



# **Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Annex A**

## **Appendix 4: Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge**

**Issues and Options 2: Part 1  
Summary of Representations and Response to Key  
Issues**



## Chapter 7

Representation 24804 (Beacon Planning) in relation to paragraph 7.13 sought a release of land south of Huntingdon Road, in Girton from the green belt. As a result of the North West Cambridge and NIAB development sites, the remaining area of Green Belt no longer performs the functions of Green Belt as identified in the NPPF and the boundary should be amended to take account of this. The Girton Gap creates a clear break between Cambridge and Girton respectively. The openness of this land provides an effective buffer to check the unrestricted sprawl of the city. The residential properties and their curtilages do not perform this same role

### Key Issues and Officer Response:

Another representation from Beacon Planning number 55110 also sought to include the same land within the development framework boundary of Girton. See the response to that representation in Appendix 1: Evidence Paper for Village Frameworks (June 2013).

## Chapter 9

### Site Options

<b>Para Number: 9.1</b>		
<b>Total representations: 3</b>		
<b>Object<sup>1</sup>: 3</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>

	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erosion of the Green Belt will impact on countryside</li> <li>Commercial Estates Group- technical assessment did not take into account submissions to previous consultation or benefits BL7 could provide with new employment land and self sustaining services and facilities</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
<b>Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
<b>Representations: total 3; Object 3 Support 0 Comment 0</b> <b>Key Issues:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt</li> </ol>

<sup>1</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

- a. The site options being considered for release from the Green Belt do not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes
- ii. Assessment Omissions
  - a. The assessment process is robust and appropriate to the Cambridge context and has been consistently applied to all sites. The previous consultations on the SHLAA and Issues and Options were responded to separately. It is acknowledged that a development of the size proposed by the objector could self sustain itself in services and facilities but the assessment methodology had to take other factors into account in particular impact on Green Belt.

<b>Para Number: 9.2</b>		
<b>Total representations: 3</b>		
<b>Object<sup>1</sup>: 3</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>

<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on setting of City</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Commercial Estates Group-Criteria used in Council proforma are landscape issues and not relevant to purposes of Green Belt; and assessment doesn't take into account the CEG master plan</li> <li>• It is not clear how Level 1 and Level 2 conclusions were arrived at</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
<p><b>Representations: total 3; Object 3 Support 0 Comment 0</b></p> <p><b>Key Issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Impact on setting of City           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provided development was kept to 2 storeys and appropriate landscape buffer areas are provided the impact of the proposed Green Belt releases on setting would be minor.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Loss Of Green Belt           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Having thoroughly studied the Inner Green Belt boundary the 2012 Green Belt Review found a limited number of small sites which were of lesser importance to Green Belt purposes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. Green Belt Assessment criteria.</li> </ul>

- a. The criteria provide an objective method of analysis of all sites. The Green Belt criteria were based upon the role of Green Belts as set out in the NPPF and the purpose and functions of Green Belt as set out in both Council's Local Plans. SCDC adopted Core Strategy gives guidance on the criteria to be used in future Green Belt Reviews.
- b. The methodology was explained in a separate report to members and was devised in conjunction with Sustainability Appraisal consultants and Cambridge City Council. A range of officers internal and external inputted depending on their expertise. Planning judgement was used to reach conclusions based on the agreed methodology.

<b>Para Number: 9.3</b>		
<b>Total representations: 1</b>		
<b>Object<sup>2</sup>: 1</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>

<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>	
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial Estates Group-unclear how assessment scores have been aggregated e.g. Green Belt 11 factors into one.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
<b>Representations: total 1; Object 1 Support 0 Comment 0</b> <b>Key Issues:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Assessment scoring aggregation           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The red scores at level 1 strategic considerations were more likely to result in a site being knocked out in the overall conclusions having regard to any scope for mitigation. Green Belt impact was a key determinant in the overall conclusions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Para Number: 9.4</b>		
<b>Total representations: 3</b>		
<b>Object<sup>3</sup>: 3</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>

<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
---

<sup>2</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule  
<sup>3</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt and precedent it creates</li> <li>• Traffic issues Babraham Road</li> <li>• Guided busway not shown on map 2</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>

### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

**Representations: total 3; Object 3 Support 0 Comment 0**

**Key Issues:**

- i. Traffic Issues
  - a. County Transport Strategy will address broader issues of congestion and have regard to existing and future infrastructure. It is being prepared in tandem with Local Plan.
- ii. Green Belt
  - a. Having thoroughly studied the Inner Green Belt boundary the 2012 Green Belt Review found a limited number of small sites which were of lesser importance to Green Belt purposes, and where the impact of the proposed Green Belt releases on setting would be minor.
- iii. Map 2
  - a. The Local Plan will include maps to identify site allocations, consideration will be given to inclusion of the Guided Busway.

**Question 2:**

**Total representations: 181**

**Object<sup>4</sup>: 95**

**Support: 14**

**Comment: 72**

**KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION**

<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rustat Road Residents Association-Views from Gogs and Beechwoods harmed by GB1 and GB2 but do not object to GB3, GB4 and GB5</li> <li>• The Wildlife Trust BCN- objections to sites GB1, GB2, and GB3 on ecology grounds and impact on achieving Strategic Green Infrastructure Strategy. See below against these sites.</li> <li>• CPRE-Will erode attractive countryside leading to Gogs which form important part of setting of City</li> <li>• Impact on views</li> <li>• Cherry Hinton Rd Rathmore Road RA-Object to</li> </ul>
-------------------	---

<sup>4</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

	<p>GB1 GB2 and GB5 loss of precious landscape Robert MacFarlane’s “Wild Places”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newtown RA object to GB1-GB2 as will lead to sprawl and worsen congestion. No objection to GB3-4. Mixed views on GB5 sprawl, visual impact. No objection GB6</li> <li>• I&amp;O Working Group Windsor Road RA-Relieved GB6 smaller than BL10 but too close to Histon Road. Object to use of Green Belt but if justifiable others are least bad options</li> <li>• PSRA Committee-Protect Green Belt presumption its available destroys its purpose. Oppose GB6</li> <li>• Trumpington RA-Oppose GB1 and GB2 as will increase urbanisation of this entrance to City adding to pressure on services and congestion in southern fringe.</li> <li>• Cambridge Past Present and Future- Object to GB1, GB2 GB3 and GB6. No “special circumstances” have been put forward to warrant building houses in the Green Belt. They reserve judgement on GB4 and GB5 and would like the Councils to make the case that they do constitute “special circumstances” for providing more employment.</li> <li>• Nineteen Acre Field RA-Site GB6 has significant environmental issues. The technical assessment offers no mitigation of red scores.</li> <li>• St Johns College-Concern at approach to resist Green Belt releases in absence of objectively assessed needs and GL Hearn submission in relation to Q1 which suggests more housing is needed than that currently proposed by the Councils</li> <li>• Barratt Eastern Counties and NW Cambridge Consortium- NIAB 3/Darwin Green 3 boundary is incorrect see plan attached to rep 22639</li> <li>• Barton Road Land Owners Group-Green Belt boundary that would result from these sites would not deliver the long term clearly defined boundary required in the NPPF. Boundaries do not follow the guidance and will not deliver the quantum of development needed to deliver sustainable development.</li> <li>• Cambridgeshire County Council-Additional development at GB1 and GB2 and R15 Glebe Farm exacerbates an unsustainable situation in relation to waste management which is a</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>strategic priority in the NPPF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Anthony Orgee-Opposes all site options. GB3 and GB4 have access issues</li> <li>• Taylor Family and Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd-No further growth of any significance can be accommodated on edge of City. SCDC will have to take the burden and Bourn Airfield represents best option in terms of balance jobs and homes.</li> <li>• Oppose any development in Green Belt at Stapleford</li> <li>• Use smaller sites in villages. Its up to parish councils to come up with sites</li> <li>• Netherhall Farm could become an educational resource (urban farm)</li> <li>• Impact on bee population</li> <li>• Green Belt must be protected to prevent urban sprawl towards and compromising the character of necklace villages</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt creates a precedent</li> <li>• Area around Gogs has great historical interest and natural beauty and should be protected.</li> <li>• Recreational value of Gogs area to walkers, cyclists joggers</li> <li>• Impact on quality of life if use Green Belt</li> <li>• There is identifiable harm to Green Belt purposes by all sites put forward</li> <li>• The NPPF provides for Green Belt boundaries to be changed only in exceptional circumstances</li> <li>• Housing and economy don't require exceptional circumstances. 95% of City's 14,000 projected housing need met by consents allocations and SHLAA sites</li> <li>• Not worth going into Green Belt for such a small number of sites</li> <li>• Infrastructure pressures.</li> <li>• Road not built for heavy traffic. Capacity safety width of local roads</li> <li>• Congestion on southern approaches to City in rush hour and access to Addenbrooke's.</li> <li>• Pressure on local road network roads narrow</li> <li>• Ecological impacts on rare species who thrive on existing enclosed farmland, reduced resistance to pests and impact on UK agricultural policy</li> <li>• Density will preclude providing amenities on site causing residents to jump into cars</li> <li>• Commuter parking pressures from Addenbrooke's</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other good alternatives exist to meet targets including infill in villages, opportunity at Bourn Airfield, Northstowe, Cambourne, Waterbeach and on other sites on southern fringe.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richmond Road RA-Support for housing provided avoid the AQMA area and use latter for employment.</li> <li>• Commercial Estates Group support GB1, GB2, GB3, GB4 and GB5 but consider a larger area within BL7 could be considered.</li> <li>• As will help meet demand for affordable homes</li> <li>• Small size and location will have negligible impact on Green Belt and will help meet housing needs</li> <li>• Housing need given other committed developments</li> <li>• Sites are accessible by public transport and bicycle</li> <li>• Support GB1-GB3 for residential and GB4, GB5, and GB6 for employment</li> <li>• Sites are close to employment and services</li> <li>• Add to outside boundary of Green Belt to compensate</li> </ul>
<b>Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage-Impact on setting of BLI's on GB1; GB1 should be developed before GB2 is commenced. Plan for appropriate treatment of eastern boundary. GB3 and GB4 are modest and align with technology park. Treat southern boundary carefully. GB5 impacts on Green Belt and Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. GB6 won't harm setting of Cambridge and can allow for robust landscape corridor. CS1 Abbey Stadium preferred option on grounds of not damaging the integrity of the Green Belt. Are cautious about Green Belt removal but at least work undertaken has identified those sites having least impact on Green Belt and setting</li> <li>• Boyer Planning-Green Belt release is not sequentially preferred to Denny St Francis proposal. All cause harm particularly GB6</li> <li>• Comberton Parish Council-Welcome fact that some of plans to develop on green belt have been dropped.</li> <li>• Teversham Parish Council-Concerned over impact of GB1-GB5 on local nature reserves and sprawl damaging setting of City. GB3-GB5 of most concern because of dangers to cyclists and pedestrians and traffic congestion on busy narrow roads.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Gail Kenny-Opposes GB1-GB6. Are access issues with GB3 and GB4</li> <li>• Orwell Parish Council-Develop brownfield sites first. Keep GB3-GB5 for employment. GB6 not suited to housing</li> <li>• Foxton Parish Council-Emphasis should be on new settlements rather than edge of Cambridge</li> <li>• Chesterford Parish Council-recognise need for practical housing strategy. Congestion on southern approach routes needs tackling.</li> <li>• Dry Drayton Parish Council-Don't object to Bourn Airfield and welcome the initiative for initiating community led plans</li> <li>• Given concentration of over 30 villages feeding onto the B1049 and A1307 Milton Rd and Madingley Rd P&amp;R sites are not accessible to these villages</li> <li>• All sites lend themselves to expansion. A14 and M11 provide barrier to future expansion</li> <li>• Green Belt should be last resort</li> <li>• Create more green space rather than houses</li> <li>• We must have green 'soft edges' to avoid sprawl</li> <li>• Infrastructure pressures</li> <li>• Don't believe boundary will be long term</li> <li>• Emphasis should be on brownfield land and new settlements</li> <li>• Sites will not deliver quantum of development needed</li> <li>• Sufficient provision has already been made</li> <li>• Impact on commuting routes into Cambridge from the south</li> <li>• Sites offer sustainable employment locations but do research companies need so many employees</li> <li>• Don't object to any of these as provide good access to employment. Favour GB3-5 and GB6 as integrated transport important (guided bus)</li> <li>• GB6 should be developed for employment</li> <li>• Keep green space between NIAB 3 and A14</li> </ul>
--	--

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

**Representations: total 3; Object 95 Support 14 Comment 72 The question elicited a significant number of objections and comments**  
**Key Issues:**

- i. Impact of GB1 and GB2 on views from Gogs and Beechwoods
  - a. This can be mitigated by buffer planting on the eastern edge of these sites to soften the existing hard urban edge

- ii. Impact on green infrastructure and biodiversity
  - a. Development can help to open up more permissive paths and enhance access to the countryside through S106 contributions
- iii. Setting of the City
  - a. The setting of the City could be mitigated if development of Sites GB1 and GB2 were restricted to two storeys and include landscape buffer areas
- iv. GB1 and GB2 will lead to sprawl and urbanisation
  - a. The boundary suggested would form a long-term boundary with planting on its eastern side to create a soft green edge and prevent development creeping up the hill.
- v. Development will worsen congestion
  - a. County Transport Strategy will address broader issues of congestion and have regard to existing and future infrastructure. It is being prepared in tandem with Local Plan
- vi. GB6 is too close to Histon Road
  - a. The site option assumes the retention of hedges and woodland and a set back of the development from Histon Road and the A14 to provide effective separation between Cambridge and Impington.
- vii. GB1 and GB2 will add to pressure on services
  - a. This can be addressed through planning contributions and design
- viii. No “special circumstances” to warrant building houses in the green belt
  - a. The NPPF provides for Green Belts to be revised by Local plans. The current boundary was established in 2002 and was expected to endure until 2016 and beyond. However circumstances change and major development at Cambridge East will no longer be deliverable for the foreseeable future. Good progress is being made with the current strategy with the exception of Cambridge East but insufficient land has been found within the urban area of Cambridge to meet identified objectively assessed needs. The NPPF requires that Green Belt boundaries are established in Local Plans, that the boundaries can endure beyond the end of the plan period (2031) and that consideration is given to the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the inner Green Belt boundary, towards villages within the Green Belt and towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.

The LPA's have taken and will continue to take a sequential sustainable approach to the location of growth using City brownfield land first before considering land on the edge of Cambridge (including land in the Green Belt), in new settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and then in the most sustainable villages. A joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary has established that there is no scope for major Green Belt releases without there being very significant detriment to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The review did identify several small sites, which could be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge where the detriment would be limited in nature and scope. This finding together with the guidance in the NPPF concerning sustainability and the need to establish a durable Green Belt boundary provides justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development.

