It is considered that a target is required but this needs to be realistic and challenging.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
35a	Orbital bus routes also for local residents	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
35a	I support Option C.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
35a	Bus routes from the north (A10/Waterbeach/Milton) should be routed via the new station to improve connectivity via public transport and buses should run every day and up to midnight, to encourage people to use the bus.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
35a	Brookgate support the setting of a modal share target for the CNFE. The 24% car trip target should be applied to trips that have an origin and destination within Cambridge City only, recognising that short urban trips have the highest propensity to be undertaken on foot, by bicycle or public transport.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
35a	Matching the modal share target is not ambitious enough. It should be possible to do much better than in other areas of Cambridge. When working within the constraints of an existing road network, improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in particular are difficult to achieve. In developing a new area there is no reason to repeat those mistakes, and a much better modal share should be achieved.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
35a	The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
35a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q35b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on modal share target, and why?			
35b	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
35b	Policies that attempt to force people into doing things they don't want to will both be unpopular and cause trouble - see, for example, the parking problems in Orchard Park resulting from insufficient provision of parking spaces.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
35b	Orbital bus, with new rail/river crossing to Wadloes Road Pedestrianised existing Cowley Road, with traffic rerouted on a new road adjacent to the sewage works Pedestrianised area around the new square (as featured on map) Buses running until midnight with stops on the new Cowley Road (B on map)	Ben Cofield [5605]	
35b	Show we can be innovative and though leading for new infrastructure.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
35b	Make the area an example of what can be achieved. Cambridge is already a tech and academic hub; and in the next few years will, hopefully, become a model cycling city. Let's merge those three together and show the country what is possible. Silicon Valley-meets-Copenhagen, if you will.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
35b	The rail, bus and cycle links make this an ideal opportunity to maximise travel by train, bus and cycling instead of by car.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
35b	To set an unrealistic target for modal shift at a time when there is an obvious funding gap in the Councils transport infrastructure plans would not be compliant with paragraph 154 of the NPPF	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
35b	This development is an ideal opportunity to have aspirational transport goals; The Guided Busway, rail link and local cycle network provide excellent connections by public and active transport. Every effort should be made to lower private motor vehicle use at this location.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
35b	The Campaign strongly supports Option B - Go beyond the target set for the city and make the area an exemplar scheme. We feel that this development is an ideal opportunity to have aspirational transport goals; The Guided Busway, a new rail link and the local cycle network provide excellent connections by public and active transport. Every effort should be made to minimise private motor vehicle use at this location.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
35b	I support Option C.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
35b	Modal share targets need to be ambitious but realistic and achievable. The Cambridgeshire County Council Cambridge Sub Regional Model (CSR) should be utilised to undertake further transport modelling work for the CNFE to develop appropriate modal share targets for the CNFE. Once further modelling work has been undertaken it will be possible to identify whether tougher modal share targets can be achieved at the CNFE.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
35b	It should be possible to do much better than in other areas of Cambridge. When working within the constraints of an existing road network, improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in particular are difficult to achieve. In developing a new area there is no reason to repeat those mistakes, and a much better modal share should be achieved.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
35b	The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
35b	Subject to viability; recognise the need to minimise car journeys and exploit the enhanced transport infrastructure.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q35c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on modal share target, and why?			
35c	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
35c	I support using this opportunity to minimise car usage.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
35c	It is inappropriate to set such targets in policy before the precise mix of uses is known and understood.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
35c	I don't think a local plan such as this should get itself involved in such matters apart not constraining any particular form of transport.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
35c	Realistic and achievable targets should be set in order to determine the likely transport impact of the CNFE and to what extent travel planning and transport improvements are able to mitigate the impact. Modal share targets should be produced to inform the development of a package of phased transport measures required to achieve the targets.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
35c	In the absence of any information about traffic generation it is not possible to set targets.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
Q35d. Do you have any other comments on modal share target?			
35d	It is plainly not possible to set a precise target at present given the uncertainty at this stage in the process as regards the mix of land uses in the scheme. However RLW Estates object to no mode share target being set as this would almost certainly undermine the transport and movement principles.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
35d	It is very difficult, at this early stage in the evolution of CNFE, to say with certainty that modal shift percentages can and will be achieved. It is certainly a worthwhile objective to ensure that modal share targets that are set for the whole of Cambridge are met on the site, and there is room for optimism that this can be achieved at CNFE. This will however be an exacting target, and Turnstone do not consider that it would yet be appropriate to seek to go beyond the target of 24% set for the City as a whole.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
35d	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
35d	None.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
35d	There should be a footpath (and possibly cycle path as well) from the new station to Green End Road, to encourage local people to leave cars at home.	mrs Jill Tatham [5640]	
35d	There should be a footpath (and possibly cycle path as well) from the new station to Green End Road, to encourage local people to leave cars at home. Buses should stop along Milton Road to collect local people who want to use the station etc. At present many buses travel along Milton Road, but few stop. Perhaps buses travelling along Milton Road could also serve the station via Cowley Road. I would like to be able, for example, to get on a bus at Union Lane to take me to the new station.	mrs Jill Tatham [5640]	
35d	The 24% car trip target by 2031 only focuses on car trips within Cambridge. Therefore further assessment work is required to identify realistic CNFE site wide car modal share targets and targets for individual land uses. The CNFE modal share targets need to be linked to a package of phased transport measures that are required to achieve the modal share targets.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
35d	Whilst the benefits of an overly prescriptive approach to mode share within the area are questionable it is clear there is strong potential for the CNFE Area to become an exemplar sustainable community and destination. To ensure this goal is fulfilled, sustainable transport links to existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town, need to be emphasized.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
35d	Good pedestrian/cycle links are required for all the surrounding areas such as Milton via Jane Coston Bridge, Chesterton via the sidings triangle, and Abbey and Fen Ditton via the planned Chisholm Trail river bridge. Bus shuttles should be considered for all the surrounding areas with departure/arrival times properly matched with rail services. Through bus services such as the green P&R service or number 9 should call at the station, Citi 2 might terminate here.	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q36a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for Cowley Road, and why?			
36a	We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
36a	There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs. The redevelopment of the area provides an opportunity to improve conditions. This includes improved separation between HCVs and other users, given the significant levels of demand likely to be generated by the AAP proposals, but also to minimise the impact of such traffic on other land uses through minimisation of noise and vibration of vehicles.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
36a	Pedestrianise existing Cowley Road New boulevard to the north, adjacent to the sewage works HGV banned from turning right towards the station	Ben Cofield [5605]	
36a	I want to minimise car usage and maximise use of rail, bus and cycling. I therefore oppose the building of any additional roads.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
36a	To retain Cowley Road as the only entrance / exit into the AAP site would restrict future development opportunities especially those associated with industrial / waste / minerals uses which is what this AAP should focus its attention on developing	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
36a	I support Option C.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
36a	Brookgate support retaining the existing Cowley Road as the main access road for all modes of transport. However Brookgate recognise routing HGV movements on a dedicated route to the north of Cowley Road would be beneficial in providing a more pedestrian and cycle friendly main access through the AAP area along Cowley Road. Suggest that the whole of the 'corridor' between the disused NR access road, the First Public Drain and the existing Cowley Road is used to create wide tree-lined boulevard delivering a high quality walking and cycling route as well as appropriate vehicle access to CNFE.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
36a	Option A would be a disaster. If there is one thing that needs to come out of this redevelopment, it is improving pedestrian and cycling access to the new station. The road is too narrow and totally unsuitable for these users to share it with general traffic.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
36a	Cowley Road remaining the main site access is supported but sustainable modes of travel along the Milton Road corridor must be catered for to allow reliable journey times from new and existing communities.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
36a	The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option. Increased traffic, including heavy goods traffic will impact upon existing businesses and may prejudice safety of pedestrians and cyclists.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q36b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for Cowley Road, and why?			
36b	We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
36b	Option B is supported above Option A, but less than Option C. There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
36b	Priority for cyclists and pedestrians will become increasingly important.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
36b	Sensible.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
36b	To protect the area from increased congestion, there must be a focus on encouraging people to use sustainable modes of transport. Make the routes safe and easy to use for cyclists and pedestrians, and this will better the journey time and experience for everyone.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
36b	I want to minimise car usage and maximise use of rail, bus and cycling. I therefore oppose the building of any additional roads.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
36b	There is no indication of how this will be funded as it will require to be implemented before a large quantum of development takes place. It would prioritise sustainable modes of transport which would be suitable if the AAP site was to host a large amount of residential and office uses, it is considered doubtful that those uses can be delivered.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
36b	A second vehicular access is a reasonable compromise. However, it must consider active modes at a design stage; efficient access, priority over side roads, dedicated space. Also there should be no through routes between the two vehicular accesses, to prevent rat running and create a safe attractive space for active modes. Filtered permeability and bus gates should be used to enable active and public modes full access to the site. Cowley Road access would also be greatly improved by opening up the old Network Rail access track as a high quality off road cycle and walking connection.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
36b	I support Option C.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
36b	Brookgate object to proposal to restrict private car movements on Cowley Road. A Quality Bus corridor is being constructed south of Cowley Road as an extension of the existing CGB. This route should be open to all public transport vehicles both guided and un-guided. The CGB route is sufficient to provide reliable and fast public transport services to the new railway station and the AAP area. High quality cycle facilities can be provided parallel to the existing Cowley Road by utilising the disused Network Rail site access road, without needing to restrict vehicle movements on Cowley Road.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
36b	Support the focus on walking, cycling and public transport. But to make a route truly attractive for these users, pedestrians should not be forced to share pavement with cyclists and cyclists should have a route separate from the road. There is no reason why this cannot be achieved and it is unclear whether even option B would do this, as Cowley Road will still be narrow even if most of its traffic is removed. What is really needed is a new route away from the road.	Mr David Collier [5680]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
36b	The improvements to Cowley Road are supported but sustainable modes of travel along the Milton Road corridor must be catered for to allow reliable journey times from new and existing communities. Any new junction arrangements with Milton Road must be shown to deliver benefits to all but with reference to the hierarchy of users.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
36b	Would segregate station and cycling/walking traffic from main employment route. However, the absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option. Increased traffic, including heavy goods traffic will impact upon existing businesses and may prejudice safety of pedestrians and cyclists.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
36b	Priority for cyclists and pedestrians will become increasingly important.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
Q36c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C for Cowley Road, and why?			
36c	In overall terms, Turnstone would support Option C whereby Cowley Road is prioritised for the station, office and any residential traffic. Turnstone agrees that it would be sensible for any heavy goods vehicle (HGV) access to be provided parallel and to the north of Cowley Road, for industrial, minerals and waste activities only. This should not pre-determine that heavy industrial or - for instance - minerals/aggregates uses will be a permanent feature at CNFE, but it would make considerable sense to have appropriate contingencies in terms of access in place right from the very outset.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
36c	We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
36c	Option C is supported above Option A and Option B. The CNFE is a mixed use area with a variety of uses existing and proposed through the AAP. There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
36c	HGV route will be needed	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
36c	Keeping heavy traffic away from any residential development is highly desirable.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
36c	It would encourage developments which lead to more lorries going to the site.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
36c	Support in principle. The creation of a dedicated HGV access to support the existing industries on site which are growing and will continue to grow, and be altered, is considered to be a positive step in developing the AAP site for an industrial hub. However, there remains substantial concern about the funding and deliverability of such a solution.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
36c	This I support.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
36c	I support Option C but feel that all aggregate lorries should access the site via westbound on-off slips from the A14 and not go onto Milton Road at all.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
36c	Brookgate support the provision of a new Heavy Goods Vehicle access parallel and to the north of Cowley Road for industrial, minerals and waste activities only. This vehicle access strategy will significantly reduce heavy good vehicle movements from Cowley Road, allowing the flexibility to create a safer walking and cycling environment for CNFE residents and employees along the Cowley Road corridor.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
36c	Access solutions that look to segregate heavy vehicle traffic from more vulnerable users are supported but designs and movement strategies must ensure that the future wholesale redevelopment of the area is acknowledged.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
36c	Support in principle, however, the absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
36c	The provision of a new HGV access to the area would be a major benefit for all industrial, minerals and waste activities taking place in the area. A route separating HGV traffic from traffic accessing the station, office and residential areas would be a major improvement in terms of Health and Safety. It would also reduce congestion and improve the ease and efficiency of access for all concerned.	Frimstone Ltd. (Mr Peter Dawes) [5708]	
36c	HGV route will be needed.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
Q36d. Do you have other suggestions for what else could be done to improve vehicular access to the area whilst mitigating the impact of traffic?			
36d	We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
36d	All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (ie: Network Rail) networks.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
36d	Plan also does not seem terribly joined up about road access. As other commentators have probably mentioned, the whole question of linkages to the A14 from Fen Road could be readily added into this mix, unsnarling major traffic issues.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
36d	A route for aggregate lorries serving the A14 improvements to come off the A14 westbound directly (left-off, left-on) to fill up AT GROUND LEVEL from the aggregate depot, would be a great improvement, so that this activity did not affect the development of the area or traffic on Milton Road.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
36d	Masterplan should safeguard a route for a road across into Fen Road Chesterton either via a new level crossing or a bridge over the railway, to link across at an appropriate point in the road system on the other side, avoiding residential areas already developed by Travellers there.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
36d	The obvious area to concentrate major highway improvements is the interface where Cowley Road meets Milton Road - to perpetuate a situation of the whole CNFE area being accessed through a single stretch of road wedged between the Innovation Park and the TV building is simply going to exacerbate existing problems.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
36d	The quantum of development envisaged through the AAP should be reduced to reflect that which is sustainable in the next five years. This needs to take account of the delivery times for the railway station, Guided busway interchange and the Milton Road A10 / A14 access upgrades.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
36d	This really depends upon the final option chosen for CNFE. As with Question 34 above, this needs to be considered in the context of the whole CNFE area and not individual land ownerships or phasing. There may be advantages to each of the road access options. Separation of cyclists and pedestrians from vehicles should be an aim.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
36d	Cyclists and pedestrians need to be catered for on each and every access road. Should the plan opt for a second access road the Campaign recommends that no through routes for motor vehicles are created between them, preventing the temptation for drivers to rat-run though the development to beat traffic on Milton Road. Flexibility and convenience of routes for active modes must be as good, indeed better, than that available for motorised vehicles. Providing this filtered permeability is crucial for central areas to be attractive for cycling and walking.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
36d	One would hope that after so much publicity cyclists would be considered too and allowed a traffic free approach where the interaction with LGVs/buses is eliminated. This is the chance to prevent the distressing and needless deaths one sees so often in London and the cities.	P Verbinnen [5650]	
36d	The nearside lane of Milton Road southbound from the interchange should be a Cowley Road only filter lane.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
36d	3) The aggregates railhead should be accessed by westbound off- and on-slips from and to the A14. Aggregates lorries should NOT travel via the Milton Road. 5) A road bridge across the railway should link to Fen Road, or the planned foot/cycle bridge should be extended to Fen Road giving access for Fen Road residents.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
36d	Strategic traffic modelling work is required to identify the highway capacity improvements required on the Milton Road corridor and access to the site. Priority needs to be given in the City Deal to funding transport schemes that improve the accessibility of the CNFE site. Area-wide travel planning should be given greater importance in reducing existing vehicular travel demand by extending the existing Travel Plan Plus scheme. The County Council also needs to undertake further assessment work to understand the impact of the new railway station on the potential for modal shift from car to rail trips in the local area.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
36d	1. Vehicle access into and out of the CNFE Plan area remains a significant problem. Caused by diversified land ownership, incremental changes, piecemeal highway works limited access with a single main route - Cowley Road - in and out of Milton Road, with heavy peak time congestion and associated environmental and economic consequences. A wholesale highway solution needs to be prepared. 2. A major new interchange is required for vehicle traffic, with the existing network of footpath and cycleways creating links to the surrounding area. If provision is not materially increased, existing problems will be exacerbated, dissuading landowners from looking at alternative uses and discouraging investors from bringing forward development proposals.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
36d	It must be time to consider widening Milton Road to two lanes southbound, between the Science Park junction and the busway. Congestion approaching the Science Park is already a serious problem, particularly as it often stretches back to the A14. This problem can only become worse if the area is developed, even if the focus is on sustainable transport. The important issue not mentioned in the document is the possible provision of a bridge over the railway linking to Fen Road. This would be a big improvement over the current access through Chesterton, and would allow the closure of the Fen Road level crossing. Although development of Fen Road should not be part of the CNFE plan, an improved access is extremely important for Fen Road's future, and it must be considered at the same time because of the amount of land any new access would require.	Mr David Collier [5680]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
36d	The important issue not mentioned in the document is the possible provision of a bridge over the railway linking to Fen Road. This would be a big improvement over the current access through Chesterton, and would allow the closure of the Fen Road level crossing. Although development of Fen Road should not be part of the CNFE plan, an improved access is extremely important for Fen Road's future, and it must be considered at the same time because of the amount of land any new access would require.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
36d	Bus priority measures are being explored along Milton Road and this is supported in principle. The potential to intelligently use carriageway space in the vicinity of the Science Park should also be explored to respond to changes in tidal demand.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
36d	Insufficient detail to comment at this stage.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
36d	A route for aggregate lorries serving the A14 improvements to come off the A14 westbound directly (left-off, left-on) to fill up AT GROUND LEVEL from the aggregate depot, would be a great improvement, so that this activity did not affect the development of the area or traffic on Milton Road. If a left-turn-off left-turn-on route is made west of the railway then it should continue beside the A14 to join with Cowley Road as a dedicated access for heavy lorries headed towards Cambridge. the masterplan should safeguard a route for a road across into Fen Road Chesterton either via a new level crossing or a bridge over the railway, to link across at an appropriate point in the road system on the other side, avoiding residential areas already developed by Travellers there. Whilst there is currently no plan to fund such a route, this will be needed later.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
36d	the masterplan should safeguard a route for a road across into Fen Road Chesterton either via a new level crossing or a bridge over the railway, to link across at an appropriate point in the road system on the other side, avoiding residential areas already developed by Travellers there. Whilst there is currently no plan to fund such a route, this will be needed later.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
36d	In addition to the vehicular options proposed through the CNFE AAP, in order to relieve traffic congestion around the existing A14/Milton Road junction, TTP Consulting have considered whether an additional access from the A14 to the station could be included within the AAP and delivered as part of the redevelopment as illustrated on the enclosed sketch TTP-SK1540A-0001. We would be grateful if CCC and SCDC would consider this as an important option to address existing and future transport, highways and access issues.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
36d	Whatever makes best sense for transport at the current stage of the project.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q37a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?			