- ix. Technical assessment of GB6 offers no mitigation on red scores for environmental issues.
  - a. The assessment methodology allows for mitigation to be taken into account where appropriate.
- x. Absence of objectively assessed needs and submission by GL Hearn on behalf St Johns
  - a. The Local Plans will meet objectively assessed needs now that the SHMA update process has been completed.
- xi. Darwin Green 3 boundary is wrong
  - a. The boundary will be reviewed and corrected as necessary
- xii. Green Belt boundaries along Barton Road are not clearly defined as required by the NPPF nor will they deliver the quantum of development needed
  - a. The boundaries are long established, are clear and the Local Plans will provide for objectively assessed needs.
- xiii. Sites on southern fringe including GB1 and GB2 exacerbate position on waste management which is strategic priority in NPPF
  - a. Disagree that GB1 and GB2 will have a significant impact on waste management issues.
- xiv. Bourn Airfield represents best option in terms of balance of jobs and homes
  - a. Noted
- xv. Use smaller sites in villages. Parishes can come up with sites
  - a. Noted
- xvi. Risks of urban sprawl compromising character of necklace villages.

- a. The new Green Belt boundary proposed on the edge of sites GB1-GB4 will serve to prevent further built development from encroaching on the surrounding necklace villages, key landscape, and historic features beyond the edge. The Council disagrees given the distance that there is any risk of coalescence with nearby villages. The scale and location of site GB5 together with a requirement for a landscape buffer will effectively mitigate any appearance of urban encroachment between Cambridge and Fulbourn. The GB6 site option assumes the retention of hedges and woodland and a set back of the development from Histon Road and the A14 to provide effective separation between Cambridge and Impington.
  
- xvii. Area around Gogs has historical interest and natural beauty which should be protected.
  - a. Agree but the development proposed is some distance from the Gogs and not likely to encroach upon them.
  
- xviii. Importance of recreational value of Gogs area to walkers cyclists and joggers
  - a. Noted. There is scope to enhance the recreational value of the area by the Green Infrastructure Strategy and by sensitive alterations to Worts Causeway to strengthen the country lane feel by additional through traffic restrictions in conjunction with the development of GB1 and GB2
  
- xix. Impact on quality of life if use Green Belt
  - a. Noted but land areas involved are small and are unlikely to have this effect
  
- xx. Identifiable harm to Green Belt purposes from all sites put forward
  - a. Disagree. The sites put forward have minimal impact on Green Belt purposes as explained in the assessments.
  
- xxi. 95% of the 14,000 projected housing need is met by commitments and SHLAA sites
  - a. Reference to the Cambridge SHLAA shows that these sites only just make up the land supply to meet identified need
  
- xxii. Capacity width and safety of local roads around GB1, GB2, GB3, GB4 and GB5 for drivers walkers and cyclists
  - a. There is scope to strengthen the country lane feel of Worts' Causeway by additional through traffic restrictions in conjunction with the development of GB1 and GB2.
  
- xxiii. Biodiversity pressures on sites and nature reserves
  - a. This can be sensitively managed in relation to each site to restrict access, minimise harm and create wildlife routes to open countryside.

- xxiv. Density on sites will preclude providing amenities and force residents to jump into cars.
  - a. Noted. Planning and design measures will be used to mitigate this adverse impact
  
- xxv. Other good alternatives exist in infill villages at Bourn, Northstowe, Cambourne, Waterbeach, and on other sites on the southern fringe. Emphasis should be on brownfield land and new settlements.
  - a. Development in such locations would be in less sustainable locations than development on the Cambridge edge where a review of the Green Belt has concluded that some land could be released with limited detriment to Green Belt purposes. In addition the development of new settlements has a very long lead in time of 8-10 years, can be dependent on major infrastructure delivery and so will not be completed by the end of the plan period in 2031.
  
- xxvi. Ensure appropriate boundary planting
  - a. Noted. These will be required to integrate with existing communities and strengthen the quality of the urban edge.
  
- xxvii. GB5 impacts upon Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area
  - a. Any impacts would be limited in scope and nature
  
- xxviii. More land should be allocated development at BL7
  - a. The Councils have carefully assessed the scope for development at BL7 and identified areas which can be released for development with limited impact on Green Belt purposes.
  
- xxix. GB4 GB5 and GB6 should be developed as sustainable employment locations
  - a. Noted
  
- xxx. All sites lend them selves to expansion.A14 and M11 provide long term barrier
  - a. Noted but it would not be desirable to develop up to these for green belt, landscape and environmental reasons.
  
- xxxi. Keep more green space between NIAB 3 and the A14
  - a. Land will be kept green because no development will be permitted within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)

**Question 3:**

**Total representations: 57**

**Object<sup>5</sup>: 14**

**Support: 31**

**Comment: 12**

<sup>5</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St John’s College-rejects the Council’s assessment of Grange Farm site in the light of the need to address objectively assessed needs, the scale and character of the site having regard to its sustainable location on the edge of Cambridge. The College’s vision is to develop the eastern part of the site and provide significant open space to the west. They therefore do not accept there would be any impact on coalescence. Dominant features in this area include the West Cambridge Site, which has changed the character of the area and forms an abrupt edge. There are two green corridors into west Cambridge but this northern one is bounded by modern development on the West Cambridge site. Vehicular access could be gained from Clerk Maxwell Road. Council is pre-empting the results of technical studies of air quality near the M11.</li> <li>• Barratt Eastern Counties and NW Cambridge Consortium- NIAB 3/Darwin Green 3 boundary is incorrect see plan attached to rep 22639</li> <li>• Barton Road Land Owners Group-believe land north and south of Barton Rd should be released for development in accordance with principles in the concept Master Plan. A strategy of dispersal is unsustainable. The scale of affordable housing need and the need to support the economy justify releasing more land on the edge of Cambridge to support the University and Colleges and research institutions in a sustainable location. Evidence to reject the sites was not robust. A number of supporting technical documents supported reps at Issues and Options Stage which have informed the production of a concept Master Plan to provide 1500 dwellings a small science park, local centre, a school, relocated sports pitches for colleges, green infrastructure and access roads. There are process issues in the timing of decisions to reject sites while the quantum of development has not been finalised which is procedurally unsound. GL Hearn’s Housing Requirements Study for BRLOG concludes an objectively assessed housing requirement would require 43,800-46,000 homes 2011-2031. 19,000 in Cambridge and</li> </ul>

	<p>25,300 in SCDC. Experience with Rushcliffe Core Strategy and elsewhere highlights importance of an up to date SHMA in identifying housing need. The need for a long term supply of land was highlighted in examination of Dacorum's Core Strategy. The Structure Plan Green Belt releases were only meant to provide land to 2016. Sites shouldn't have been assessed before the quantum of land needed is identified. If Cambridge East does not come forward in the plan period alternative locations should be considered. The Green Belt is tightly drawn and doesn't allow for any safeguarded land to meet longer term needs. The approach taken is not justified in line with PAS guidance.in relation to a credible evidence base, consideration of reasonable alternatives, and how they perform. The evidence used to reject the site is not robust, and the proposed strategy is not justified and is likely to be found unsound unless early and material changes are made. The decision to reject the site also not legally compliant on basis that reps made to Issues and Options One have been ignored (Regulation 18(3) of 2012 Regs) given they promoted a reasonable alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial Estates Group-The summary assessment of BL7, land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road is flawed as it did not take into account the detailed submissions to a previous consultation in particular the scope for the development to provide self sustaining services. No overarching SA has been undertaken to look at the implications of the current development strategy before considering any departure. The assessment of impact against the Air Safeguarding Zone is flawed in that it represents a consultation zone with airport authorities. The site has been classified as not having access to high quality public transport even though it is close to the park and ride and has poor cycle access. The assessment of Green Belt in Chapter 7 is skewed in significance of the contribution BL7 makes to green belt purposes.</li> <li>• Cambridge South Consortium-The consultation document is not sound as it is not based on objectively assessed needs, the draft plan is not justified –fundamental background technical work has not been carried out. The draft plan is</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>not the most appropriate strategy-there has been no strategic assessment of development on the edge of Cambridge. Joint working has not addressed cross boundary delivery of housing and employment. The draft plan is not consistent with national policy. BL5, land south of Addenbrooke's Road has been incorrectly assessed as a housing site despite reps to both council's as part of Issues and Options One for an employment led scheme comprising a 45ha science park and 1,250 homes. This would have led to a better scoring of the site. The green belt and SA assessment included criteria such as views green corridors and soft green edges which are not relevant to SA and has resulted in double counting. They have commented further in the Green Belt Critique and Critique of Interim SA. The allocation for and employment led mixed use scheme will have a number of benefits. City can be expanded in a sustainable way, access to good public transport, employment, rail station, Addenbrooke's. It would not harm the Green Belt. It would create jobs and benefit the economy, provide 1250 homes including 500 affordable homes to meet ongoing needs beyond 2021. Provide a new focus of R&amp;D development to the south related to a new sustainable community. Would meet all NPPF sustainability objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MCA Developments Ltd-have no objection to a new Community Stadium at Bourn Airfield provided it is commercially viable in its own right and is not used as catalyst for a large scale housing allocation on an unsustainable site.</li> <li>• Carter Jonas (4412) and the Quy Estate (2918)- Object to the rejection of BL9, land at Fen Ditton. It is an appropriate location is suitable viable and deliverable. The Council has underestimated the opportunity provided by the Science Park Station and Chisholm Trail. Inner Green Belt Review has not taken into account that this development will keep a green wedge between the development and the A14. Development by Marshall north of Newmarket Rd will fall short of anticipated delivery. It would redress the growth imbalance between SW Cambridge and NE Cambridge.</li> <li>• Quy Estate-Object to the rejection of BL9 as it is an appropriate location</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce traffic on Worts Causeway by only developing half of GB2 and access it from the Park and Ride safeguarding the permissive right of way</li> <li>• Rejections reasons for BL4 and BL5 are thin sites should be reconsidered</li> <li>• City has limited influence over what is achieved in new settlements. BL1 and BL5 must be considered.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grantchester Parish Council-strongly supports rejection of BL1, BL2, BL3, BL4 and BL5 in the light of their QTSQ vision document. They also offer additional comments in relation to BL3-5.</li> <li>• Trumpington Residents Association-Supports the Council's conclusions on the remaining sites in the Green Belt around Trumpington. They offer additional reasons supporting the rejection of BL3-BL6</li> <li>• Cambridge Past Present and Future-Supports the rejections proposed in each Broad Location and acknowledges the great importance attached to them by the Councils. They do not however regard the Green Belt as sacrosanct and there may be special reasons to allow exceptions such as maintaining a balanced portfolio of sites to retain and attract a knowledge based firms. This could constitute a very special circumstance.</li> <li>• Southacre Latham Rd and Chaucer Road Residents Association-support the rejections of sites in BL1 BL3 and BL4 and BL5. Sites are used by the community. Around Trumpington sites are visible from the M11 and impact on the identity of Trumpington as a village.</li> <li>• A further 7 Parish Council's supported the Council's reasons for rejection of edge of City Green Belt sites</li> <li>• Boyer Planning-RLW/DIO support rejection of other possible Green Belt sites.in Appendix 4</li> <li>• Cllr Anthony Orgee and Cllr Gail Kenney-Supports the rejection of all sites in Appendix 4 because of their impact on Green Belt and for the other reasons given.</li> <li>• Hinxton Land Ltd-Councils are correct to dismiss all sites listed</li> <li>• Welcome rejection of BL1 sites due to loss of playing fields and open fields, BL3 sites due to</li> </ul>

	<p>loss of Lakes congestion and playing fields, and BL4 and BL5 due to setting of City</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support rejection of BL1 and BL2 in light of importance of these locations</li> <li>• Need to retain Green Belt around Girton</li> <li>• Endorse reasons for rejection but criteria applied in subjective way and could equally be used to reject GB1 and GB2</li> <li>• Support rejections in BL3-5</li> <li>• City has rightly rejected sites that would aggravate flooding issues. Use of playing fields must be stopped there is not enough open space to replace them.</li> <li>• Support rejection of BL1 which would damage setting of the University city as well as views.</li> <li>• Strongly support the rejection of Site 911 in BL7.</li> <li>• Support all rejections there are no exceptional circumstances</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage-Sites in BL1 and BL2 and BL3 are all very sensitive and important to the setting of the historic core of the City. The historic skyline is clearly visible from the western approaches. The inner boundary should be regarded as permanent</li> <li>• English Heritage-BL4 is important for reasons set out in our objections to the Community Stadium. The current Green Belt Boundary was reviewed when Trumpington Meadows was allocated. At the time it was widely agreed to buffer the new edge away from the motorway</li> <li>• English Heritage- BL5 The new Addenbrooke's access road forms a logical boundary in this location as accepted by the Inspector at the Waste Recycling Facility Inquiry. Would lead to coalescence with Gt Shelford and Stapleford and harm the character of both villages.</li> <li>• English Heritage-BL6 and BL7. The proposed allocations GB1-5 provide only modest erosion into the Green Belt in this vicinity. Larger scale incursions would be harmful to the purpose of Green Belt.</li> <li>• English Heritage-BL9 in spite of its close proximity Fen Ditton retains a distinct identity with clear and discernable character of a small Cambridgeshire village. Allocation of any of the sites would harm the setting of many heritage assets within it.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support rejection of Barton Road sites which would have adverse impact on very sensitive Green Belt</li> <li>• Would encourage re-assessment as it is more sustainable to develop close to City</li> <li>• Bottom line is we will be back here discussing these sites again within 10 years and some will have to go green especially if the airport site is locked out.</li> </ul>
--	--

## ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

**Representations: Total 57; Object 14 Support 31 Comment 12 The question elicited a significant number of support and comments for the proposed rejections**

### **Key Issues:**

#### **Grange Farm Site BL 1 CC916**

- i. Lack of objectively assessed needs
  - a. Disagree. The earlier stages of plan making were founded upon a substantial body of relevant evidence concerning the quantum of development. Objectively assessed needs are identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and will be met in full by the Local Plan.
  
- ii. Impact on coalescence
  - a. Disagree that development in this location would contribute to coalescence.
  
- iii. Green corridors. There are two distinctive green corridors on the west side of the City the one south of the Coton footpath and the other focusing on the Rifle Range. The whole purpose of siting the West Cambridge Development where it is was to safeguard these corridors and the Green Belt to the south
  - a. Comment noted
  
- iv. Vehicular access. This point of access would necessitate an unacceptably long cul de sac. Access if it to be achieved would be better from the south.
  - a. Comment noted
  
- v. Air quality
  - a. Disagree the Council is not pre-empting air quality studies in making this assessment.

#### **Barton Road Sites BL 1 CC921 SC232 SC299**

- vi. Sustainability dispersal is unsustainable
  - a. Agree that a dispersal strategy would not be as sustainable as a strategy focussing development in more sustainable locations. However sustainability also concerns environmental matters including the natural, built and historic environment. Looked at

together the emerging new Local Plans of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire cannot be characterised as following a strategy of dispersal. Housing will be built in the most sustainable locations subject to known constraints including the protection of the Green Belt setting of Cambridge.

- vii. Evidence to reject is not robust having regard to technical documents submitted
  - a. Disagree. The Local Plans are being developed supported by a substantial body of evidence. The Local Plans will meet objectively assessed needs for housing and employment. The level of employment growth has been addressed in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The identified level of growth reflects the outcome of two different employment models, and it is a sound evidence base for the Local Plan. The Councils completed and published an update of the joint Employment Land Review in July 2012. It explores a range of factors, and concludes that there is sufficient employment land committed to meet forecast employment growth. It highlights a particular issue of high demand in Cambridge. The draft Local Plan has responded to this, supporting further employment development around the Cambridge Science Park Station, and near to the Peterhouse Technology Park. Future new settlements will also include employment development. The representation proposes an additional Science Park which would significantly exceed the level of employment land needed in the plan period. Development of this scale would undermine the wider development strategy.
  - b. The Councils do not accept the criticisms of the 2012 Green Belt boundary study which followed a well-established and sound methodology. The study examines the importance and significance of sites with regard to Green Belt purposes. Some development sites have been identified through this process. But not including land at Barton Road where a significant level of impact would arise because of the resulting impact on the setting of Cambridge.
- viii. Process issues- timing of rejection while quantum of development was being finalised is procedurally unsound
  - a. Comment noted, however plan making must also be prompt and the earlier stages of plan making were founded upon a substantial body of relevant evidence concerning the quantum of development.
- ix. Importance of having an up to date SHMA
  - a. The SHMA has been updated and agreed and was published in early May. The SHMA does not support the GL Hearn's Housing Requirements Study conclusions regarding housing requirements.

- x. Need for a Green Belt release to cater for longer term-safeguarded land
  - a. Longer term growth is provided for in two ways. First by the inclusion of new settlements in South Cambridgeshire whose completion will be post 2031, and by the land at Cambridge Airport which was removed from the Green Belt and is unlikely to be developed before 2031.
- xi. Proposed Strategy is not justified and will be unsound unless early and material change made
  - a. Disagree.
- xii. Not legally compliant given reps to Issues and Options One have been ignored and given they are promoting a reasonable alternative
  - a. Disagree. The sites have been assessed and reasonable alternatives are being tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
- Cambridge SE BL7 CC911 SC111 SC284**
- xiii. Assessment is flawed in that it didn't take submission to previous consultation into account in particular scope for development to self sustain services
  - a. The assessment of Green Belt fringe sites did take into account their ability to self-sustain services.
- xiv. Assumption that all GB land equally of high quality. Assessment didn't differentiate between different parcels of high and low quality in different areas.
  - a. The Green Belt assessment provides a sound approach to testing development options and does differentiate between the significance to the Green Belt of different areas of land. It would not be possible to deliver development on the site identified by the representor without the impacts identified.
- xv. No overarching SA undertaken reviewing current strategy before any departure
  - a. The emerging Local Plans are continuing the current strategy of focussing growth in the most sustainable locations. There is no departure. The South Cambridgeshire District Council has worked closely with Cambridge City Council. The joint consultation in 2013 allowed people to comment on the direction the strategy should take, including edge of Cambridge, new settlements, and villages.
  - b. The Final Sustainability Appraisal has considered the development strategy, and the impact of choosing different strategic development options. A joint SA was undertaken of different strategy options as part of the preparation of the Councils' Local Plans. It should be noted that the strategy retains a significant focus on the edge of Cambridge. The Council's SA has identified transport impacts of different

strategies, including the benefits of locating development on the edge of Cambridge, however, sustainability requires the Council to balance a range of factors.

- xvi. Air Safeguarding Zone
    - a. Noted the zone is a consultation zone but in this instance cover all structures of any height the most stringent in the classification. The Council is not the regulator so it remains a key constraint on any development.
  - xvii. HPQT and cycle access
    - a. The services from the Park and Ride do not meet the Local Plan definition of a High Quality Public Transport route for the majority of the site hence the scoring. Cycle access is available in the Broad Location but there isn't a link via Beaumont Road so the red score in terms of distance is justified. The Council has carried out transport modelling of the development strategy and alternatives. The Council has explored infrastructure requirements of the new plan, and will continue to develop the evidence.
  - xviii. Green Belt purposes
    - a. Disagree that the assessment of Green Belt in Chapter 7 is skewed regarding land at BL7. The great majority of the land comprising BL7 is important with regard to Green Belt purposes as shown by the Council's joint review of the Inner Green Belt undertaken to support the Local Plan.
- Cambridge South BL5 SC105 CC878**
- Plan is not sound because:-
- xix. It has not been positively prepared -based on objectively assessed needs
    - a. Disagree. The earlier stages of plan making were founded upon a substantial body of relevant evidence concerning the quantum of development. Objectively assessed needs are identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and will be met in full by the Local Plan.
  - xx. Draft Plan is not justified-background technical work has not been carried out
    - a. Comment noted, however plan making must also be prompt and the earlier stages of plan making were founded upon a substantial body of relevant evidence concerning the quantum of development.
  - xxi. Draft Plan is not the most appropriate Strategy –there is no strategic assessment of development on the edge of Cambridge
    - a. Disagree. A review of the sustainable development strategy was undertaken by the Joint Strategic Planning Unit as part of the preparation of the Issues and Options 2 Part 1 consultation and detailed assessment of all sites proposed on the edge of

Cambridge. The sites have been assessed and reasonable alternatives have been tested through the Sustainability Appraisal process including assessment of development on the edge of Cambridge. The two Councils have worked jointly together on cross boundary issues and also with regard to key parts of the evidence base including with regard to the SHMA.

- xxii. Joint working has not addressed cross boundary delivery of housing and employment
  - a. Disagree. There has been effective cross boundary working.
- xxiii. Draft Plan is Inconsistent with national policy
  - a. Disagree, consistency with national policy in the NPPF is a test that has been applied as the plan has been developed.
- xxiv. The site should be allocated for development to meet need for additional employment development and a new Science Park.
  - a. The level of employment growth has been addressed in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The identified level of growth reflects the outcome of two different employment models, and it is a sound evidence base for the Local Plan. The Council completed about published an update of the Employment Land Review in July 2012. It explores a range of factors, and concludes that there is sufficient employment land committed to meet forecast employment growth. It highlights a particular issue of high demand in Cambridge. The draft Local Plan has responded to this, supporting further employment development around the Cambridge Science Park Station, and near to the Peterhouse Technology Park. Future new settlements will also include employment development. The representation proposes an additional 45 hectares of employment land. This would significantly exceed the level of employment land needed in the plan period. Development of this scale would undermine the wider development strategy.
- xxv. Adequacy of the Sustainability Appraisal.
  - a. The Councils have completed a Sustainability Appraisal of the development strategy, and development at different levels in the development sequence around Cambridge. This is included in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report. The SA acknowledges potential benefits of edge of Cambridge for certain sustainability objectives, but also potential harm to others. The Councils have to make a judgement regarding the relative merits of alternative development options. The strategy identified in the plan retains a significant Cambridge focus, and further development would have a significant negative impact on a number of objectives, therefore the strategy including development of new settlements has been selected.
  - b. Provision of a science park would bring employment additional employment land to the area. The SA already acknowledges the

area is close to existing and planned employment. The SA also acknowledges that larger sites would be capable of incorporating their own local centres, and could also incorporate other uses. The SA notes positive impacts in terms of sustainable transport, but also the potential negative impacts of locating development in areas of poor air quality, such as near the M11. The SA has considered landscape and townscape impact. Objectives of the Green Belt reflect many important issues of landscape and townscape of key relevance to this area. Adding up the number of impacts as the objectors have done is overly simplistic.

xxvi. Green Belt critique.

- a. The Green Belt critique is incorrect with regard to its comments on the purpose of the Buchanan Study and of the 2002 City Green Belt Study. The Buchanan Study was to inform the Structure Plan and if any land could be released from the inner Green Belt boundary. The Structure Plan did identify broad locations for release informed by the study. The City Green Belt study from 2002 then identified the detailed boundaries of those Green Belt releases.
- b. The critique places its emphasis on the economic and social aspects of sustainable development and downplays / ignores the importance of the environment to sustainable development according to the NPPF definition on page 2. The Cambridge Green Belt is of fundamental importance to sustainable development in the Cambridge context and development which would cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes on the edge of Cambridge cannot be sustainable. The Councils have considered the need to promote sustainable patterns of development as shown in its SA and the emphasis of providing new development as high as possible in the sustainable development sequence.
- c. The Councils do not accept the criticisms of the 2012 Green Belt boundary study which followed a well-established and sound methodology. The study examines the importance and significance of sites with regard to Green Belt purposes. Some development sites have been identified through this process. It did not start from an assumption that sites must be identified for Green Belt release to meet development needs because it would be most sustainable to do so which is the approach advocated by the objector.

**NIAB 3 /Darwin Green GB6**

xxvii. Boundary plan is incorrect

- a. The Council consulted on a boundary that would have provided for residential development outside the AQMA and employment development within it. Following consultation and in light of comments and with the benefit of pre-application discussions on the adjoining allocated site no employment is allocated in the

Local Plan given the need to provide landscaping, noise and water attenuation measures to the north of the development to serve all parts of the development in this sector of Cambridge.

**Bourn Airfield**

- xxviii. Community stadium should not be catalyst for large scale housing allocation on unsustainable site  
a. Comment noted.

**BL 9 Fen Ditton**

- xxix. Council has underestimated potential of Science Park station and Chisholm Trail.  
a. Comments noted and are recognised in the allocation of Cambridge Northern Fringe East for employment led development. It is not considered that these benefits outweigh the significant harm there would be to Green Belt purposes in this location.

- xxx. Will retain a green wedge to A14  
The retention of a Green wedge would not effectively mitigate the impacts of development on Green Belt purposes.

- xxxi. Marshalls will fall short on delivery  
a. Both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire Council will be able to meet their objectively assessed needs for new housing development without the development of Cambridge Airport.

**Other Objections**

- xxxii. Rejection reasons for BL1 and BL5 are weak and should be reconsidered  
a. Comment noted
- xxiii. City has limited influence over what is achieved in new settlements BL1 and BL5 must be reconsidered  
a. Comment noted
- xxiv. May be a case for special exceptions in order to maintain balanced portfolio of sites to attract knowledge based firms  
a. Comment noted
- xxv. We will be back here discussing these sites again within 10 years and some will have to be allowed if the Airport is unavailable  
a. Disagree, objectively assessed development needs can be met.
- xxvi. English Heritage –agree rejection of all sites in Appendix 2  
a. Comment noted

<b>Site Number: GB1</b>		
<b>Total representations: 292</b>		
<b>Object<sup>6</sup>: 250</b>	<b>Support: 25</b>	<b>Comment: 17</b>

	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<b>Objections GB1 (number of similar comments in brackets)</b>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green belt /creates precedent (10)</li> <li>• If Green Belt is used it can never be replaced (2)</li> <li>• Cumulative impact of loss this and other green belt land represents a 30% loss (1)</li> <li>• It will cause fundamental harm/impact upon the green belt (77)</li> <li>• Unjustified breach of Green Belt policy (5)</li> <li>• There is a wrongful assertion that GB1 and 2 are of low environmental value. The NPPF doesn't discriminate in this way. (1)</li> <li>• NPPF Parag 83 provides for Green Belt boundary changes only in "exceptional circumstances" The Council has not presented a compelling case as to why this constitutes exceptional circumstances (10)</li> <li>• Needs of economy don't require exceptional circumstances (1)</li> <li>• Contravenes stated purpose of Green Belt as defined in NPPF in failing to check unrestricted sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from urban encroachment, which would further contribute to the destruction of the special character of an historic town. (2)</li> <li>• Area was not allowed to be developed in 2002 LDA Green Belt Boundary Study (1)</li> <li>• Reasons for designating it Green Belt have not changed (3)</li> <li>• Further attempts to move green belt boundaries will be subject to legal challenge (1)</li> <li>• This area must be the highest value Green Belt and is vital for keeping Cambridge attractive and compact. (4)</li> <li>• Object to development in green belt but site has minimal impact and good access to local services (1)</li> <li>• This is arguably the best landscape in the City (3)</li> <li>• It is the landscape which makes City attractive not its housing estates (1)</li> <li>• Will run risk of unrestricted sprawl</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