37a	The County Council would wish to consider the form of car parking provision at a later date when further details are known. It is important to note, however, that car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
37a	low-level car parking facilities	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
37a	I support Otion B.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
37a	Brookgate object to the current proposed surface car parking layout. The consented layout doesn't make best use of the site. It would be difficult to extend or to construct a multi-storey structure on the footprint given the site's shape and proximity to the Bramblefields reserve. Better location for a surface car park is adjacent to the existing main railway line, north of new station building. A conventional rectangular footprint could be used, being more efficient in terms of the number of spaces and providing flexibility to convert to a multi-storey car park if sufficient future demand arises.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
37a	Object. The CNFE Area should be looking to maximise developable land in and around the comprehensive transport networks that exist.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
37a	Object. The CNFE Area should be looking to maximise developable land in and around the comprehensive transport networks that exist.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
37a	Seems short-sighted. Justification for capacity not provided.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
37a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q37b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?			
37b	The County Council would wish to consider the form of car parking provision at a later date when further details are known. It is important to note, however, that car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
37b	Of course the possibility to have a multi-storey car park should be there!!! Cambridge North could, and possibly should be, a new city centre, so we will need considerably more parking than is currently proposed in the future.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
37b	If it has to be so, then yes.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
37b	This will free up space for other uses	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
37b	Option B. This maximises land use, potentially enables a wider range of land uses and should enable more residential development away from the odour footprint.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
37b	Makes better use of the land and not everyone can walk or cycle to the station. If they use the bus there be appropriate public transport when the late trains arrive from London?	Nicky Morland [5636]	
37b	This will ensure that more people will have the ability to use the station.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
37b	I think a multi-storey car park makes more sense. Witness the pressure on parking at the main station. Not everyone can walk or cycle.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
37b	Brookgate support the location of a surface car park that makes best use of the overall site. As discussed in response to Q37a, it is recommended that the surface car park is constructed adjacent to the existing main railway line to the north of the new station building as per redevelopment Option 2a (appended to this submission). The surface car park could be laid out in a conventional rectangular footprint which is more efficient in terms of the number of spaces and provides flexibility to convert to a multi-storey car park if there is sufficient future demand.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
37b	Important to make best use of the available space.	Mr David Collier [5680]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
37b	Support. The efficient use of land is supported in this key Cambridge North location where strong sustainable transport links are already in place and will be enhanced between existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
37b	Provides more flexibility and realistic longer term solution, although no details of capacity given.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
37b	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
37b	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q37c. Do you have other comments on parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange?			
37c	RLW Estates submits that the key priority as regards car parking is to ensure that it is provided to a standard and in a way which supports the overall strategy for CNFE. Therefore proper provision needs to be made both for appropriate car parking, but also for public realm befitting of one of the main entrances to CNFE. In determining how car parking can best be integrated into the setting of the proposed new rail/bus interchange primary regard should be given to the quality of the bus/rail interchange for passengers and also for cycle parking, for which proper provision should be made so that lack of cycle parking does not constrain future use of the railway and guided bus to/from the CNFE.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
37c	The County Council would wish to consider the form of car parking provision at a later date when further details are known. It is important to note, however, that car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
37c	All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation. The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away - a covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). One would hope that after so much publicity cyclists would be considered too and allowed a traffic free approach where the interaction with LGVs/buses is eliminated. This is the chance to prevent the distressing and needless deaths one sees so often in London and the cities.	P Verbinnen [5650]	
37c	The car parking at the Station should be for station users only. The car park should not be operated as a 'park and ride' site for the CGB.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
37c	Adequate provision should be made to preclude overspill parking elsewhere in the area.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
Q38a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for car parking standards, and why?			

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
38a	Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. The County Council therefore considers that more detailed consideration of parking numbers, and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of traffic on networks	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
38a	The car parking restrictions in appendix L8 of the referenced documents are far too tight - see what has happened about car parking in Orchard Park.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
38a	This is the least worst Option.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
38a	Brookgate support the use of car parking standards across the whole area that are more restrictive than the car parking standards policy set by the Cambridge City Council car parking standards, to reflect the highly sustainable location. The current policy however forms a useful starting point in discussions over car parking levels.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
38a	Parking standards should not be more onerous than in the rest of the city especially given the location on the edge of the settlement.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
38a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
38a	TCE do not support a restriction in car parking standards or further cycle parking spaces. TCE support Option A for the CNFE AAP to include CCC adopted car parking standards and cycle parking standards.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q38b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for car parking standards, and why?			
38b	Car parking has a strong relationship to traffic generation and consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. More detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on networks	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
38b	Even tighter restriction for residential accommodation would be ridiculous (see answer to 38a). However, there is a need to ensure that parking intended for residents and their visitors isn't usurped by station and business users. Therefore such parking should not be "on-street" but within the confines of each property, in order to avoid having to pay for a "residents' parking scheme".	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
38b	Let's look to a future where cars are not the primary mode of transport.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
38b	Option B. This seems to be a sensible approach if to maximise more sustainable forms of transport as well as encouraging employers to support more sustainable forms of transport for travel to work.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
38b	I am in full support of restrictive standards across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. Enabling active and public transport must be the focus for this development. Restrictions on private motor use is part of achieving this mode shift.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
38b	The Campaign is in full support of Option B: restrictive car parking standards across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. Placing restrictions on private motor use must be part of achieving this mode shift. I am in full support of restrictive standards across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. Enabling active and public transport must be the focus for this development. Restrictions on private motor use is part of achieving this mode shift.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
38b	This is the worst Option.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
38b	Brookgate support the use of more restrictive car parking standards across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. Transport modelling work will assist in determining the appropriate levels of car parking taking into account the site accessibility and proposed land-uses. It should be recognised that car parking levels particularly for commercial development should not be set too low as it may make development unattractive to potential tenants, particularly given the high car parking levels consented on adjacent establish commercial development sites. The under-provision of car parking could also lead to off-site overspill parking.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
38b	Encourages on-street parking, competition for spaces and does not reduce car usage, just displaces it.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
38b	consideration to be given to this to reflect sustainability of location	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
38b	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q38c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C for car parking standards, and why?			
38c	Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. More detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on the highway	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
38c	As experience in the rest of Cambridge has shown, if you stop people parking in one place or charge for it they will just move to parking somewhere nearby (even, it seems, on double yellow lines). Therefore you have no option but to either provide entirely adequate car parking facilities for those who want to park, or to provide car parking facilities on individual properties that are owned by the residents.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
38c	Mor focus on public transport	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
38c	This is the second worst Option.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
38c	Brookgate object to a 'tiered' approach to car parking standards based on the proximity to the station. The success of the whole AAP will in part be based on linking the benefits of the new station and the extension of the CGB with the whole AAP site through a variety of sustainable transport measures including encouraging walking, train/cycle, shuttle buses and other innovative solutions which will allow the whole allocation (and the wider area) to shift from car dominated transport to other modes.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
38c	Support only providing displacement of station area parking is carefully controlled to prevent problems elsewhere.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q38d. Do you have other comments on car parking standards?			
38d	Turnstone agrees that appropriate levels of car parking must be planned for as part of the CNFE development. However, parking associated with the railway station must not, under any circumstances, interfere with the need to create a proper entrance/arrival point to CNFE, and therefore parking should not be delivered for cars at the expense of high quality provision for bicycles, bus interchange and public realm.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
38d	Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. More detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking, will be required including inter-alia detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, the potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on the highway	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
38d	It is important that any new developments which do come forward do not compound existing parking problems. Land owners such as St John's College along with their tenants may well need a more stringent car parking management system to ensure proper controlled parking in the instance where new significant development is coming forward.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
38d	All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation.	P Verbinnen [5650]	
38d	A balanced approach is required recognising the accessibility of the site by non-car modes but also the need to provide appropriate levels of operational car parking. Further modelling work should be undertaken to inform the car parking standards for each of the land-uses proposed on the CNFE site.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
38d	It is entirely appropriate for the Plan to acknowledge that car parking in and around a new CNFE area will be an important part of any new development. This is particularly the case where existing employment areas have established patterns of movement and car parking which seek to meet the needs of users. We acknowledge that owners and tenants of existing buildings will perhaps need a more stringent car parking management system in place to ensure that there is no abuse of the spaces within their control.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
38d	No preference on the three options but it is relevant that car use can be further discouraged by ensuring sustainable links are secured to existing and planned communities, including Waterbeach New Town. A relationship between accessibility and parking provision is a sensible and pragmatic approach. Any adopted parking standards need to consider the volume of vehicles that this could in turn generate and the implications for traffic and transport along the important Milton Road corridor.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
38d	Consideration to be given to reflect sustainability of location.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
38d	TCE are setting about trying to improve the amount of cycle parking provision and quality at CBP, and hope to deliver on this initiative within 2015, again this is part of their Sustainability Action Plan.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q39a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for cycle parking standards, and why?			
39a	Cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that seeks to maximise cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required but as noted this will require further, more detailed, analysis. Increased cycle parking is in line with increasing modal share to walking and Cycling, and Active Transport is a key wider determinant of health.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
39a	Brookgate support the Cambridge City Council cycle parking standards. The standards have been successfully used on the CB1 development, a similar highly sustainable transport hub.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
39a	Sustainable location given existing and new cycleway links, therefore adequate provision needed which is likely to exceed local plan standards.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
39a	TCE do not support a restriction in car parking standards or further cycle parking spaces. TCE support Option A for the CNFE AAP to include CCC adopted car parking standards and cycle parking standards.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q39b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for cycle parking standards, and why?			
39b	Cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that seeks to maximise cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required but as noted this will require further, more detailed, analysis. Increased cycle parking is in line with increasing modal share to walking and Cycling, and Active Transport is a key wider determinant of health.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
39b	Providing even greater amounts of cycle parking that are expected to be used seems an appropriate way to encourage people to use cycles. If you are hoping that some workers will arrive by train and then cycle to locations on the Science Park, then you need to provide sufficient secure cycle storage to enable people to leave their cycles at the station overnight and at weekends.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
39b	Yes.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
39b	The more available cycle parking, the more attractive this area will be to cycle to. Fighting for spaces is already very off-putting to those trying to get to the city centre station, so let's not make the same mistake here.	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
39b	High quality cycle parking throughout the site - station, employment and residential areas - is entirely appropriate for enabling high cycling use.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
39b	The Campaign supports Option B: higher cycle parking standard across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. High-quality, easily accessible and available cycle parking throughout the site is entirely appropriate for enabling high cycling use at all destinations - employment, residential and the station. The Campaign also recommends secure, covered cycle parking in residential areas as these reduce theft and deterioration of residents' bikes.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
39b	With cycle racks that are not like those towers at Cambridge Station!	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
39b	Brookgate object to higher cycle parking standards as the current standards are sufficient to deal with the likely demand for cycle parking in areas with good cycle infrastructure and connectivity.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
39b	Since this development aims to achieve higher cycling levels, certainly a higher standard of cycle parking will be needed. It would be absurd to create a pleasant cycling environment but not require there to be enough spaces for all potential users.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
39b	Option B (Higher Standards) is supported because this would be more likely to maximise the potential for employees and visitors to travel by bike, for example between Waterbeach New Town and the CNFE Area.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
39b	New cycleways will encourage more cycling and therefore higher level of provision likely.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
39b	Consideration to be given to higher standard to reflect sustainability of location.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
39b	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q39c. Do you support or object to the proposed Option C for cycle parking standards, and why?			
39c	The ability to park a cycle in a safe, secure, and convenient location is a key aspect of encouraging and supporting travel by bike. Cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that maximises cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required but as noted this will require further, more detailed, analysis.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
39c	I would also like to see cycle lockers as an option in the station cycle parking areas.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
39c	Option C. The station will inevitably be used for commuting and encouraging travel to the station by cycle should be supported and provided for. The Guided Busway links will also encourage the use of cycling from possibly further than may otherwise be the case.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
39c	To encourage cycling, it will be essential to have sufficient, safe, well-lit, adequately roofed cycle parking	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
39c	Brookgate object to a 'tiered' approach to cycle parking standards based on the proximity to the station. The success of the whole AAP will in part be based on linking the benefits of the new station and extension of the CGB with the whole AAP site through a variety of sustainable transport measures including encouraging walking, train/cycle, shuttle buses and other innovative solutions which will allow the whole allocation (and the wider area) shift from car dominated transport to other modes.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
39c	New cycleways will encourage more cycling and therefore higher level of provision likely.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
39c	We would also like to see cycle lockers as an option in the station cycle parking areas.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
39c	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q39d. Do you have other comments on cycle parking standards?			
39d	Turnstone take the view that in order to achieve the modal share targets envisaged, high levels of cycle parking provision will be required. As a starting point the standards in the emerging Local Plan (Policy 82 and Appendix L) should be adopted, but Turnstone agrees that there may be scope for higher levels of provision in close proximity to the railway station interchange.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
39d	The ability to park a cycle in a safe, secure, and convenient location is a key aspect of encouraging and supporting travel by bike. Cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that seeks to maximise cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required but as noted this will require further, more detailed, analysis.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
39d	The City Council have a preference for cycle parking to be provided using Sheffield Stands. Increasingly double stacking racks are being installed and used at rail stations and are widely used new residential and non-residential developments. Double stackers provide added benefits, maximising cycle parking provision and making the most efficient use of limited space. It is suggested that the Cambridge City cycle parking standards are updated to reflect the increased use and popularity of double stackers. The provision of a high proportion of cycle parking using double-stackers would maximise the efficient use of the CNFE site.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
39d	Consideration to be given to higher standard to reflect sustainability of location	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
39d	TCE are setting about trying to improve the amount of cycle parking provision and quality at CBP, and hope to deliver on this initiative within 2015, again this is part of their Sustainability Action Plan.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Q40. What further provision should be made to improve the cycle and pedestrian environment in the Cambridge Northern Fringe East area, and are there any other pedestrian and cycleway linkages that are important and you wish to be included in the plan?			