	<p>extending/encroaching upon open countryside beyond this site toward the Gogs (45)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area forms important visual and physical buffer between urban edge and higher ground (71)</li> <li>• Soft green edge works and should not be compromised (34)</li> <li>• The development of these forelands will destroy the iconic status of area (1)</li> <li>• Represents an unspoilt gateway to open countryside even a small number of dwellings will change this ambience (1)</li> <li>• Land at base of Gogs is visually important and contributes to setting of City when viewed from south (1)</li> <li>• As you come over the hill the City appears and is largely unspoilt (1)</li> <li>• The Gogs are the only hilly feature in an otherwise singularly flat landscape (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views of Beech Woods (6)</li> <li>• Impact on views from Gogs (8)</li> <li>• Impact on views of Gogs (1)</li> <li>• Paths provide safe access to Beech Woods and the highest public space in Cambridge (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views across Cambridge (11)</li> <li>• Visual impact will differ vastly from what is there now (2)</li> <li>• Impact on setting of Cambridge (7)</li> <li>• Development of Green Belt will lead to coalescence of villages which would lose their identify (3)</li> <li>• The integrity of necklace villages should be preserved at all costs and they should not be subsumed into the City (1)</li> <li>• Will destroy City's historic compact scale (1)</li> <li>• Green belt must remain for physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health as well as environmental reasons (6)</li> <li>• Building in the green belt will harm the attractiveness of Cambridge and thereby hamper economic growth (5)</li> <li>• Sir William Wort gifted this land in perpetuity in 1709 so that Cambridge scholars could be coaxed into the countryside and enjoy the view (1)</li> <li>• Green Belt should be more valuable and protected as population of our small city densifies (2)</li> <li>• Impact of other housing on outskirts of</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Cambridge has yet to be evaluated (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop such frequent reviews of the Green Belt (1)</li> <li>• The Council's 2012 Green Belt Review comments at parag 3.4 "that where the city is viewed from higher ground or generally has open aspects...it cannot accommodate change easily" This is a clear instance of a view from higher ground.</li> <li>• <b>CPRE</b> – Will erode attractive open countryside leading to Gogs which form an important part of setting of Cambridge (1)</li> <li>• <b>Rotherwick Way Residents Group</b>- Should not build on the green belt and make farming less viable. Will impact on biodiversity and encourage future infill housing. Development will detract from current density that characterises the present fringe. Will increase the volume of traffic as not all residents would use public transport. Will create pressure to release additional land for new local facilities (shops, schools, GP's). No provision has been made to investigate archaeology. Views of residents have been ignored and little evidence the Council has absorbed previous consultations. The justification does not appear to be robust. Focus should be beyond City area. (1)</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Forum for Community Action</b>-Will cause fundamental harm to Green Belt due to proximity to higher quality landscape on higher ground; land provides important visual and physical buffer between urban edge and rising ground; green edge works well; pressures on area of natural beauty and wildlife by extra footfall litter dogs; alternatives exist in selected villages and new settlements.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b>- Opposed to changes to Green Belt around the village to retain the environment and ambience of Fulbourn (1)</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b>- Object to GB1 and GB2 as development not justifiable in this location (1)</li> <li>• <b>Shepreth Parish Council</b>- Welcomes the reduction in the number of Green Belt sites being considered but do not favour GB1 and GB2 as they are in the congested southern side of City and will encroach on the Gogs the only high land around Cambridge affording views</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Councillor Jean Swanson-</b> Support the rejection of Site 911; but concerned at loss of further green belt; it is well used by local residents; it is productive arable land and food production is important to sustainability; the 2006 Inspector rejected development of Netherhall Farm; its important for wildlife and public recreation; it includes an important County Wildlife site; insufficient argument has been made about exceptional circumstances to alter green belt; junction with Hills Road is awkward; local infrastructure is problematic; unwise to add more housing until existing housing developments near completion</li> <li>• <b>Greenlands Residents Association-</b> Who will buy these homes? They will spoil the City's compact scale. The green belt is precious and there are far less critical sites outside the boundary. There are pressures on parking and transport systems schools and healthcare. Destruction of the countryside south of City will destroy habitats and biodiversity. GB1 and GB2 are currently a defining buffer between the City and the Gog Magog Hill. Remaining land will become more vulnerable. The government were told Cambridge was developing a green corridor in return for giving up green belt land. Where are they?</li> <li>• <b>Southacre, Latham and Chaucer Road Resident's Association-</b>Both sites GB1 and GB2 are visible from further along Worts Causeway, which is a major access route into the City. A function of Green Belt is to provide visual demarcation between the City and surrounding rural landscape protecting the setting and character of the City. Both sites fail this test.</li> </ul> <p><b>Natural Environment Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge doesn't have a lot of unspoilt natural beauty Granchester Meadows, the river, the Gogs and Beech Woods is all we have/Pressure on an area of natural beauty (58)</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity (87)</li> <li>• Irreparable damage to wildlife on site and green corridors to Worts Causeway (1)</li> <li>• Netherhall Farm Meadow is County Wildlife site and important for National Vegetation</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Classification Community CG3 Bromus Erectus Grassland (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arable land and hedgerow supports farmland birds corn bunting, yellowhammer, linnet skylark and grey partridge which have suffered major declines and are indicators of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy (3)</li> <li>• Damage to habitat of rare barbastelle bat (1)</li> <li>• The area is directly linked by hedgerow network to the Beech Woods, Wandlebury and the Gogs SSSI (3)</li> <li>• Threat to ecology, Gog Magogs, and wider environmental impact (2)</li> <li>• It will destroy an area, which acts as a green lung for the City and a haven for leisure and wildlife (1)</li> <li>• Loss of permitted paths to edge of fields/rights of way (1)</li> <li>• Further loss of already declining open space in City (1)</li> <li>• It will harm the bridleway, local biodiversity hedgerow and wild flowers (2)</li> <li>• Destruction of semi natural environmental resource on edge of City (2)</li> <li>• Loss historical landscape (leading to Roman Road), and impact on archaeology (6)</li> <li>• There is no up to date evidence/survey of plant, insect and bird populations to show what would be lost (1)</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust BCN</b> – will have unacceptable adverse impact on the local ecological network including SSSI's, County and City Wildlife sites and will compromise the ability to achieve the Gog Magogs Strategic Green Infrastructure Scheme. The Council's Assessment has underplayed impacts on natural environment and biodiversity in particular. They take issue with the assessment scores for GB1 re the scope for mitigation of impacts upon Netherhall Farm Meadow (County Wildlife site). To assume mitigation might be possible is arrogant. Reassessing GB1 could result in scores changing from amber to red in which case site should not be developed. They also question the Council's score on impact on an SSSI. This should not be green as traffic levels on LimeKiln Hill are already damaging the SSSI. Any increase would pose a real threat.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Notes that County Wildlife site is within site and is important for its semi natural grassland and biodiversity. The area is also designated, as protected open space for its environmental qualities Natural England would wish to see this area retained and enhanced as far as possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pollution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will create air, noise, and light pollution (9)</li> <li>• Addenbrookes incinerator requires open areas nearby (1)</li> <li>• This Green Belt Land is a valuable part of the City's heritage visually and also with wildlife sheltered from noise and light pollution. Any partial development would have a knock-on effect on the northern part of the GB1 site. (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Loss Agricultural Land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would destroy productive arable land (21)</li> <li>• <b>I&amp;O Working Group Windsor Road Residents Association</b> -Permission for conversion of barns on site to dwellings granted in 2012 subject to surrounding land remaining open and of agricultural appearance (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping as Green Belt will help the carbon balance (3)</li> <li>• Site cannot meet sustainability criteria as will generate local traffic across southern Cambridge (1)</li> <li>• Development is not sustainable (4)</li> <li>• People won't use sustainable modes of travel (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Active and Passive Local Recreation/Leisure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area around Gogs Beech Wood the Roman Road and Wandlebury much needed for recreation by a large urban population (20)</li> <li>• Gogs were acquired by Cambridge residents LA's and other benefactors to provide recreation for the community whilst practicing conservation and restoration of the countryside (1)</li> <li>• Access to countryside for locals residents walkers cyclists joggers, cross country runners, birdwatchers (24)</li> <li>• Should retain paths and green lanes for future</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>generations to enjoy (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on local amenities (3)</li> <li>• No detail of green space within the development. Nightingale Rec is not large enough need something this size split between GB1 and GB2 (1)</li> <li>• Impact on physical and mental health by building on green space (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic issues in locality local roads inadequate, commuter parking (44)</li> <li>• Parking requirements of Addenbrookes (16)</li> <li>• Road not built for heavy traffic. Capacity safety width of local roads (30)</li> <li>• Capacity of A1307 in rush hour/exacerbates congestion (37)</li> <li>• Delivery will be compromised by increased congestion (2)</li> <li>• Extra traffic will impact on ambulances getting out of Addenbrookes (14)</li> <li>• Bollards did deal with earlier traffic problem but traffic growth will worsen again (9)</li> <li>• Bollards prove congestion problem exists (1)</li> <li>• Depending on location of bollards could isolate the new community (1)</li> <li>• Beaumont Road is not suitable for more traffic (2)</li> <li>• Queen Ediths Way overloaded at peak times (2)</li> <li>• No Transport Strategy from County to address problems (1)</li> <li>• No assessments of highway capacity have been completed (2)</li> <li>• Impact on operation of Park &amp; Ride scheme (17)</li> <li>• The Worts Causeway bypass route used by other services e.g. A13 Haverhill bus (1)</li> <li>• Distance and safety of access to local facilities would mean residents use cars (4)</li> <li>• Using public transport and bikes is a personal choice (1)</li> <li>• Worts Causeway would become a rat run (1)</li> <li>• No main access point has been identified for GB1 (1)</li> <li>• Access through GB2 to GB1 will make GB2 very busy (1)</li> <li>• A traffic improvement might be to consider</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>building a new link road from Cambridge Biomedical Campus roundabout within the Addenbrookes site to Granhams Road junction or a point 250m SE of it. Better still extend this by a tunnel through Lime Kiln Hill north to the roundabout on Cambridge Road Fulbourn (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor public transport for local residents (excluding Park and Ride services) (5)</li> <li>• Considerable walking distance to park and ride (1)</li> <li>• What plans are there for enhanced bus services? (1)</li> <li>• Don't wish to lose current paths across site (3)</li> <li>• Nightingale Ave has become a rat run (1)</li> <li>• There is no access to Almoners Ave (1)</li> <li>• Safety of walkers (1)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrary to Council officer's belief there is NO pedestrian or cycle access from GB1 into Almoners Ave. It is privately owned by 39 and 39A.</li> <li>• Cycle access only possible via Worts Causeway and would reduce attractiveness of cycling (1)</li> <li>• Danger to cyclists on local roads (1)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>RAON</b>-Doesn't feel it is possible to assess these sites options without a set of traffic options (which could be met within budget limits) alongside an assessment of the impact on the local network (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of school places (11)</li> <li>• Are new schools proposed? (1)</li> <li>• Lack healthcare provision (16)</li> <li>• Few amenities shops and facilities in area (20)</li> <li>• Distance to local shops (7)</li> <li>• Distance to schools (8)</li> <li>• Distance medical facilities (2)</li> <li>• South of the City lacks community facilities compared with north (2)</li> <li>• Site has poor community access (2)</li> <li>• Need for a meeting hall (1)</li> <li>• Need for playing field and playgrounds (1)</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure/water/drainage won't cope (32)</li> <li>• Cambridge can't keep growing it doesn't have the infrastructure to be a big city (1)</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building below a hill could result in greater flooding risk on lower land (1)</li> <li>• Wait and see impact of current growth sites on communities, schools, health facilities, traffic, environment (1)</li> <li>• Numbers of dwellings will overwhelm existing community (1)</li> <li>• Integration with existing community (3)</li> <li>• LA's have failed to provide long term infrastructure solutions (1)</li> <li>• <b>Environment Agency</b>-Site at low risk to fluvial flooding. Surface water drainage discharge rate should meet current standards. Site sits over an important primary water source but not within a source protection zone. Preliminary site investigation needed before any planning applications needed to check any contamination from agricultural use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houses will be unaffordable for Addenbrookes workers (4)</li> <li>• Lot of other housing on southern fringe for hospital workers (1)</li> <li>• Give incentives to use unoccupied properties. There are 10,000 in Cambridgeshire (2)</li> <li>• Root calculations of need for housing and employment are inconclusive (2)</li> <li>• 95% of projected housing need can be met through existing planning consents, allocated sites, and SHLAA projections. (1)</li> <li>• SoS turned down a proposal for 500 homes here in 2006 (11)</li> <li>• Need given new developments on southern fringe at north west Cambridge and on land near station (13)</li> <li>• We need affordable homes not homes for commuters/investors? (13)</li> <li>• Area of site is overstated because of privately owned areas and the Wildlife site (1)</li> <li>• Planning Authorities must work together to solve housing shortages (1)</li> <li>• Need for sheltered housing yet to be evaluated (1)</li> <li>• Pressure from government to meet housing targets (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Marshalls land instead (2)</li> <li>• Consider Waterbeach or Northstowe instead</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>(7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With all other sites in City and at Marshalls no need to further urbanisation. Need more balance (1)</li> <li>• Expand selected villages and new settlements instead (37)</li> <li>• In view of Northstowe going ahead the balance is against building on any Green Belt land around Cambridge (1)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on other brownfield sites instead (11)</li> <li>• Alternative brownfield sites near village rail stations and the guided bus route would enable workers to use public transport (4)</li> <li>• CPRE says there is enough brownfield land to build 1.5 million homes in UK (1)</li> <li>• Support the rejection of Site 911 Cambridge SE but same criteria apply to GB1 and GB2 (1)</li> <li>• It is perverse to build more in the SE when the government at local and national level are trying to develop the north of the country (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of development will overwhelm Cherry Hinton (1)</li> <li>• Should be rejected for similar reasons to CC925 Land South of Addenbrookes and South west of Babraham Road (1)</li> <li>• Represents a 100% reversal in planning policy (2)</li> <li>• Site is not all in single ownership (2)</li> <li>• Owners own recently completed barn conversions (2)</li> <li>• Buildings on site listed as Buildings of Local Interest and have heritage status (2)</li> <li>• There is a GHQ Line Anti tank trench running across the GB1 and GB2 sites which presents contaminated land issues and cultural heritage /archaeological issues and historic monument of national and regional importance requiring a risk evaluation under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (1)</li> <li>• Impact on house prices (2)</li> <li>• Can't be assumed all will work locally (1)</li> <li>• Pressure on City centre (1)</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire will soon grind to a halt (1)</li> <li>• Impact upon quality of life (8)</li> <li>• Density must be more compatible with that in</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>locality (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density is detrimental to owners on site and those adjoining (2)</li> <li>• 480 homes is too many (1)</li> <li>• Plans represent overdevelopment (1)</li> <li>• A concrete jungle is proposed which will remain for long time (1)</li> <li>• Density won't allow for green verges within site (1)</li> <li>• Three storey buildings on land rising by 20ft will have deleterious effect on landscape (2)</li> <li>• Build few houses along Worts Causeway only rather than create new roads (1)</li> <li>• Huge disruption in return for minimal number of new houses (1)</li> <li>• There is a significant consensus of objection (1)</li> <li>• 7.33ha is not available (1)</li> <li>• Impact on amenity of Cambridge (1)</li> <li>• Will ruin what was once a pleasant edge of the city (1)</li> <li>• Where will profits from development end up? (1)</li> <li>• <i>Field path alongside GB2 running to Wandlebury and Beech Woods has featured in 2 well known books written by a local resident. 'Wild Places' is about the indispensable value of certain landscapes and how such hard to articulate qualities such as beauty, biodiversity and landscape history are so important to our well being. 'The Old Ways' focuses on paths nature and happiness and focuses on the field path and Roman Road. 'Over the Hills to Cherry Hinton' also outlines important aspects of this area (2)</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Support GB1 (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fills a natural corner that lends itself to the purpose (1)</li> <li>• Provides a reasonable choice provided it doesn't spread nearer the Beechwoods (1)</li> <li>• Sites are suitable for residential development agree with arguments in favour (1)</li> <li>• Site appears to be well connected (1)</li> <li>• More homes are needed close to Addenbrookes (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to Park and Ride, Addenbrookes, and Guided Bus and Science Parks. (3)</li> <li>• Visually satisfactory (1)</li> <li>• Limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site accessible by public transport and bicycle and close to employment and services. Preferable to village locations where it adds to commuting/pollution/congestion/environmental impact (1)</li> <li>• Support on basis green belt setting is not compromised (2)</li> <li>• Development here would be beneficial (1)</li> <li>• Support as not as congested as area as Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Large developments should be kept close to Cambridge City (1)</li> <li>• Site could be extended to Junction of Worts Causeway and Lime Kiln Road (2)</li> <li>• Support as it would only extend existing built up areas (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to centres of employment, good public transport, schools and facilities thereby putting minimum strain on road congestion (1)</li> </ul> <p>Other general supports (5)</p>
<p><b>Comment Green</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area was not allowed to be developed in 2002 LDA Green Belt Boundary Study (1)</li> <li>• Site should be kept as Green Belt (1)</li> <li>• Will lead to ribbon development towards Fulbourn and Shelford (1)</li> <li>• Favour Worts Causeway sites because they wouldn't fundamentally change the nature of that part of the Cambridge boundary, visually or functionally (1)</li> <li>• Development here seems practical and has minimal impact (1)</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage-</b> The curved alignment of Beamont Road will ensure that to some extent this allocation will give the appearance of 'rounding off' the city edge, though the eastern boundary might then have taken a more northeast-southwest alignment up to the track that forms the western boundary of the large field, whereas the current north-south alignment appears better suited to justifying the allocation of site GB2. We note the site includes locally listed farm buildings and while these might be retained, their setting is likely to be compromised by the allocation. It will therefore be necessary to consider whether or not there is sufficient wider public benefit to be derived from this allocation to justify the harm.</li> </ul>

	<p>The eastern boundary would need careful treatment to form an appropriate junction between the city and the Green Belt.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor integration with existing communities (1)</li> <li>• Existing facilities won't cope (1)</li> <li>• Schools infant and primary will be needed (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity to Addenbrookes is major selling point so why not seek 90% affordable housing here (1)</li> <li>• Sites GB1 and GB2 seems good if low cost housing is included for hospital workers (1)</li> <li>• Site is a good solution for 480 homes</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since most job opportunities are north of Cambridge further development to the north of City seems logical, beyond that Bourn and Cambourne are possibilities (1)</li> <li>• Worts Causeway/Fulbourn proposals seem low impact (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> –Any development should seek to improve the green infrastructure function of the area (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to Beech Woods where lesser spotted woodpecker and tawny owl nests and rare wild hellebores flower (1)</li> <li>• Hedgerow attracts many bird and insects and verge hosts wild flowers (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road not built for heavy traffic. Capacity safety width of local roads (1)</li> <li>• Pathway along field boundary on Worts Causeway is a restrictive right of way</li> <li>• A southern relief road would have supported development in this area but it was cancelled (1)</li> <li>• Access to the Bell School is still not resolved (1)</li> <li>• Will only cause further traffic gridlock (1)</li> <li>• Development of Worts Causeway seems logical as long as increased traffic considerations are addressed (1)</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More exit roads needed near to hospital and other areas of employment (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Reason Unspecified (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not support GB1 (1)</li> </ul>
--	---

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE GB1**

**Representations: Total 292 Object 250 Support 25 Comment 17**

**Key Issues:**

- i. Impact on setting of City
  - a. The 2012 Green Belt Appraisal fully recognised the proximity of this land to higher quality landscape associated with the higher ground to the south-east. Provided development was kept to 2 storeys on this site and appropriate landscape buffer areas are provided in advance to soften and significantly improve the urban edge in this location the impact of the proposed Green Belt releases on setting would be relatively minor.
  