40	As stated in response to previous questions RLW Estates considers that the strategy must focus on the connectivity which CNFE affords for slow modes with key destinations lying to the south and north. These routes are important both for accessibility to CNFE itself and as part of the wider corridor, including the link between Waterbeach new town (via Jane Coston Bridge) and the city centre. Notwithstanding the above linkage, when considering redevelopment options, RLW Estates consider that the opportunity for linking the Chisholm Trail northwards through CNFE to the Milton Country Park via the rail corridor should also be taken.	RLW Estates [149]	Boyer Planning (Mr Matthew Clarke) [146]
40	This issue needs significant attention - in particular good linkages for pedestrians and cyclists and, potentially, horse riders should be achieved to the eastern boundary of the site linking with the River Cam Corridor (and its special neighbourhood) and Milton Country Park (including proper wide tunnel etc under or bridge over the A14 adjacent to the River Cam). Effective and sympathetic solutions need to be found to link with existing neighbourhood to south of the new Guided Bus Route and the River Cam/ Chisholm Cycle Trail.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
40	The AAP must recognise existing cycle infrastructure which exists in the area, and must consider the scope that may exist for enhancing this. There are important links to the CNFE area from the north, via the Jane Costen Bridge, and possibly up from the River Cam corridor. It is not only a case of ensuring that adequate provision is made in terms of wide cycle paths, etc, but also that these gateways are made as attractive as they possibly can be, therefore encouraging cycle usage.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
40	Any considerations for further provision of cycle and pedestrian access in CNFE should take account of both the existing and planned mineral and waste activities in the area and the importance of separation between HCVs and other users.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
40	Cycle routes should also be better joined up to create more safe, segregated cycling (although I understand that there is access to the cycling lanes along the busway). The question of bridges and river crossings in Chesterton should be addressed as part of this plan - people still face a nightmare-ish commute north of the river to these re-generated areas. So much cycling provision requires joined up, segregated routes. The North Area (including Science Park) is dis-joined in cycling planning and a set of small improvements is made in this location alone, rather than as part of a joined-up plan.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
40	<p>It would be good to have more connections to the North and East of the area: a cycle tunnel under the A14 near the railway into Milton Country Park, and a level crossing link to Fen Road and onwards to the River Cam via Grassy Corner.</p> <p>Safeguard the old Network Rail (Lafarge) track on the south side of the First Public Drain as a dedicated cycle path to the station.</p>	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
40	Safeguard the old Network Rail (Lafarge) track on the south side of the First Public Drain as a dedicated cycle path to the station.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
40	Access should be available between the newly pedestrianised Cowley Road and the Business Park to avoid the need to walk all the way up to Cowley Road if pedestrians are coming from the south. Initially this could be at the very end of the business park, with additional access to the side, once the area there gets developed.	Ben Cofield [5605]	
40	<p>We encourage the planning department to consider pedestrian and cycling infrastructure as two separate priorities. Those on foot do not want to mix with those on bikes, and vice-verca. We would also encourage all infrastructure geared towards cyclists to be given the same right-of-way as vehicular traffic - new cycle routes should not be broken up by side roads.</p> <p>Three routes into the area that we would like to be looked at: Milton Road Green End Road Fen Road</p> <p>Improvement to cycling infrastructure here should be considered as part of the plan, encouraging more people to travel by bike.</p>	Stanton Shallcross (Ms Caitlin Alvey) [5610]	
40	Make Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton sidings a public footpath and cycleway for pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from the new railway station. This would be more pleasant and convenient than the pedestrian and cycle route currently proposed for Cowley Road. It would also enable the Crown Estate to install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park to shorten the walk between offices on the Cambridge Business Park and the new railway station and encourage travel to the Cambridge Business Park by train.	Dr Alan Mayes [5618]	
40	<p>There should be a new bridge over the river for cyclists to reach the station directly from the Abbey area. I believe this has already been discussed and I hope approved.</p> <p>Cycling along Fen Road should be made safer, again I think there are already proposals for this.</p>	Ms Anne Swinney [5626]	
40	Support proposed approach.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
40	<p>There should be frequent and reliable bus, cycle and pedestrian access to the new Cambridge North station to encourage all residents of North Cambridge to leave cars at home.</p> <p>A footpath (plus possibly cycle path) from the station to Green End Road would help many local residents to reach the station on foot (or cycle).</p>	mrs Jill Tatham [5640]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
40	<p>The Campaign believes off-site connections are crucial for enabling a high cycling and walking mode share. There should be separate and high-quality provision for each of these modes. Shared-use facilities should not be considered acceptable at a new development. These routes should have priority over side accesses, be separated from motor traffic and have direct (not multi-stage) protected crossings at off-site junctions.</p> <p>Off site connections are crucial for enabling a high cycling and walking mode share. These should have separate provision for each mode - no shared used. Priority over side accesses. Separated from motor traffic. Direct (not multi-stage) protected crossings at off side junctions.</p> <p>Major connections to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Jane Coston bridge, * Northern Guideway, * Fen Road (through Chesterton Sidings Triangle), * Cowley Road (need to ensure Network Rail track is protected from development to use as cycle and pedestrian access to station), * Chisholm trail (including bridge). 	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
40	<p>Off site connections are crucial for enabling a high cycling and walking mode share. These should have separate provision for each mode - no shared used. Priority over side accesses. Separated from motor traffic. Direct (not multi-stage) protected crossings at off side junctions.</p> <p>Major connections to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Jane Coston bridge, * Northern Guideway, * Fen Road (through Chesterton Sidings Triangle), * Cowley Road (need to ensure Network Rail track is protected from development to use as cycle and pedestrian access to station), * Chisholm trail (including bridge). 	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
40	The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away - a covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). Similarly, a taxi rank should not be any closer than 100 metres to allow space for ordinary and guided buses.	P Verbinnen [5650]	
40	I think this should be very carefully thought through. Access needs to be suitable for everyone. I suggest a local consultation if possible	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
40	I support Cllr Hazel Smith's suggestion. I'd also like a direct route(avoiding all the junctions off Milton Road) from the Jane Coston Bridge to the railway station.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
40	The Milton Road corridor offers a relatively poor cycling environment along with the existing connections to the Jane Coston Bridge. The CNFE should deliver improvements to this corridor improving cycle access to the CNFE site and improving connections northwards to Milton village. The City Deal should deliver the Chisholm Trail to improve cycle connectivity to the south along with good quality local links into Chesterton. High quality cycle facilities could be provided parallel to the existing Cowley Road by utilising the disused Network Rail site access road to help improve links to Milton Road and the existing Science Park	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
40	In addition to the routes mentioned, links from the Jane Coston bridge are very important, both to the new station and to Milton Road (where existing path has much scope for improvement).	Mr David Collier [5680]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
40	We welcome the proposed attention to cycle improvements linked to both the Chisholm Trail and Milton Road. Consideration also needs to be given to how cycling and walking linkages could be improved to the north of the area, specifically linking to Milton Country Park and the River Cam/Hailing Way. A further pedestrian / cycle tunnel under or bridge over the A14 to the West of the River Cam and East of the existing Coston Cycle Bridge would bring significant benefits and we would like this to be considered.	Cambridge Sport Lakes Trust (Mr Mick Woolhouse) [5684]	
40	There are economic and environmental benefits is ensuring CNFE has sustainable links not only to existing residential neighbourhoods but also planned new communities. The AAP should set out how CNFE will contribute to securing and/or enhancing cycle links to the proposed Waterbeach New Town. Specifically cycle links along the River Cam, through Milton, between the Jane Coston Cycle Bridge and the CNFE and also along any future bus priority routes - especially along the Chisholm Trail to connect to the future busway links under the A14.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
40	Good pedestrian/cycle links are required for all the surrounding areas such as Milton via Jane Coston Bridge, Chesterton via the sidings triangle, and Abbey and Fen Ditton via the planned Chisholm Trail river bridge.	Mr Maciej W Rozycki [5698]	
40	Support the need to maximise linkages to existing communities but insufficient detail to assess fully at this stage.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
40	Safeguard the old Network Rail (Lafarge) track on the south side of the First Public Drain as a dedicated cycle path to the station. It would be good to have more connections to the North and East of the area: a cycle tunnel under the A14 near the railway into Milton Country Park, and a level crossing link to Fen Road and onwards to the River Cam via Grassy Corner.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
40	<p>The element is crucial because it will be important to link the existing offices within the AAP with the proposed station. As set out above, TCE would like to see improved access between the new railway station and CBP. Potential pedestrian/cycle access options have previously been worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information. These options have then been shared with the occupiers at CBP who responded positively to the proposals. We would therefore like to see these options included within the next stage of the AAP.</p> <p>TCE broadly supports the principle of promoting sustainable transport and movement through the idea of improving permeability and access to key routes, although TCE object to public access and new walkways being provided through CBP as shown within development options 2-4. For security and health and safety reasons, the general public cannot have access to and through CBP.</p> <p>However, TCE would like to see improved pedestrian and cycle access between the new railway station and the CBP, for both the occupiers and their customers/visitors. This should be identified and supported in the AAP. Potential options for improving access from CBP to the Station have been previously worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
40	The element is crucial because it will be important to link the existing offices within the AAP with the proposed station. As set out above, TCE would like to see improved access between the new railway station and CBP. Potential pedestrian/cycle access options have previously been worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information. These options have then been shared with the occupiers at CBP who responded positively to the proposals. We would therefore like to see these options included within the next stage of the AAP.	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
40	I do not think this should go ahead unless as part of the scheme a cycle footway is provided on land Network Rail own along side Cowley Road (to the south of Cowley Road). The scheme needs a safe route for cyclists and pedestrians. The Cowley Road footpath as proposed would have the entrances across it.	Jane Coston [5715]	
Q41a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for Cowley Road, and why?			
41a	Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan polices related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
41a	We would be content to rely on Local Plan policies related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
41a	Reliance should be placed on statutory development plan policies as set out in Option A. Not to do so raises the danger of creating a specific and potentially more onerous policy framework for the CNFE which would be strongly objected to by St John's College assuming that their landholdings would fall within the Plan area.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
41a	I support Option B	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
41a	Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
41a	41.1 Option A relates to sustainable design and construction and floodrisk at the CNFE. It suggests that reliance be placed on Local Plan policies relating to climate change and sustainable design and construction. We support such an approach because Development Plan policies should guide development across the whole of the District. Creating a separate, more onerous policy regime compared is entirely inappropriate. This is particularly true if significant costs are involved in complying with more stringent policy guidance in the AAP 41.2 In our view, there should be no "special treatment" of sites within the CNFE; and if more onerous policies apply as legal obligations, then we object strongly to the St John's Innovation Park being included within the plan area.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
41a	Development should not be more expensive than elsewhere in the City. Should comply with policy which complies with NPPF or other national standards.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
41a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q41b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for Cowley Road, and why?			
41b	We support the proposal for redevelopment in the vicinity to be above the existing standards identified within the Local Plan policies. SuDS should also consider the improvement of water quality as a key feature.	Environment Agency (Mr Adam Ireland) [645]	
41b	We welcome proposals to develop policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design and construction. We advise that these should be worded to ensure benefits for the natural environment are maximised.	Natural England (Janet Nuttall) [1009]	
41b	Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan polices related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
41b	At present the proposal to develop a bespoke sustainable design and construction policy for CNFE through Option B seeks a minimum BREEAM standard of 'excellent' for all 'new non-residential development' under point (a). As 'new non-residential development' would include future mineral and waste applications, where operations can be designed without the need for a building, question whether a minimum standard of BREEAM excellent is relevant in these circumstances? As such we would recommend that point (a) is reworded to make reference to non-residential built development in the form of offices and industrial units etc. which excludes mineral and waste uses	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
41b	d. In view of the low-lying nature of this area and the flood map which shows very flood-prone areas just between here and the river, it is essential that SuDS do NOT discharge water into the ground. There are gravels under the wider area which have been extracted in places, and water runs under the railway and out at ground level on Chesterton Fen in places. As much rainwater as possible to be used on-site. I see no mention of stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
41b	This is the future so lets do it now.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
41b	Option B. Given the reputation of the adjoining Science Park and the likely employment uses within CNFE, it is considered that aspiring to high levels of sustainable design should be expected, although this may in itself be driven as much by occupier demand as policy.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
41b	Am very concerned that this is a Flood Zone 1 area and do wonder what can be done to alleviate this problem	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
41b	I think BREEAM is standard more should be working to.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
41b	It is vital that rainwater run-off is controlled and contained such that it does not seep through the underlying gravels to flood the residential and industrial properties on Fen Road to the east, which lie at a lower level. The groundwater is already very close to the surface on Fen Road and frequently floods.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
41b	Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
41b	Adds further onerous requirements to costs. Should comply with policy which complies with NPPF or other national standards.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
41b	Support exploration of bespoke policies for CNFE subject to viability.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
41b	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q41c. Do you have other policy option suggestions for sustainable design and construction and flood risk?			
41c	In summary, Turnstone considers that the AAP should simply rely on Local Plan Policies in the emerging Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (proposed submission), as these will have been subjected to independent scrutiny by the Local Plan Inspector. There is no basis that we can see as to why more exacting standards should be applied in the case of development within the CNFE area.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
41c	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
41c	I see no mention of stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
41c	Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
41c	d. In view of the low-lying nature of this area and the flood map which shows very flood-prone areas just between here and the river, it is essential that SuDS do NOT discharge water into the ground. There are gravels under the wider area which have been extracted in places, and water runs under the railway and out at ground level on Chesterton Fen in places. As much rainwater as possible to be used on-site. We see no mention of stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
41c	d. In view of the low-lying nature of this area and the flood map which shows very flood-prone areas just between here and the river, it is essential that SuDS do NOT discharge water into the ground. There are gravels under the wider area which have been extracted in places, and water runs under the railway and out at ground level on Chesterton Fen in places. As much rainwater as possible to be used on-site. We see no mention of stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
Q42. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on renewable and low carbon energy generation, and why? If you have other policy option suggestions for renewable and low carbon energy generation please add your suggestions.			
42	Turnstone considers that the principle of area based approach towards renewables and low carbon energy generation is worthy of further consideration. However, much will depend on the manner in which the CNFE development as a whole is delivered, by whom and over what timescale. There is no reason why the AAP should not reference the potential desirability of such an approach, however, it may be inappropriate to be overly prescriptive on this particular issue.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]
42	We welcome proposals to develop policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design and construction. We advise that these should be worded to ensure benefits for the natural environment are maximised.	Natural England (Janet Nuttall) [1009]	
42	The requirement for new waste management processing facilities to carry out a feasibility study for the potential for anaerobic digestion is onerous and inappropriate. The waste management uses proposed for this area through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan are a Household Recycling Centre (dealing with bulky household waste items) and a permanent inert waste recycling facility; neither of these facilities would be treating organic municipal waste. The only suitable location for anaerobic digestion would appear to be the Water Recycling Centre where sludge treatment works, involving the importation of sludge from elsewhere, is already in place.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
42	Some sort of CHP plant may be appropriate. 1.b.Municipal organic waste processing could be a very antisocial neighbour. Milton currently suffers from smells from putrified organic waste in landfill, and we would not wish this area to be a dumping ground for antisocial industrial processes - put these away from residential areas.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
42	It has to be done to protect the future	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
42	It is agreed that the CNFE may present opportunities for a site wide approach to renewable and low carbon generation. It may be that this is not completely site wide but it should certainly be considered for substantial areas, for example, combined heat and power plants. While phasing may be challenging in terms of capacity in the early stages, consideration to such provision should be made. With regard to waste processing facilities, further work in this respect would be supported.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
42	It would be irresponsible to ignore energy efficiency and generation with new buildings.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
42	This has to be done	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
42	These types of schemes need encouragement.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
42	I would not support anaerobic digestion facilities (option B) as these can be very smelly. I would support every building being roofed with having integral solar PV generation tiles, high quality insulation and double glazing.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
42	Developments should be required to meet the current Building Regulations standards at the point of delivering the development. The removal of the requirement to achieve a 10% reduction due to LZC's/passive solar design is however welcome. It would be useful to clarify what is meant by suitable LZC's for the area. All technologies should be technically and economically viable.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
42	Site wide provision of energy generation gives economies of scale, but needs careful consideration re technologies promoted to ensure no adverse impacts. Whilst anaerobic digester suggested for waste industries, such technologies must fit with surrounding uses.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
42	Support approach but object to anaerobic digestion in this location due to potential impacts on quality of new community and amenity.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
42	Some sort of CHP plant may be appropriate. 1.b.Municipal organic waste processing could be a very antisocial neighbour. Milton currently suffers from smells from putrefied organic waste in landfill, and we would not wish this area to be a dumping ground for antisocial industrial processes - put these away from residential areas.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	
42	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q43. Do you support or object to the proposed approach on Health Impact Assessments, and why?			
43	This approach is supported for residential and office / industrial built development; However, it would be prudent to require a Full Health Impact Assessment for all residential development given the mixed use of the area, especially if residential development is located in proximity to the Water Recycling Centre and / or aggregates railheads and other uses which have the potential to give rise to amenity issues. The requirement of requiring a health impact assessment is supported.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
43	Sensible and an example for the future.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
43	Support. The odour footprint needs to be updated following the recent investment in the Water Recycling Centre so that the information and odour zones are up to date.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
43	Should be implemented	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
43	The requirement for a Health Impact Assessment is overly onerous and is not currently required, or proposed to be required, by Cambridge City Council. The CNFE area is by its location and nature a part of Cambridge City and it is not considered necessary to introduce additional requirements for the production of HIA's in support of planning applications. The production of HIA's incurs additional costs/time which will not assist developers to efficiently deliver the necessary projects required to regenerate the CNFE area. Local Plan polices/EIA requirements already result in the provision of sufficient supporting information for planning applications.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
43	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
43	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q44. Are there alternative policy approaches or policy options you think we should have considered?			
44	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
44	No.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
44	No.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
44	Bramfields and Jersey Cudwell need to be protected	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
44	Brookgate consider that a redevelopment Option 2a, as submitted in answer to q14 of this consultation should be considered. Option 2a facilitates a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased Offices/RD provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. The land is utilised more efficiently, with a balanced mix of land uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable. The submitted plan provides further detail.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
Q45. Are there any other policy areas that need to be specifically addressed in the Area Action Plan rather than relying on the Local Plans?			
45	It is not considered the document adequately addresses the issues of formal open space provision for sport. It is considered that, depending on the number of residential units proposed, there will be a policy requirement to provide formal recreation space for outdoor sport to local policy standards. It is accepted that on a tight urban site such as this it may not be appropriate to provide such facilities on site, but provision should be made for suitable off-site provision to meet the need generated by the new residents of this area.	Sport England (Mr Philip Raiswell) [210]	
45	Turnstone does not consider that there is any need for the AAP to become an overly weighty document, but there would be justification for an Appendix which might list all of the policies in the adopted Local Plan (which is assumed it will be by that date), and to which regard will need to be had when individual applications are made for development within the CNFE area.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
45	Appendix 2 includes 'Cambridge WRC: Comparative Odour Potential Assessment 2014'. This should be removed from the AAP. It is not an appropriate guide to the encroachment risk posed by potential new development as it is based on indicative emissions rates for the type of processes that will be installed. Once the new plant is commissioned and actual emissions can be measured we will be able to model the odour impact with more certainty. The Odour Dispersion Modelling Report dated August 2012 is the only applicable evidence to inform the AAP on this issue.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
45	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
45	No.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
45	Phasing of development and the need to review the AAP should development not be meeting with market demands.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
45	No.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
45	No.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
45	The best practice design for cycling in new developments is fully outlined in Making Space for Cycling, a national guide which the Campaign was commissioned to write and which is backed by every national cycling advocacy organisation (see http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/). The Campaign hopes that the design principles outlined in this document can be incorporated into the planning process for the Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan.	Mr Tom McKeown [5643]	
45	Provision must be made for all Cambridge residents to be able to access the new station by public transport.	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
45	Yes. Consideration must be given to the PRS market and the contribution which it can make to the successful regeneration of the CNFE area. The Local Plans do not provide sufficient policy support for the provision of PRS and it is essential that the AAP recognises and addresses this shortfall. There is an ever increasing market demand for PRS and it will play a key role in meeting the housing shortfall in Cambridge City and the surrounding area. The CNFE area provides a unique and sustainable opportunity to accommodate PRS schemes and the AAP should reflect this.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
Q46. Do you support or object to the Councils' views on Infrastructure, and why?			