- ii. Loss Of Green Belt
  - a. The current Green Belt was last altered following the 2002 Structure Plan and was intended to last until 2016. The Council's are currently reviewing their Local Plans to 2031 and have to have regard to future settlement policy and future Green Belt. NPPF makes provision for Local Plans to establish Green Belt boundaries to provide a long-term framework having regard to the need to promote sustainable development. Having thoroughly studied the Inner Green Belt boundary the 2012 Green Belt Review found a limited number of small sites, which were of lesser importance to Green Belt purposes and could provide for future housing and other needs with minimal impact. The Local Plan has to consider objectively assessed needs and how these might be met over the plan period in a sustainable way. On balance the level of harm in losing these small sites is judged to be minimal when weighed against the broader needs of the City to 2031.
  
- iii. Development of this site will lead to sprawl of urban area into surrounding countryside
  - a. The boundary suggested is intended to be long term and endure beyond the plan period. Planting and landscaping of its eastern boundary will form a stronger and distinctive urban edge and will serve to enhance the setting maintain the openness of the surrounding landscape and protect historic features. Its green belt status will prevent development creeping any closer to the Gogs and open countryside.
  
- iv. Development will lead to coalescence with surrounding necklace

villages

- a. The new Green Belt boundary proposed on the edge of sites GB1 and GB2 would serve to prevent further built development from encroaching on the surrounding necklace villages, key landscape, and historic features beyond the edge. The Council disagrees given the distance that there is any risk of coalescence with nearby villages.
- v. Encroachment of open landscape to the south east
  - a. One of the purposes of green belt is to prevent this happening. The Council believes that once a new boundary is confirmed it will serve to prevent any further encroachment occurring. The 2012 Green Belt Appraisal fully recognised the qualities of the landscape to the south on the higher ground, which, as residents say is among the best to be found in the Cambridge area.
- vi. Impact of GB1 and GB2 on views from Gogs and Beechwoods
  - a. This can be mitigated by buffer planting on the eastern edge of these sites to soften the existing hard urban edge
- vii. No “special circumstances” to warrant building houses in the Green Belt
  - a. The NPPF provides for Green Belts to be revised by Local plans. The current boundary was established in 2002 and was expected to endure until 2016 and beyond. However circumstances change and major development at Cambridge East will no longer be deliverable for the foreseeable future. Good progress is being made with the current strategy with the exception of Cambridge East but insufficient land has been found within the urban area of Cambridge to meet identified objectively assessed needs. The NPPF requires that Green Belt boundaries are established in Local Plans, that the boundaries can endure beyond the end of the plan period (2031) and that consideration is given to the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the inner Green Belt boundary, towards villages within the Green Belt and towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. The LPA’s have taken and will continue to take a sequential sustainable approach to the location of growth using City brownfield land first before considering land on the edge of Cambridge (including land in the Green Belt), in new settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and then in the most sustainable villages. A joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary has established that there is no scope for major Green Belt releases without there being very significant detriment to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The review did identify several small sites, which could be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge where the detriment would be limited in nature and scope. This finding together with

the guidance in the NPPF concerning sustainability and the need to establish a durable Green Belt boundary provides justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development.

viii. Impact on natural beauty of area

- a. The Council acknowledges the unique quality this area has and the physical and psychological benefits of having such high quality open land near where City residents live. It does not however believe this will be harmed by a discrete development some distance away at the bottom of the slope. Indeed the development of this land could serve to enhance the enjoyment of the surrounding countryside by taking steps to reduce traffic in the area, maintain the country lane feel of Worts' Causeway and opening up permissive paths and green infrastructure improvements to help improve such access and enjoyment.

ix. Recreational value of area to local and Cambridge residents

- a. The Council fully acknowledges the value the area has for outdoor recreation by walkers joggers and cyclists. Transport and access measures in conjunction with the development of this site could serve to enhance the safety and experience of walkers joggers horse riders and cyclists through improvement of access to the countryside. Permissive paths can also be retained and enhanced. Retain Worts' Causeway as a bus only access with limited car access to develop it as a green link into the surrounding open countryside.

x. Biodiversity in the area

- a. The development of this and adjoining site GB2 could make provision for wildlife corridors to be provided to enable wildlife to move between the sites and adjoining land.
- b. Netherhall Farm Meadow is a County Wildlife site and Protected Open Space. It is particularly important for its unique grassland. As protected Open Space it is designated for its environmental importance. This Meadow would be retained in any development and an appropriate management regime put in place to ensure its long-term ecological value is protected. Land area of site has been reduced to allow for this.
- c. The protected roadside verge is also important and should be retained and enhanced by minimising any widening of Worts' Causeway to retain its country lane feel. Provision for non-vehicle users to be within the development site in order to preserve the hedgerows.
- d. Measures to safeguard the habitat of the bats on the site have already been addressed through a planning application for alterations to the barn, which will make provision for a new bat roost.
- e. Planting and management of access to the chalk grassland nearby could be improved with the Green Infrastructure Strategy

- to benefit wildlife and the ecology of the area.
- f. Buffer planting along the western boundary will help to reduce any issues of overlooking and help maintain biodiversity
- xi. Loss of agricultural land
  - a. Half of the site is designated Grade 2 agricultural land with the remainder designated as urban land in the agricultural land classification. The loss is considered to be minor.
- xii. Pollution
  - a. Mitigation should be possible following an air quality contamination assessment
- xiii. Sustainability
  - a. The location on the edge of the city has good access to high quality public transport, local employment, services and facilities within the City. It can be reached by non-car modes of travel.
- xiv. Infrastructure
  - a. The site scores an amber score in relation to access to local amenities. Distances to local services will be rechecked on a walking route basis. Scope to improve provision should be explored through the development of Sites GB1 and GB2. Contributions through S106 can be sought to help improve wider provision e.g. school places.
- xv. Housing Need
  - a. The development will enable the provision of much needed affordable housing
  - b. The objectively assessed statement of needs through the SHMA has been updated and confirms a housing requirement of 14,000 dwellings by 2031.
  - c. 95% of projected housing need cannot be met through current commitments allocations and SHLAA sites. The SHLAA update shows there is only just enough land to meet objectively assessed needs including GB1 and GB2
  - d. In relation to open market housing the planning system cannot control who ends up buying houses but given it is close to local employment it should prove attractive to local people
- xvi. Alternative locations
  - a. The LPA's have taken and will continue to take a sequential sustainable approach to the location of growth using City brownfield land first before considering land on the edge of Cambridge (including land in the Green Belt), in new settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and then in the most sustainable villages. The strategy for South Cambridgeshire is proposing a combination of these alternatives as part of its settlement strategy. The scale and nature of the objectively assessed need now requires all of these options to be explored.

- xvii. Access and Traffic issues
- a. Any development would be subject to a full transportation assessment and travel plan and make S106 contributions to mitigate any issues including the safety and experience of all road users.
  - b. It would be possible to retain the permissive paths as part of the development through planning and design.
  - c. The bollards could be relocated in order to retain Worts' Causeway as a bus only access with limited car access to develop it as a green link into the surrounding open countryside.
  - d. Vehicular traffic could be routed by a north south link into Site GB2 with access to the main road network being made from a new junction on the Babraham Road. This should address the concerns of local residents about the capacity and safety of the local road network.
  - e. Congestion on the A1307 and the access to Addenbrookes will be tackled through the County Council's forthcoming wider Transport Strategy.
  - f. Impact on Lime Kiln Hill and nearby nature reserves would be minimised by the proposed traffic reduction measures on Worts' Causeway
  - g. Pedestrian access issues from the site are noted and will be further investigated.
- xviii. Locally Listed Farmhouse Buildings and their setting
- a. The farmhouse and adjoining buildings are listed as being Buildings of Local Interest. They were subject to a recent application for a sensitive refurbishment and conversion to residential use.
  - b. Development of Site GB1 should ensure an area of at least 0.81ha around the farm buildings is set aside to maintain their setting. Adjust the number of overall dwellings on site by 47 to provide for this.
  - c. Seek to retain and protect existing mature trees and groups of trees on site. Enhance with new planting of large species trees to ensure a long term presence around the farm buildings and on main site.
- xix. Archaeology
- a. With regard to the GHQ Line this is not yet recorded in the HER. A scheme of archaeological works should occur prior to any planning determination.

<b>Site Number: GB2</b>		
<b>Total representations: 284</b>		
<b>Object<sup>7</sup>: 240</b>	<b>Support: 26</b>	<b>Comment: 18</b>

<sup>7</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<b>Objections GB2</b>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green belt /creates precedent (43)</li> <li>• If Green Belt is used it can never be replaced (2)</li> <li>• Cumulative impact of loss this and other green belt land represents a 30% loss (1)</li> <li>• It will cause fundamental harm/impact upon the green belt (73)</li> <li>• Serious impact on Green Belt but less than GB1 since land is flat (1)</li> <li>• Unjustified breach of Green Belt policy (6)</li> <li>• There is a wrongful assertion that GB1 and 2 are of low environmental value. The NPPF doesn't discriminate in this way. (3)</li> <li>• NPPF Parag 83 provides for Green Belt boundary changes only in "exceptional circumstances" The Council has not presented a compelling case as to why this constitutes exceptional circumstances (9)</li> <li>• Needs of economy don't require exceptional circumstances (1)</li> <li>• Building in the green belt will harm the attractiveness of Cambridge and thereby hamper economic growth (4)</li> <li>• Contravenes stated purpose of Green Belt as defined in NPPF in failing to check unrestricted sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from urban encroachment, which would further contribute to the destruction of the special character of an historic town. (8)</li> <li>• Area was not allowed to be developed in 2002 LDA Green Belt Boundary Study (1)</li> <li>• Reasons for designating it Green Belt have not changed (5)</li> <li>• Further attempts to move green belt boundaries will be subject to legal challenge (1)</li> <li>• Object to green belt development but if absolutely required this site has minimal impact and good access to local services and employment. (1)</li> <li>• Disagree it will have minimal impact on the Green Belt (6)</li> <li>• Scores for green belt significance questionable in 2012 document as they relate to two halves of same field (1)</li> <li>• It is the landscape which makes City attractive not its housing estates (1)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep Green Belt for future generations to enjoy (1)</li> <li>• Green belt has prevented ribbon development (2)</li> <li>• This is arguably the best landscape in the City (1)</li> <li>• Will run risk of unrestricted sprawl extending/ encroaching upon open countryside beyond this site toward the Gogs (40)</li> <li>• Site CC911 has not gone away (1)</li> <li>• Support the rejection of Site 911 Cambridge SE but same criteria apply to GB1 and GB2 (1)</li> <li>• Area forms important visual and physical buffer between urban edge and higher ground (67)</li> <li>• Soft green edge works and should not be compromised (33)</li> <li>• The development of these forelands will destroy the iconic status of area (1)</li> <li>• Represents an unspoilt gateway to open countryside even a small number of dwellings will change this ambience (2)</li> <li>• Land at base of Gogs is visually important and contributes to setting of City when viewed from south (1)</li> <li>• As you come over the hill the City appears and is largely unspoilt 1)</li> <li>• The Gogs are the only hilly feature in an otherwise singularly flat landscape (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views of Beech Woods (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views from Gogs (5)</li> <li>• Impact on views of Gogs (4)</li> <li>• New developments will be visible all way into Cambridge from south (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views across Cambridge (7)</li> <li>• Visual impact will differ vastly from what is there now (4)</li> <li>• Impact on setting of Cambridge (4)</li> <li>• Development of Green Belt will lead to coalescence of villages which would lose their identify (4)</li> <li>• The integrity of necklace villages should be preserved at all costs and they should not be subsumed into the City. (1)</li> <li>• Green belt must remain for physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health as well as environmental reasons (2)</li> <li>• Sir William Wort gifted this land in perpetuity in 1709 so that Cambridge scholars of Emmanuel College could be coaxed into the countryside</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>and enjoy the view (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt should be more valuable and protected as population of our small city densifies (1)</li> <li>• Impact of other housing on outskirts of Cambridge has yet to be evaluated (1)</li> <li>• Land off Long Road should never have been taken out of the Green Belt (1)</li> <li>• Green Belt should never be reviewed? (3)</li> <li>• The Council's 2012 Green Belt Review comments at parag 3.4 "that where the city is viewed from higher ground or generally has open aspects...it cannot accommodate change easily" This is a clear instance of a view from higher ground. (2)</li> <li>• <b>CPRE</b> – Will erode attractive open countryside leading to Gogs which form an important part of setting of Cambridge</li> <li>• <b>Rotherwick Way Residents Group</b>- Should not build on the green belt and make farming less viable. Will impact on biodiversity and encourage future infill housing. Development will detract from current density that characterises the present fringe. Will increase the volume of traffic, as not all residents would use public transport. Will create pressure to release additional land for new local facilities (shops, schools, GP's). No provision has been made to investigate archaeology. Views of residents have been ignored and little evidence the Council has absorbed previous consultations. The justification does not appear to be robust. Focus should be beyond City area. (2)</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Forum for Community Action</b>-Will cause fundamental harm to Green Belt due to proximity to higher quality landscape on higher ground; land provides important visual and physical buffer between urban edge and rising ground; green edge works well; pressures on area of natural beauty and wildlife by extra footfall litter dogs; alternatives exist in selected villages and new settlements.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b>- Opposed to changes to Green Belt around the village to retain the environment and ambience of Fulbourn</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b>- Object to GB1 and GB2 as development not justifiable in this</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Shepreth Parish Council-</b> Welcomes the reduction in the number of Green Belt sites being considered but do not favour GB1 and GB2 as they are in the congested southern side of City and will encroach on the Gogs the only high land around Cambridge affording views</li> <li>• <b>Harlton Parish Council –</b> Object as development in the green belt is not justifiable at this location.</li> <li>• <b>Councillor Jean Swanson-</b> Support the rejection of Site 911; but concerned at loss of further green belt; it is well used by local residents; it is productive arable land and food production is important to sustainability; the 2006 Inspector rejected development of Netherhall Farm; its important for wildlife and public recreation; it includes an important County Wildlife site; insufficient argument has been made about exceptional circumstances to alter green belt; junction with Hills Road is awkward; local infrastructure is problematic; unwise to add more housing until existing housing developments near completion</li> <li>• <b>Greenlands Residents Association-</b> Who will buy these homes? They will spoil the City's compact scale. The green belt is precious and there are far less critical sites outside the boundary. There are pressures on parking and transport systems schools and healthcare. Destruction of the countryside south of City will destroy habitats and biodiversity. GB1 and GB2 are currently a defining buffer between the City and the Gog Magog Hill. Remaining land will become more vulnerable. The government were told Cambridge was developing a green corridor in return for giving up green belt land. Where are they?</li> <li>• <b>Southacre, Latham and Chaucer Road Resident's Association-</b>Both sites GB1 and GB2 are visible from further along Worts Causeway, which is a major access route into the City. A function of Green Belt is to provide visual demarcation between the City and surrounding rural landscape protecting the setting and character of the City. Both sites fail this test.</li> </ul> <p><b>Natural Environment Biodiversity</b></p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge doesn't have a lot of unspoilt natural beauty Granchester Meadows, the river, the Gogs and Beech Woods is all we have/pressure on an area of natural beauty (66)</li> <li>• In flat Cambridge this is one area of beautiful undulating countryside crowned by woods and ancient sites (Roman Road, Wandlebury and Gogs). How irresponsible to destroy such beauty and peace that enhances the city and defines its semi rural character (1)</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity (66)</li> <li>• May be anomaly in scoring of biodiversity impact in Council Technical Assessment on GB2 (1)</li> <li>• Irreparable damage to wildlife on site and green corridors to Worts Causeway (3)</li> <li>• Loss of green space (2)</li> <li>• Increased footfall problems of litter dogs (34)</li> <li>• Impact on Netherhall Farm Meadow County Wildlife Site / and protected roadside verges (4)</li> <li>• Impact on bridleway path up side of GB2 to Beech Woods (1)</li> <li>• Arable land and hedgerow supports farmland birds corn bunting, yellowhammer, linnet skylark and grey partridge which have suffered major declines and are indicators of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy (2)</li> <li>• The area is directly linked by hedgerow network to the Beech Woods, Wandlebury and the Gogs SSSI (3)</li> <li>• Area already suffered from environmental degradation (1)</li> <li>• Threat to ecology, Gog Magogs, and wider environmental impact (1)</li> <li>• Further loss of already declining open space in City (2)</li> <li>• It will harm the bridleway, local biodiversity hedgerow and wild flowers (1)</li> <li>• Loss historical landscape (leading to Roman Road), and impact on archaeology (8)</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust BCN</b> – will have unacceptable adverse impact on the local ecological network including SSSI's, County and City Wildlife sites and will compromise the ability to achieve the Gog Magogs Strategic Green Infrastructure Scheme. The Council's Assessment has underplayed impacts on natural environment and biodiversity in</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>particular. Reassessing GB2 could result in scores changing from amber to red in which case site should not be developed. They also question the Council's score on impact on an SSSI. This should not be green as traffic levels on Limekiln Hill are already damaging the SSSI. Any increase would pose a real threat. Some of the scores against Green Belt on GB2 also underplay impacts and may be categorised red or amber. Cumulative scores may end up being changed amber to red.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Notes that site is adjacent to Netherhall Farm Meadow County Wildlife site and Worts Causeway Protected Roadside Verge. Site is outside the urban area and classified in the SA as having poor public transport access and is some distance from local services and facilities. The allocation would place increased reliance on private cars conflicting with SA objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pollution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will create air, noise, and light pollution (9)</li> </ul> <p><b>Loss Agricultural Land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would destroy productive arable land (18)</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping as Green Belt will help the carbon balance (2)</li> <li>• Development is not sustainable (4)</li> <li>• Park &amp; Ride is sustainable but more development is not (1)</li> <li>• People won't use sustainable modes of travel (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Active and Passive Local Recreation/Leisure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area around Gogs Beech Wood the Roman Road and Wandlebury much needed for recreation by a large urban population (26)</li> <li>• Gogs were acquired by Cambridge residents LA's and other benefactors to provide recreation for the community whilst practicing conservation and restoration of the countryside (1)</li> <li>• Access to countryside for locals residents walkers cyclists joggers, cross country runners, birdwatchers (24)</li> <li>• Paths provide safe access to Beech Woods</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>and the highest public space in Cambridge (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of permitted paths to edge of fields/rights of way (3)</li> <li>• Impact on local amenities (3)</li> <li>• Historical interest of area (4)</li> <li>• Development here is contrary to Local Plan Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space (1)</li> <li>• No detail of green space within the development. Nightingale Rec is not large enough need something this size split between GB1 and GB2 (2)</li> <li>• Impact on physical and mental health by building on green space (1)</li> <li>• <b>Ramblers Association of Cambridge Group-</b> A number of attractive permissive footpath links are threatened by the proposed development along with impacts on biodiversity and the loss of safe attractive off road routes to Beech Woods and the Park &amp; Ride. This area of Cambridge lacks rights of way and as the population expands there will be increasing demand for access. Any new development should help provide footpath routes linking the nature reserves and potentially the Roman Road.</li> <li>• <b>Shelford &amp; District Bridleways Group-</b> There are currently multi usage permissive tracks on this site which link with off road routes to Beechwoods Nature Reserve and the Roman Road. These are well used and should be retained in any development. Provision should be made for safe off road multi use access (pedestrians/cycles/horses) to the Roman Road entrance as current road access has dangerous bends and no verge paths. Without these any development would create more traffic and make it even more dangerous for horses and cyclists.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic issues in locality local roads inadequate, commuter parking (24)</li> <li>• Parking requirements of Addenbrookes (15)</li> <li>• Road not built for heavy traffic. Capacity safety width of local roads (31)</li> <li>• Capacity of A1307 in morning rush hour/exacerbates congestion (53)</li> <li>• Delivery will be compromised by increased congestion (4)</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extra traffic will impact on ambulances getting out of Addenbrookes (14)</li> <li>• Schools and other developments on southern fringe will add lot additional traffic (7)</li> <li>• Bollards did deal with earlier traffic problem but traffic growth will worsen again (9)</li> <li>• Depending on location of bollards could isolate the new community (1)</li> <li>• Depending on location of bollards could add to congestion Lime Kiln Hill/Queen Ediths Way (1)</li> <li>• Bollards need moving (1)</li> <li>• Problems turning right or left out of Worts Causeway (3)</li> <li>• Queen Ediths Way overloaded at peak times (2)</li> <li>• No Transport Strategy from County to address problems (1)</li> <li>• Lack of traffic management in area (5)</li> <li>• Impact on operation of Park &amp; Ride scheme (17)</li> <li>• The Worts Causeway bypass route used by other services eg A13 Haverhill bus (1)</li> <li>• Distance and safety of access to local facilities would mean residents use cars (5)</li> <li>• Using public transport and bikes is a personal choice (2)</li> <li>• Safety of walkers (2)</li> <li>• Danger to cyclists on local roads (4)</li> <li>• Worts Causeway is narrow and higher than surrounding fields making it difficult for cyclists in particular (1)</li> <li>• Worts Causeway would become a rat run (2)</li> <li>• No main access point has been identified (2)</li> <li>• Access through GB2 to GB1 will make GB2 very busy (1)</li> <li>• Access onto Worts Causeway or Babraham Road are both inappropriate (3)</li> <li>• Babraham Road will require another major roundabout (2)</li> <li>• Considerable walking distance to park and ride (1)</li> <li>• Don't wish to lose current paths and permissive rights of way across site to Beech Woods and Roman road (5)</li> <li>• Nightingale Ave has become a rat run (1)</li> <li>• There is no access to Almoners Ave and land owner will not sell (1)</li> <li>• May need compulsory purchase of properties in</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>order to create an access from existing estates? (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrary to Council officer's belief there is NO pedestrian or cycle access from into Almoners Ave. It is privately owned by 39 and 39A. (1)</li> <li>• Disagree site is in easy cycling distance of City centre and station (1)</li> <li>• <b>RAON</b>-Doesn't feel it is possible to assess these sites options without a set of traffic options (which could be met within budget limits) alongside an assessment of the impact on the local network</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of school places (26)</li> <li>• Lack healthcare provision (20)</li> <li>• No community centre (2)</li> <li>• Few amenities shops and facilities in area (18)</li> <li>• Distance to local shops (8)</li> <li>• Distance to schools (12)</li> <li>• Distance medical facilities (6)</li> <li>• Distance to sports facility (1)</li> <li>• South of the City lacks community facilities compared with north (2)</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure/water/drainage won't cope (27)</li> <li>• Cambridge can't keep growing it doesn't have the infrastructure to be a big city (1)</li> <li>• Building below a hill could result in greater flooding risk on lower land (1)</li> <li>• Numbers of dwellings will overwhelm existing community (1)</li> <li>• Integration with existing community (5)</li> <li>• LA's have failed to provide long term infrastructure solutions (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houses will be unaffordable for Addenbrookes workers (1)</li> <li>• Lot of other housing on southern fringe for hospital workers (2)</li> <li>• Give incentives to use unoccupied properties. There are 10,000 in Cambridgeshire (2)</li> <li>• Root calculations of need for housing and employment are inconclusive (1)</li> <li>• There are no such circumstances as 95% of projected housing need can be met through existing planning consents, allocated sites, and SHLAA projections. (1)</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth currently too rapid (1)</li> <li>• Pressure from government to meet housing targets (2)</li> <li>• SoS turned down a proposal for 500 homes here in 2006 affect on area best landscape and setting (11)</li> <li>• Housing provided on Green Belt sites has been uninspiring (1)</li> <li>• Not seen projections of homes and jobs asked for at previous submission (1)</li> <li>• Need given new developments on southern fringe at north west Cambridge and on land near station (11)</li> <li>• We need affordable homes not homes for commuters/investors? (15)</li> <li>• Planning Authorities must work together to solve housing shortages (1)</li> <li>• Need for sheltered housing yet to evaluated (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Marshalls land instead (2)</li> <li>• Consider Waterbeach or Northstowe instead (10)</li> <li>• Expand selected villages and new settlements instead (33)</li> <li>• Focus on other brownfield sites instead (12)</li> <li>• Alternative brownfield sites near village rail stations and the guided bus route would enable workers to use public transport (2)</li> <li>• CPRE says there is enough brownfield land to build 1.5 million homes in UK (1)</li> <li>• It is perverse to build more in the SE when the government at local and national level are trying to develop the north of the country (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of keeping with existing structures (2)</li> <li>• There is a GHQ Line Anti tank trench running across the GB1 and GB2 sites which presents contaminated land issues and cultural heritage /archaeological issues and historic monument of national and regional importance requiring a risk evaluation under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (1)</li> <li>• Impact on house prices (2)</li> <li>• Can't be assumed all will work locally (2)</li> <li>• Pressure on City centre (1)</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire will soon grind to a halt</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>(1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon quality of life (6)</li> <li>• Density must be more compatible with that in locality (2)</li> <li>• High density is detrimental to owners on site and those adjoining (1)</li> <li>• 480 homes is too many (1)</li> <li>• Plans represent overdevelopment (1)</li> <li>• New development will be an eyesore with modern house not in keeping with existing (1)</li> <li>• A concrete jungle is proposed which will remain for long time (2)</li> <li>• Density won't allow for green verges within site (1)</li> <li>• Huge disruption in return for minimal number of new houses (1)</li> <li>• There is a significant consensus of objection (1)</li> <li>• Where will profits from development end up? (1)</li> <li>• <i>Field path alongside GB2 running to Wandlebury and Beech Woods has featured in 2 well known books written by a local resident. 'Wild Places' is about the indispensable value of certain landscapes and how such hard to articulate qualities such as beauty, biodiversity and landscape history are so important to our well being. 'The Old Ways' focuses on paths nature and happiness and focuses on the field path and Roman Road. 'Over the Hills to Cherry Hinton' also outlines important aspects of this area (1)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Other with no reason stated</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to development either side of Worts Causeway (1)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support GB2 (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fills a natural corner that lends itself to the purpose (1)</li> <li>• Provides a reasonable choice provided it doesn't spread nearer the Beechwoods (1)</li> <li>• Sites are suitable for residential development agree with arguments in favour (1)</li> <li>• Most sites look suitable for housing (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to Park and Ride, Addenbrookes, guided bus, Science Parks, and rail station to be built at Long Road (1)</li> <li>• Visually satisfactory (1)</li> <li>• Limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site accessible by public transport and bicycle and close to employment and services. Preferable to village locations where it adds to commuting/pollution/congestion/environmental impact (1)</li> <li>• Support on basis green belt setting is not compromised (2)</li> <li>• Development here would be beneficial but Cambridge still needs infrastructure to overcome congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support as not as congested as area as Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Support as it would only extend existing built up areas (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to centres of employment, good public transport, schools and facilities thereby putting minimum strain on road congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support if site includes significant green space to moderate impact of Addenbrookes from the Gogs (1)</li> <li>• Support but traffic along Babraham Rd needs to be <b>addressed</b> first (1)</li> <li>• Other general supports (4)</li> <li>• Support because large developments should be kept close to Cambridge and within the A14 /M11 corridor) (1)</li> <li>• Strongly support in view of proximity to Addenbrookes (1)</li> <li>• <b>Sawston Parish Council</b>-There is no good reason why Site GB2 couldn't be extended to cover the whole triangle of land bordered by Worts Causeway /Babraham Rd/ and Lime Kiln Road</li> <li>• <b>Cllr David Bard</b>- Should be extended to cover the whole triangle of land bordered by Worts Causeway /Babraham Rd/ and Lime Kiln Road</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division</b>-Support development of GB2. Site is a logical extension to Cambridge in terms of its accessibility to surrounding built up area and is in sustainable location. It has minimal impact on green belt. It meets housing needs and could provide affordable housing. It is unconstrained by major infrastructure capacity issues and is in single ownership. It could be developed independently or as part of larger phased development with adjoining land.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Carter Jonas-</b> Support development of site, which is logical extension to Cambridge with minimal impact on green belt. It is a sustainable location. Site is available and can be developed independently or as part of larger phased scheme. It is unconstrained by infrastructure capacity and is unlikely to have contamination issues. Background evidence supports its development and is endorsed by the County Council. Offers potential for provision of affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comments GB2</b></p>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area was not allowed to be developed in 2002 LDA Green Belt Boundary Study (1)</li> <li>• Site was rejected previously what has changed? (1)</li> <li>• Site should be kept as Green Belt (1)</li> <li>• Will lead to ribbon development towards Fulbourn and Shelford (1)</li> <li>• Favour Worts Causeway sites because they wouldn't fundamentally change the nature of that part of the Cambridge boundary, visually or functionally (1)</li> <li>• Development here seems practical and has minimal impact (1)</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage-</b> The curved alignment of Beamont Road will ensure that to some extent this allocation will give the appearance of 'rounding off' the city edge, though the eastern boundary might then have taken a more northeast-southwest alignment up to the track that forms the western boundary of the large field, whereas the current north-south alignment appears better suited to justifying the allocation of site GB2. We note the site includes locally listed farm buildings and while these might be retained, their setting is likely to be compromised by the allocation. It will therefore be necessary to consider whether or not there is sufficient wider public benefit to be derived from this allocation to justify the harm. The eastern boundary would need careful treatment to form an appropriate junction between the city and the Green Belt.</li> <li>• English Heritage-Not logical to develop on its own but justified if developed in conjunction with GB1. Recommend GB1 is developed first.</li> </ul>