46	Turnstone considers that the Council's general approach to infrastructure is broadly sound, and recognises the possibility of the need for the relocation of the aggregates rail head and the retention of the Water Recycling Centre (WRC), at least in part. Turnstone however believes that, should scope exist, then a relocation of the aggregates rail head away from the CNFE area would be desirable, and should not be ruled out.	Turnstone Estates Limited [650]	Carter Jonas (Mr Colin Brown) [649]

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
46	<p>Recommend addition of 'waste infrastructure' for consistency with the approach set out within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD(2012) which highlights the importance of designing in waste infrastructure at the outset to support a sustainable community.</p> <p>Involve all elements of waste infrastructure and storage requirements for housing and businesses, right up to the Household Recycling Centre provision.</p> <p>Although Para 10.5 states that infrastructure provision will be funded through a number of sources, we are still concerned that the viability of some of the options is still unclear, which questions the delivery of some of the proposals. Further clarification needed.</p>	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
46	Proper investigation needed into the adequacy of water supply in general for new developments such of this has been determined. This seems to be the elephant in the room on a lot of wider regional development.	Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166]	
46	Sensible.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	
46	The statements contained in paragraphs 10.1-10.5 are benign and contain little to object to but considerable further assessment is required to understand the infrastructure requirements and identify viable and appropriately phased funding streams	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
46	The CNFE is a bounded by key routes into and around Cambridge. The scale of development proposed here could potentially put significant pressure on these key routes if the infrastructure is not right in terms of approach and/or timing. This could affect not just the CNFE but existing traffic as well and so impact the objective to keep traffic to existing levels...	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
46	The CNFE is a bounded by key routes into and around Cambridge. The scale of development proposed here could potentially put significant pressure on these key routes if the infrastructure is not right in terms of approach and/or timing. This could affect not just the CNFE but existing traffic as well and so impact the objective to keep traffic to existing levels...	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
46	A road bridge across the railway should link to Fen Road, or the planned foot/cycle bridge should be extended to Fen Road giving access for Fen Road residents.	Cllr Anna Bradnam [5656]	
46	The early stages of the delivery of any 'masterplanning' scheme generally has a higher burden of infrastructure costs. The cost of bringing sufficient utility infrastructure (gas, water, electricity, telecoms and drainage) to the service the site is likely to be significant in terms of on-site and off-site upgrading of pipelines, sub stations etc. The delivery of the AAP needs to minimise the upfront infrastructure costs (utilities, highways, remediation etc.) associated with the early phases of the build out of the CNFE. Failure to do this could affect the overall deliverability of the CNFE.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
46	Provided obligations clearly set out and explained to ensure parity across the site and city-wide.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
46	Requires a more specific approach in particular with regard to the WWTW consolidation or relocation to maximise opportunity.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
Q47a. Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on phasing and delivery approach, and why?			
47a	This option will create ad-hoc development picking the best development options for the early phase and leaving less viable options for later phases.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
47a	Option A is realistic as it accepts that development will come forward in the different areas of the CNFE at different times. This is particularly the case if Options 3 or 4 were pursued, both of which foresee major changes to the Water Recycling Centre. These options are dependent upon a viable financial arrangement being in place, and may take a considerable time to deliver.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
47a	The Council need to take ownership for the delivery of the AAP site and provide clear guidelines on how the necessary infrastructure will be funded and delivered.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
47a	I support Option B.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
47a	Brookgate agree the multiple ownership of the CNFE will result in phased development. The Chesterton Partnership can deliver CB4 at an early stage, allowing Phase 1 to constitute the largest possible area. The ability for individual phases to come forward with their own masterplan is supported, however requiring contributions to meet the needs of development at all stages of implementation is overly onerous.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
47a	More direct and provides clarity at early stage.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
47a	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
47a	Yes.	Silke Scheler [5712]	
Q47b. Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on phasing and delivery approach, and why?			
47b	Strongly supported by CambridgePPF. Good master planning will ensure that a high quality new quarter for the city is established, regenerating sub-sites and avoiding many mistakes at a later date. Best urban design practice is crucial to create a vibrant city and the value of 'participatory master planning' for larger development sites is well known.	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
47b	Option B may be difficult to deliver given that a developer of the early phases may not be aware of issues and constraints in areas they do not propose to develop, and therefore it may not be appropriate to propose detailed master planning proposals for other areas of the CNFE. In particular the reduction in size and enclosure of the Water Recycling Centre in Option 3 could take different forms and be located in different ways on the site depending on the constraints placed on the redevelopment by the inlet works and other technical aspects of the development.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
47b	We object to Option B since it suggests that there is a phasing plan in place and where the developer undertaking any development will have to provide a masterplan for the whole of the Plan area. This is unacceptable, in our view the AAP should provide the detailed development framework against which planning applications will be considered.	The Master Fellows and Scholars of the College of Saint John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge [2389]	Savills (Mr Garth Hanlon) [698]
47b	An integrated approach with all upfront design and finance agreed.	Management Process Systems Limited (Mr Des Downey) [5608]	

Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues Options Consultation

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
47b	The first planning application should not be overburdened with having to provide an entire masterplan. The Council need to ensure that all of landowners have been fairly and comprehensively consulted.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
47b	Good design and clear financial report necessary	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
47b	The scheme is more likely to happen if this approach is taken.	Coulson Building Group (Mr Philip James) [5654]	
47b	Requiring the first phase of development to provide a masterplan for the whole AAP area is overly onerous, hindering phase 1 deliverability and reducing flexibility. Phase 1 should demonstrate that it can integrate with future phases of development and policy should be flexible enough to facilitate this. The development framework should be provided within the AAP, with apportionment of infrastructure requirements identified.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
47b	47.1 Option B on phasing and delivery approach set out in the Issues and Options Report implies that any planning application for the first phase of development will need to provide a Masterplan for the whole of the AAP area. It is unclear where the first phase of development will take place and we have seen nothing in the plan as published for consultation that suggests a phased approach to the development. The redevelopment options are not phasing plans and therefore it is difficult to understand why a developer of any area of land within the Plan should be made responsible for providing a Masterplan for the whole of the area. The AAP as drafted and set out in Option A on page 68 of the report should provide the principles for a development framework against which a specific phase of redevelopment can come forward as part of its own individual, detailed planning application. We object to the onus placed on the first developer to set out a Masterplan for the whole of the CNFE as it is entirely unreasonable.	St John's Innovation Centre (Mr David Gill) [5672]	
47b	More drawn out process - abrogates framework to potential private developer, may result in amendments to AAP.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
47b	Could severely impact on delivery of vision and objectives for the CNFE.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q48. Do you have any comments on Plan Monitoring?			
48	No comment	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
48	The MOD has no objections to the proposed Area Action Plan. However, it is important to recognise that the proposed site is encompassed by the statutory safeguarding aerodrome height consultation plan. The main concern of the MOD is to ensure tall structures do not disrupt or inhibit air traffic operations on site. On reviewing the proposed Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan, the proposed area falls within the 15.2m height consultation zone. This means no development should exceed 15.2m. This office requests to be kept informed of any proposed applications within this area for review.	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MRS LOUISE DALE) [5616]	
48	Monitoring needs to be quantifiable. Monitoring policies should be developed that clearly show whether the AAP is delivering on its objectives and meeting with the City's needs. The monitoring needs to be firm that failure to meet realistic targets within defined timescales will result in other development options being considered.	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
48	No	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
48	No further comment.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
48	Successful measuring will depend on the use of appropriate, realistic and measurable indicators. Data must be collectable.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
48	No additional comment	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
Q49. Do you have any other comments about the CNFE area and/or Area Action Plan? If you wish to make suggestions, please provide your comments.			