	<p>The eastern boundary would need careful treatment to form an appropriate junction between the City and the Green Belt.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor integration with existing communities (1)</li> <li>• Existing facilities won't cope (1)</li> <li>• <b>Environment Agency- Environment Agency-</b> Site at low risk to fluvial flooding. Surface water drainage discharge rate should meet current standards. Site sits near two two known groundwater abstractions (1km and 750m) Ground water aquifer below site is important needs protection and improvement as a primary water source but site is not within a source protection zone. Preliminary site investigation needed before any planning applications needed to check any contamination from agricultural use. Potential to use infiltration drainage on site. Recommend non piling foundation solutions are used</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity to Addenbrookes is major selling point so why not seek 90% affordable housing here (1)</li> <li>• Sites GB1 and GB2 seems good if low cost housing is included for hospital workers (1)</li> <li>• Site is a good solution for 480 homes (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since most job opportunities are north of Cambridge further development to the north of City seems logical, beyond that Bourn and Cambourne are possibilities (1)</li> <li>• Worts Causeway/Fulbourn proposals seem low impact (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity to Beech Woods where lesser spotted woodpecker and tawny owl nests and rare wild hellebores flower (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road not built for heavy traffic. Capacity safety width of local roads (2)</li> <li>• Pathway along field boundary on Worts Causeway is a restrictive right of way (1)</li> <li>• A southern relief road would have supported</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>development in this area but it was cancelled (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to the Bell School is still not resolved (1)</li> <li>• Will only cause further traffic gridlock (1)</li> <li>• Development of Worts Causeway seems logical as long as increased traffic considerations are addressed (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other /Reason Unspecified</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Council own site (1)</li> <li>• Fulbourn Rd with local employment preferred (1)</li> <li>• Worts Causeway -unspecified (1)</li> <li>• Do not support this option (1)</li> </ul>
--	---

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE GB2**

**Representations: Total 292 Object 250 Support 25 Comment 17**

**Key Issues:**

- i. Impact on setting of City
  - a. The 2012 Green Belt Appraisal fully recognised the proximity of this land to higher quality landscape associated with the higher ground to the southeast. Provided development was kept to 2 storeys on this site and appropriate landscape buffer areas are provided in advance to soften and significantly improve the urban edge in this location the impact of the proposed Green Belt releases on setting would be relatively minor.
  
- ii. Loss Of Green Belt
  - a. The current Green Belt was last altered following the 2002 Structure Plan and was intended to last until 2016. The Council's are currently reviewing their Local Plans to 2031 and have to have regard to future settlement policy and future Green Belt. NPPF makes provision for Local Plans to establish Green Belt boundaries to provide a long-term framework having regard to the need to promote sustainable development. Having thoroughly studied the Inner Green Belt boundary the 2012 Green Belt Review found a limited number of small sites, which were of lesser importance to Green Belt purposes and could provide for future housing and other needs with minimal impact. The Local Plan has to consider objectively assessed needs and how these might be met over the plan period in a sustainable way. On balance the level of harm in losing these small sites is judged to be minimal when weighed against the broader needs of the City to 2031.
  
- iii. Development of this site will lead to sprawl of urban area into

surrounding countryside

- a. The boundary suggested is intended to be long term and endure beyond the plan period. Planting and landscaping of its eastern boundary will form a stronger and distinctive urban edge and will serve to enhance the setting maintain the openness of the surrounding landscape and protect historic features. Its green belt status will prevent development creeping any closer to the Gogs and open countryside.
- iv. The development on GB2 should be extended to include the triangle of land between Worts Causeway Limekiln Hill/Cherry Hinton Rd and Babraham Road
    - a. Disagree because the development of this area would result in significant harm to the Green Belt and setting of the City.
  - v. Development will lead to coalescence with surrounding necklace villages
    - a. The new Green Belt boundary proposed on the edge of sites GB1 and GB2 will serve to prevent further built development from encroaching on the surrounding necklace villages, key landscape, and historic features beyond the edge. The Council disagrees given the distance that there is any risk of coalescence with nearby villages.
  - vi. Encroachment of open landscape to the south east
    - a. One of the purposes of green belt is to prevent this happening. The Council believes that once a new boundary is confirmed it will serve to prevent any further encroachment occurring. The 2012 Green Belt Appraisal fully recognised the qualities of the landscape to the south on the higher ground, which, as residents say is among the best to be found in the Cambridge area.
  - vii. Impact of GB1 and GB2 on views from Gogs and Beechwoods
    - a. This can be mitigated by buffer planting on the eastern edge of these sites and to the south of GB2 around the farm complex to soften the existing hard urban edge
  - viii. No “special circumstances” to warrant building houses in the Green Belt
    - a. The NPPF provides for Green Belts to be revised by Local plans. The current boundary was established in 2002 and was expected to endure until 2016 and beyond. However circumstances change and major development at Cambridge East will no longer be deliverable for the foreseeable future. Good progress is being made with the current strategy with the exception of Cambridge East but insufficient land has been found within the urban area of Cambridge to meet identified objectively assessed needs. The NPPF requires that Green Belt boundaries are established in Local Plans, that the boundaries

can endure beyond the end of the plan period (2031) and that consideration is given to the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the inner Green Belt boundary, towards villages within the Green Belt and towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. The LPA's have taken and will continue to take a sequential sustainable approach to the location of growth using City brownfield land first before considering land on the edge of Cambridge (including land in the Green Belt), in new settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and then in the most sustainable villages. A joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary has established that there is no scope for major Green Belt releases without there being very significant detriment to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The review did identify several small sites, which could be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge where the detriment would be limited in nature and scope. This finding together with the guidance in the NPPF concerning sustainability and the need to establish a durable Green Belt boundary provides justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development.

ix. Impact on natural beauty of area

- a. The Council acknowledges the unique quality this area has and the physical and psychological benefits of having such high quality open land near where City residents live. It does not however believe this will be harmed by a discrete development some distance away at the bottom of the slope. Indeed the development of this land could serve to enhance the enjoyment of the surrounding countryside by taking steps to reduce traffic in the area, maintain the country lane feel of Worts' Causeway and opening up permissive paths and green infrastructure improvements to help improve such access and enjoyment.

x. Recreational value of area to local and Cambridge residents

- a. The Council fully acknowledges the value the area has for outdoor recreation by walkers joggers and cyclists. Transport and access measures in conjunction with the development of this site could serve to enhance the safety and experience of walkers joggers horse riders and cyclists through improvement of access to the countryside. Permissive paths can also be retained and enhanced as part of the design of the development. Retain Worts' Causeway as a bus only access with limited car access to develop it as a green link into the surrounding open countryside.

xi. Biodiversity in the area

- a. The development of this and adjoining site GB1 could make provision for wildlife corridors to be provided to enable wildlife to move between the sites and adjoining land.

- b. Netherhall Farm Meadow to the north on GB1 is a County Wildlife site and Protected Open Space. It is particularly important for its unique grassland. As protected Open Space it is designated for its environmental importance. This Meadow would be retained in any development and an appropriate management regime put in place to ensure its long term ecological value is protected. Land area of site has been reduced to allow for this.
- c. The protected roadside verge is also important and should be retained and enhanced by minimising any widening of Worts' Causeway to retain its country lane feel. Provision for non-vehicle users to be within the development site in order to preserve the hedgerows.
- d. Planting and management of access to the chalk grassland nearby could be improved with the Green Infrastructure Strategy to benefit wildlife and the ecology of the area.
- e. Buffer planting along the western boundary will help to reduce any issues of overlooking and help maintain biodiversity

xii. Loss of agricultural land

- a. Half of the site is designated Grade 2 agricultural land with the remainder designated as urban land in the agricultural land classification. The loss is considered to be minor.

xiii. Pollution

- a. Mitigation should be possible following an air quality contamination assessment

xiv. Sustainability

- a. The location on the edge of the city has good access to the Park & Ride services but lacks a high quality public transport. It is nonetheless close to local employment, services and facilities within the City. It can be reached by non-car modes of travel.

xv. Infrastructure

- a. The site scores an amber score in relation to access to local amenities. Distances to local services will be rechecked on a walking route basis. Scope to improve provision should be explored through the development of Sites GB1 and GB2. Contributions through S106 can be sought to help improve wider provision e.g. school places.

xvi. Housing Need

- a. The development will enable the provision of much needed affordable housing
- b. The objectively assessed statement of needs through the SHMA has been updated and confirms a housing requirement of 14,000 dwellings by 2031.
- c. 95% of projected housing need cannot be met through current commitments allocations and SHLAA sites. The SHLAA update

shows there is only just enough land to meet objectively assessed needs including GB1 and GB2

- d. In relation to open market housing the planning system cannot control who ends up buying houses but given it is close to local employment it should prove attractive to local people

xvii. Alternative locations

- a. The LPA's have taken and will continue to take a sequential sustainable approach to the location of growth using City brownfield land first before considering land on the edge of Cambridge (including land in the Green Belt), in new settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and then in the most sustainable villages. The strategy for South Cambridgeshire is proposing a combination of these alternatives as part of its settlement strategy. The scale and nature of the objectively assessed need now requires all of these options to be explored.

xviii. Access and Traffic issues

- a. Any development would be subject to a full transportation assessment and travel plan and make S106 contributions to mitigate any issues including the safety and experience of all road users.
- b. It would be possible to retain the permissive path through GB2 as part of the development through planning and design.
- c. The bollards could be relocated in order to retain Worts' Causeway as a bus only access with limited car access to develop it as a green link into the surrounding open countryside.
- d. Vehicular traffic could be routed by a north south link from Site GB1 with access to the main road network being made from a new junction to the south on the Babraham Road. This should address the concerns of local residents about the capacity and safety of the local road network.
- e. Congestion on the A1307 and the access to Addenbrookes will be tackled through the County Council's forthcoming wider Transport Strategy.
- f. Impact on Lime Kiln Hill and nearby nature reserves would be minimised by the proposed traffic reduction measures on Worts' Causeway

xix. Archaeology

- a. With regard to the GHQ Line this is not yet recorded in the HER. A scheme of archaeological works should occur prior to any planning determination.

<b>Site Number: GB3</b>		
<b>Total representations: 115</b>		
<b>Object<sup>8</sup>: 74</b>	<b>Support: 24</b>	<b>Comment: 17</b>

<sup>8</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<p><b>Objections GB3</b> <b>(number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of views of fields and piece and quiet (1)</li> <li>• Views of Lime Kiln Hill (1)</li> <li>• It is an encroachment on the Green Belt (2)</li> <li>• Proposal doesn't check unrestricted sprawl nor does it assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment (1)</li> <li>• Contributes to coalescence Cambridge and Fulbourn (2)</li> <li>• Green belt is there to protect expansion into surrounding countryside (1)</li> <li>• Object as development should be located in new settlements and better served villages (1)</li> <li>• Green belt must remain for physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health as well as environmental reasons (2)</li>   <li>• Negative visual impact on Lime Kiln Hill Nature Reserve (2)</li>   <li>• Visual impact misrepresented in document (2)</li>   <li>• It will cause fundamental harm/impact upon the green belt (4)</li>   <li>• Loss of Green belt /creates precedent (9)</li>   <li>• If green belt is used it can never be replaced (2)</li>   <li>• Object to development in Green Belt but if absolutely required this site is near employment and has good access to City (1)</li>   <li>• NPPF Parag 83 provides for Green Belt boundary changes only in "exceptional circumstances" The Council has not presented a compelling case as to why this constitutes exceptional circumstances (1)</li> <li>• Will encourage ribbon development along Fulbourn Rd (1)</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Green Belt due to its location on rising ground (37)</li> <li>• Disagree it will have minimal impact on the Green Belt (1)</li> <li>• Will be visible from higher ground to the south (3)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of countryside (1)</li> <li>• Object to all green belt sites they should be left for future generations to enjoy (1)</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Forum For Community Action -</b> Adverse impact on Green Belt due to its location on rising ground. Proximity to and pressure upon Chalk Pits Nature reserve compromising its value as a nature reserve by increasing its isolation from wider countryside. The access to the development goes through existing housing areas and contributes to increased vehicular and pedestrian movements at the busy Robin Hood junction.</li> <li>• <b>CPRE</b> –Parags 10.9 and 10.10 of SCDC I&amp;O 1 Document suggest there is a good range of employment sites in the South Cambridgeshire at Northstowe and NW Cambridge. There is therefore no need for employment development on this site which would adversely affect the green belt setting of Cambridge</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust BCN</b> – will have unacceptable adverse impact on the local ecological network including SSSI's, County and City Wildlife sites and will compromise the ability to achieve the Gog Magogs Strategic Green Infrastructure Scheme. The Council's Assessment has underplayed impacts on natural environment and biodiversity in particular. Reassessing Site GB3 could result in the score changing from amber to red in which case they should not be developed</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b>-Site lies close to nationally and locally designated sites Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit SSSI, Limekiln Hill Local Nature Reserve. Natural England would only be satisfied with these sites being allocated if they result in no adverse effect on these sites through uncontrolled access, fly tipping, fires etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Natural Environment Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ainsdale is quiet and rural place to live (1)</li> <li>• Will ruin natural beauty of area (1)</li> <li>• Loss of many gardens and allotments over last</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>30 years (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity (3)</li> <li>• Puts pressure on Chalk Pits. Wildlife needs corridors to move between habitats (1)</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Chalk Pits Nature Reserve SSSI (7)</li> <li>• Proximity to Chalk Pits Nature Reserve (37)</li> <li>• Nature reserve one of few wild areas around Cambridge much used and appreciated by local residents (1)</li> <li>• Will compromise the value of the nature reserve by increasing its isolation from open countryside (36)</li> <li>• Dogs and cats from GB3 will badly effect wildlife on Lime Kiln Nature Reserve (2)</li> <li>• I&amp;O Working Group Windsor Road Residents Association - Adverse impact on Chalk Pits Nature Reserve</li> </ul> <p><b>Active and Passive Local Recreation/Leisure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ramblers Association Cambridge Group-</b> Have long campaigned for a safe off road footpath link from Fulbourn Road south to the Roman Road. Lime Kiln Hill is dangerous for walkers and lacks a footpath for most of its length. Improved rights of way could be provided as part of this development to provide safe access to the wider countryside.</li> <li>• <b>Cherry Hinton Residents Association-</b>Not suitable for housing or employment due to proximity to Lime Kiln Hill nature reserves and Cherry Hinton Hall as it constitutes valuable green corridor as identified in CCC and Wildlife Trust City Nature Conservation Strategy 2006. Vehicular access is also issue for Ainsdale/Tweedale</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic along Fulbourn Road (4)</li> <li>• Impact on existing heavy congestion (2)</li> <li>• Exit from development would be through existing housing and contribute to increased traffic and pedestrian movement at the busy Robin Hood junction (42)</li> <li>• Speed limit on Fulbourn Road too high at 40mph (2)</li> <li>• Cycle routes are inadequate (1)</li> <li>• Safe routes for schoolchildren cyclists and pedestrians needed (3)</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic issues (6)</li> <li>• Fulbourn Road at this point is not on a bus route (1)</li> <li>• <b>RAON</b>-Doesn't feel it is possible to assess these sites options without a set of traffic options (which could be met within budget limits) alongside an assessment of the impact on the local network</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At bursting point on services and infrastructure (3)</li> <li>• Infrastructure (2)</li> <li>• Lack of school places (1)</li> <li>• Impact on health facilities (1)</li> <li>• Adds to flood risk on lower ground (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of recent high density town houses in area (1)</li> <li>• Benefit is small for damage caused (1)</li> <li>• We need affordable homes not homes for commuters/investors? (1)</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> –Favour the housing option. Development should seek to improve green infrastructure in the area, and strengthen the ecological network and protect ecologically important features.</li> </ul> <p><b>Loss Agricultural Land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of arable land (6)</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give incentives to use unoccupied properties. There are 10,000 in Cambridgeshire (2)</li> <li>• Develop in areas of decline elsewhere in Britain (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of science park (1)</li> <li>• Object because it will create an imbalance between employment and housing (1)</li> <li>• Cherry Hinton has been overdeveloped (1)</li> <li>• Site is disappointing choice for housing and employment (1)</li> <li>• Pressure on City centre (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>General objection (1)</b></p>
<b>Support GB3 (number</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would do not change the beauty of the</li> </ul>