49	<p>CNFEA redevelopment is highly important for long term growth of Cambridge. Report provides useful exposition of constraints/ opportunities influencing form/ extent/ pace of redevelopment.</p> <p>Fragmented ownerships/ multitude of occupiers absolutely necessitate that interests are aligned behind common strategy.</p> <p>Lead developer/development agency is essential to co-ordinate comprehensive masterplan approach (backed by statutory plan) and increases viability.</p> <p>Clearly both future location/ operations of Anglian Water and extensive land holdings of Network Rail are fundamental - impacting development potential.</p> <p>Critical that area around new railway station is developed - with excellent access - in accordance with a master plan (avoiding prejudicing wider regeneration).</p>	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	
49	Appendix 2 includes 'Cambridge WRC: Comparative Odour Potential Assessment 2014'. This should be removed from the AAP. It is not an appropriate guide to the encroachment risk posed by potential new development as it is based on indicative emissions rates for the type of processes that will be installed. Once the new plant is commissioned and actual emissions can be measured we will be able to model the odour impact with more certainty. The Odour Dispersion Modelling Report dated August 2012 is the only applicable evidence to inform the AAP on this issue.	Anglian Water (Sue Bull) [1288]	
49	Viability calculations will need to factor in the very real transport challenges as well as those associated with redesigned/relocated water recycling works.	Cambridgeshire County Council (Miss Sinead O Donoghue) [1554]	
49	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Serious public money needs to be invested. 2. Inaccessible location 3. Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential 4. Power line would need to be removed. 5. Relocation of stagecoach needed. 6. New station could increase traffic. 7. Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area. 8. Transport links would need to be improved. 	Dr Anthony J Cooper [1885]	
49	If a left-turn-off left-turn-on route is made South of the A14 west of the railway for lorries taking aggregate to the A14 works, then this road should continue beside the A14 to join with Cowley Road as a dedicated access for heavy lorries headed towards Cambridge, so they avoid the interchange. This could later become a local road parallel with the A14 between here and Fen Ditton junction, with access into Fen Road from the A14 end.	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	

**Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Issues Options Consultation**

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
49	<p>In Chapter 5, I wanted to comment that I am concerned that an aggregates depot, loading lorries for the A14 improvement work, may cause unnecessarily loud noise for residents of both Chesterton Fen and Milton if the loading is at a level higher than the natural ground level. Whilst I approve of this work being done in a way that does not impact on the traffic on Milton Road, it must not be allowed to impact on people's amenity.</p> <p>If a left-turn-off left-turn-on route is made South of the A14 west of the railway for lorries taking aggregate to the A14 works, then this road should continue beside the A14 to join with Cowley Road as a dedicated access for heavy lorries headed towards Cambridge, so they avoid the interchange. This could later become a local road parallel with the A14 between here and Fen Ditton junction, with access into Fen Road from the A14 end.</p>	Cllr Hazel Smith [2300]	
49	The most important point from my point of view is that the sewage works should not be moved to some other site, both for reasons of existing investment in sewage infrastructure, and in order not to destroy some other site.	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	
49	<p>We are concerned that while the area has some potential the existing land uses and those which are proposed are generally incompatible with no obviously satisfactory solution.</p> <p>The delivery of essential infrastructure to make any of the options proposed sustainable in transportation terms is in doubt.</p> <p>If the AAP progresses with a large amount of office / R&D allocation and does not deliver its intended outcome or cannot be brought forward quickly to meet with unexpected demand then it will have failed the local and national economy and will mask the true supply level for employment floorspace.</p>	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]	CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Ian Reilly) [5633]
49	The site must be viewed as one comprehensive scheme, carefully planned and phased, with opportunities taken to maximise the capacity of the site but in a sustainable way. Much of the phasing and works will be market driven as and when demand is available and there needs to flexibility to recognise this. This should, however, reflect a medium to long term view, not short term. The transport strategy is a key part of this. Piecemeal and incremental infrastructure improvement should be avoided to bring the whole site forward in a timely and cohesive way.	Cambridge City Council (Mr Dave Prinsep) [5635]	
49	I'm unsure if this is mentioned in the document but the area between the rail line and the river should also be considered for re-development. This is potentially the best land left in Cambridge to redevelop and shouldnt be ignored.	Mr Stephen Hills [5642]	
49	No	Mrs Sasha Wilson [5651]	
49	Early delivery of the re-development of the area around the new station is essential. It is fundamental to City wide masterplanning that the authorities encourage gateway sites to be delivered at the earliest possible opportunity, to enable the rest of the masterplan to be delivered. Creating this 'front door' is of the utmost importance, without which the successful re-development of the CNFE area cannot be achieved.	Brookgate [5666]	Bidwells (Mr Tim Havers) [5665]
49	The important issue not mentioned in the document is the possible provision of a bridge over the railway linking to Fen Road. This would be a big improvement over the current access through Chesterton, and would allow the closure of the Fen Road level crossing. Although development of Fen Road should not be part of the CNFE plan, an improved access is extremely important for Fen Road's future, and it must be considered at the same time because of the amount of land any new access would require.	Mr David Collier [5680]	
49	<p>There is a lot of information without clear diagrams explaining the objectives. The four key strategy plans do not visually indicate what the key drivers for development are, or what the wider benefits to the community would be e.g. a new public square, new affordable housing, new connections through the site and beyond. This is embedded in the text, but should be illustrated.</p> <p>The online commenting procedure is confusing. Some of the questions are direct, some are very open ended - this results in confusion about appropriateness of comments generally.</p>	Cambridge Association of Architects (Miss February Phillips) [5682]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
49	The proposed development of the CNFE is generally supported and the opportunity to comment is welcomed. Comments have been made to ensure clear references are made on the opportunities to link CNFE area with Waterbeach New Town.	Urban&Civic Ltd [5688]	David Lock Associates (Mr Darren Bell) [5687]
49	Yes, see attached. 1. The Household Recycling Centre is not supported. 2. All options lead to increased traffic in Cowley Road. 3. Previous investigations have failed to find an alternative site for the Waste Water Recycling Centre, further investigation needs to take place.	Orchard Street Investment Management LLP [5690]	Beacon Planning (Charlotte Burton) [1506]
49	Area is blighted by physical severance caused by infrastructure; this fragmentation needs to be overcome. Existing environmental constraints need to be converted into opportunities. Including a strong edge to the city in order to buffer the A14; Site should achieving sufficient critical mass to relocate WWTW and provide access to, and mutual support for high-quality landscapes around it including the river meadows and Milton Country Park. Public transport accessibility must be central to the site. A comprehensive plan for a network of streets of appropriate character should ensure that existing bottlenecks on Milton Road do not constrain development.	Grosvenor Developments Limited [5701]	AECOM (Mr Paul Comerford) [5700]
49	The impact of the proposed transport interchange and the development of residential and commercial property on neighbouring villages has not been assessed. However there is a real potential cost to the neighbouring villages in terms of road usage and congestion as the CNFE development proposed will have a significant adverse effect in congestion, pollution and general loss of amenity. The plans need to be extended to include provision for better public transport and roads within a semi circular radius of 10 miles from west to East adjoining the CNFE site.	Cottenham Parish Council (Jo Brook) [5703]	
49	In Chapter 5, we wanted to comment that we are concerned that an aggregates depot, loading lorries for the A14 improvement work, may cause unnecessarily loud noise for residents of both Chesterton Fen and Milton if the loading is at a level higher than the natural ground level. Whilst we approve of this work being done in a way that does not impact on the traffic on Milton Road, it mustn't be allowed to impact on people's amenity. If a left-turn-off left-turn-on route is made west of the railway then it should continue beside the A14 to join Cowley Road.	Milton Parish Council (Gemma Faulkner) [5709]	

QUESTION NO.	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	RESPONDENT	AGENT
49	<p>The draft AAP is broadly supported by TCE, subject to the two main concerns set out within these representations being addressed.</p> <p>Firstly, clarification must be provided with regards to the employment uses which will be encouraged on the site. As set out under 'vision' above, we would like to see a greater emphasis on the area being developed further as an internationally recognised business, research and development cluster, as per the existing character of this part of Cambridge. This must not be diluted by the AAP.</p> <p>Secondly, we have significant concerns regarding the traffic and movement principles set out within the AAP which have been developed without an understanding of the baseline position for the area. The traffic modelling and sensitivity testing which has been identified as necessary must be undertaken to establish the baseline position for the development of the area. Until this modelling has been undertaken, TCE are of the view that the AAP should not be further progressed.</p> <p>Lastly, it is essential that the AAP ensures mechanisms to ensure that the new station is effectively linked to the existing businesses within the AAP area, including CBP; however, there should be no public access through CBP.</p>	Indigo Planning Ltd (Alice May) [5710]	
Sustainability Appraisal			
	Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through the middle of my property. With the planned expansion of public transport as part of the City Deal, how do you propose we achieve this without a bus depot? If we are to be relocated who pays for the building for the new bus depot?	Stagecoach (Andy Campbell) [5623]	