<p><b>of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<p>area (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good choice as close to Cherry Hinton with its facilities and transport links although Chalk Pits and Nature Reserve must be protected (1)</li> <li>• Support provided shared use cycle path can be converted to proper cycle lanes on both sides of Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Support employment or housing but address traffic issues prior to development (1)</li> <li>• Beneficial development but Cambridge still needs infrastructure to overcome congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support provided setting not compromised (2)</li> <li>• General support of option (5)</li> <li>• Support as only extending built up area slightly (1)</li> <li>• Support as large developments should be kept close to Cambridge (2)</li> <li>• Support this site as is accessible by public transport and bicycle. And is close to employment and services. This is preferable to village locations which add to commuting and congestion (2)</li> <li>• Support as there are good local employment, schools and shopping facilities (2)</li> <li>• Creates minimum strain on roads (1)</li> <li>• Minimal problems/ limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (2)</li> <li>• Support as small developments and benefit housing (1)</li> <li>• <b>ARM Holdings</b> –Some of this land may provide opportunity for ARM to meet its growth requirements in the City which could involve it doubling of its floorspace from 150,000sqft to 300,000sq ft over the next 10 years through a series of phased developments. Given its expansion requirement and its desire to remain</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>in Cambridge it is therefore supportive of the allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Southacre Latham and Chaucer Road Residents Association- Support</b> development of this site as GB3 and GB4 are infill sites screened from the road by tall buildings on Peterhouse Technology Park and the rising ground to the south. Development should be recessed into the hill side to reduce visual impact further. Site GB3 should not be promoted for industrial development due to its proximity to residential development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comment Green</b></p>	<p><b>Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site seems to cause low impact (2)</li> <li>• Best option is Fulbourn road site and NIAB site (1)</li> <li>• Fulbourn Rd with local employment preferable (1)</li> <li>• Most sites look suitable for housing (1)</li> <li>• Support Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• <b>Harlton Parish Council</b>-Support for employment use as discrete and aligns with Peterhouse Technology Park. Proposers should offset balancing green belt provision elsewhere.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b>- Would not materially effect the village</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> – Do not object to employment on this site as aligns with Peterhouse Technology Park and would be discrete.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> - <b>These</b> sites are relatively modest allocations where the boundary of the southern edge of the city would be aligned with the Peterhouse Technology Park. English Heritage does not object and would wish to see careful treatment of the southern boundary to form an appropriate boundary with the green belt.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most jobs opportunities in north of the City. Focus instead on Histon Girton Milton Waterbeach Cottenham (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports local jobs and housing demand but should not on green belt (1)</li> <li>• Do not support option (1)</li> <li>• <b>Orwell Parish Council</b> –Protection of Green Belt should receive highest priority. Brownfield sites should be exhausted first. GB3 and GB4 should be kept for employment use.</li> <li>• <b>Environment Agency- Environment Agency-</b> Site at low risk to fluvial flooding. Surface water drainage discharge rate should meet current standards. Site sits on chalk formation. Principal ground water aquifer below site. This is important and needs protection and improvement as a primary water source but site is not within a source protection zone. OS plans show springs at source of Cherry Hinton Brook 185m to NW. Technical Assessment acknowledges possible contamination due to adjacent land use. Preliminary site investigation needed before any planning applications needed to ensure delivery. Potential to use infiltration drainage on site. Recommend non piling foundation solutions are used. More pollution measures likely to be required for any employment use on site. A hydrogeological risk assessment will be required.</li> </ul>
--	--

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE GB3**

**Representations: total 115; Object 74 Support 24 Comment 17**

**Key Issues:**

- i. Adverse impact upon the Green Belt due to its location on rising ground
  - a. The site options does not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes. It is located at the bottom of the hill and makes a very minimal encroachment.
  - b. It is likely to be developed for employment and could be cut into the hill side in the same way as the Peterhouse Technology Park meaning that it would not be seen from higher ground to the south.
  - c. Appropriate planting and landscaping would be undertaken on the southern boundary
- ii. Likely to lead to coalescence with Fulbourn
  - a. Disagree it is a considerable way from Fulbourn
- iii. Impact on setting
  - a. This can be mitigated by planning and design and by setting any

development into the hillside	
iv.	Biodiversity- Adverse impact ecologically and visually on the SSSI and Nature Reserves on Lime Kiln Hill <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If it is developed for employment use this is less likely as domestic pets are not likely to stray into the reserve</li> </ul>
v.	Will compromise the value of the nature reserve by increasing isolation from open countryside <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. An wildlife corridor could be established as part of the development to retain any routes to open countryside for wildlife</li> </ul>
vi.	Recreation Active and Passive-The Ramblers Association have long campaigned for safe off road path from Fulbourn Road south to the Roman Road avoiding the dangers of Lime Kiln Hill <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Improved rights of way could be negotiated as part of the development of this site to provide safer access to open countryside</li> </ul>
vii.	Loss of agricultural land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All classified as urban land in the agricultural land classification</li> </ul>
viii.	Traffic and access issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If used for employment access could be achieved from site GB4 to the east and would not effect Ainsdale</li> <li>b. Other traffic issues raised would not be an issue</li> <li>c. General problems with the Robin Hood junction can be addressed by the County Council's Transport Strategy which is being prepared in tandem with the Local Plan</li> </ul>
ix.	Other Infrastructure Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the development is for employment as planned it won't place pressures on local infrastructure and will bring new employment</li> <li>b. It is at low risk of fluvial flooding. Site investigation will be needed before any application to check any contamination. Relevant pollution measures will be required for employment uses.</li> </ul>
x.	Some of this land may help ARM Holdings meet its future space requirements over the next 10 years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. It will be important to continue to support high technology firms which contribute significantly to local employment.</li> </ul>

<b>Site Number: GB4</b>		
<b>Total representations:</b>		
<b>Object<sup>9</sup>: 28</b>	<b>Support: 25</b>	<b>Comment: 49</b>

<sup>9</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>	
<b>Objections Green</b>	<p><b>Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Special circumstances” case for a green belt release has not been made (1)</li> <li>• Will lead to creep up the hill and is unwelcome (1)</li> <li>• Proposal doesn’t check unrestricted sprawl nor does it assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment (1)</li> <li>• Contributes to coalescence Cambridge and Fulbourn (2)</li> <li>• Object as development should be located in new settlements and better served villages (1)</li> <li>• Green belt must remain for physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health as well as environmental reasons (2)</li> <li>• Visual impact misrepresented in document (2)</li> <li>• It will cause fundamental harm/impact upon the green belt (5)</li> <li>• Loss of Green belt /creates precedent (6)</li> <li>• If green belt is used it can never be replaced (2)</li> <li>• Object to development in Green Belt but if absolutely required this site is near employment and has good access to city/minimal impact (2)</li> <li>• Development will be an eyesore and should be recessed into the hill side to reduce visual impact further (1)</li> <li>• Will be visible from higher ground to the south (1)</li> <li>• Object to all green belt sites they should be left for future generations to enjoy (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Natural Environment Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will ruin natural beauty of area (1)</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity (1)</li> <li>• Puts pressure on Chalk Pits. Wildlife needs corridors to move between habitats should include a buffer zone between reserves and this site (3)</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Chalk Pits Nature Reserve SSSI (2)</li> <li>• Proximity to Chalk Pits Nature Reserve (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Active and Passive Local Recreation/Leisure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area around Gogs Beech Wood the Roman Road and Wandlebury much needed for recreation by a large urban population (1)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to countryside for locals residents walkers cyclists joggers, cross country runners, birdwatchers ( )</li> <li>• Impact on local</li> <li>• <b>Ramblers Association Cambridge Group-</b> Have long campaigned for a safe off road footpath link from Fulbourn Road south to the Roman Road. Lime Kiln Hill is dangerous for walkers and lacks a footpath for most of its length. Improved rights of way could be provided as part of this development to provide safe access to the wider countryside.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic along Fulbourn Road (2)</li> <li>• Impact on existing heavy congestion (3)</li> <li>• Exit from development would be through existing housing and contribute to increased traffic and pedestrian movement at the busy Robin Hood junction (1)</li> <li>• Speed limit on Fulbourn Road too high at 40mph (1)</li> <li>• Safe routes for schoolchildren cyclists and pedestrians needed (1)</li> <li>• Traffic issues (4)</li> <li>• Fulbourn Road at this point is not on a bus route (1)</li> <li>• <b>RAON-</b>Doesn't feel it is possible to assess these sites options without a set of traffic options (which could be met within budget limits) alongside an assessment of the impact on the local network</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At bursting point on services and infrastructure (2)</li> <li>• Infrastructure (1)</li> <li>• Lack of school places (1)</li> <li>• Impact on health facilities (1)</li> <li>• Adds to flood risk on lower ground (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need affordable homes not homes for commuters/investors? (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Loss Agricultural Land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of arable land (5)</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p><b>Alternative locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give incentives to use unoccupied properties. There are 10,000 in Cambridgeshire (2)</li> <li>• Develop in areas of decline elsewhere in Britain (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object because it will create an imbalance between employment and housing (1)</li> <li>• Need for development here given all development at Addenbrooke's (1)</li> <li>• Pressure on City centre (1)</li> <li>• General objection (1)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good choice as close to Cherry Hinton with its facilities and transport links although Chalk Pits and Nature Reserve must be protected (1)</li> <li>• Support provided shared use cycle path can be converted to proper cycle lanes on both sides of Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Beneficial development but Cambridge still needs infrastructure to overcome congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support provided setting not compromised (2)</li> <li>• General support of option (9)</li> <li>• Limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> <li>• Represents a natural extension of the Technology Park (1)</li> <li>• Support as only extending built up area slightly (1)</li> <li>• Support as large developments should be kept close to Cambridge (2)</li> <li>• Support this site as is accessible by public transport and bicycle. And is close to employment and services. This is preferable to village locations which add to commuting and congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support as there are good local employment, schools and shopping facilities (2)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creates minimum strain on roads (1)</li> <li>• Minimal problems/ limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> <li>• <b>ARM Holdings</b> –Some of this land may provide opportunity for ARM to meet its growth requirements in the City which could involve it doubling of its floorspace from 150,000sqft to 300,000sq ft over the next 10 years through a series of phased developments. Given its expansion requirement and its desire to remain in Cambridge it is therefore supportive of the allocation</li> <li>• <b>Southacre Latham and Chaucer Road Residents Association- Support</b> development of this site as GB3 and GB4 are infill sites screened from the road by tall buildings on Peterhouse Technology Park and the rising ground to the south. Development should be recessed into the hill side to reduce visual impact further.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> –Support development of this site from an economic perspective as it forms a logical extension to the existing Peterhouse Technology Park and provide quality employment development for high tech uses</li> <li>• <b>Cherry Hinton Residents Association-</b> Supports the development as it represents a discrete extension to the mini science and technology park and will provide employment for local people, provide synergy with existing businesses, and contribute to business generally in the Cherry Hinton local centre</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comments Green</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site seems to cause low impact (2)</li> <li>• Fulbourn Rd with local employment preferable (1)</li> <li>• Support GB4 if adequate environmental safeguards are maintained (1)</li> <li>• <b>Harlton Parish Council</b>-Support for employment use as discrete and aligns with Peterhouse Technology Park. Proposers should offset balancing green belt provision elsewhere.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b>- Would not</li> </ul>

	<p>materially effect the village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> – Do not object to employment on this site as aligns with Peterhouse Technology Park and would be discrete.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage - These</b> sites are relatively modest allocations where the boundary of the southern edge of the city would be aligned with the <b>Peterhouse</b> Technology Park. English Heritage does not object and would wish to see careful treatment of the southern boundary to form an appropriate boundary with the green belt.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most jobs opportunities in north of the City. Focus instead on Histon Girton Milton Waterbeach Cottenham (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports local jobs and housing demand but should not on green belt (1)</li> <li>• Do not support option (1)</li> <li>• Support but address traffic issues prior to development (1)</li> <li>• A limited expansion may be acceptable if careful attention is given to height massing &amp; materials (inc colour). The site can be seen from higher ground to the south. Any development must safeguard the amenity of adjoining housing to the north be no more than 2 storeys and incorporate a green roof to minimise visual impact from the higher ground and respond to environmental considerations (32).</li> <li>• Any development must safeguard the amenity of adjoining housing to the north , be no more than 2 storeys and incorporate a green roof to minimise visual impact from the higher ground and respond to environmental considerations (1)</li> <li>• <b>Orwell Parish Council</b> –Protection of Green Belt should receive highest priority. Brownfield sites should be exhausted first. GB3 and GB4 should be kept for employment use.</li> <li>• <b>Environment Agency- Environment Agency-</b> Site at low risk to fluvial flooding. Surface water drainage discharge rate should meet current standards. Site sits on chalk formation.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Principal ground water aquifer below site. This is important and needs protection and improvement as a primary water source but site is not within a source protection zone. OS plans show springs at source of Cherry Hinton Brook 185m to NW. Technical Assessment acknowledges possible contamination due to adjacent land use. Preliminary non intrusive and intrusive site investigation needed before any planning applications needed to ensure delivery. Potential to use infiltration drainage on site. Recommend non piling foundation solutions are used. More pollution measures likely to be required for any employment use on site. A hydrogeological risk assessment will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Forum For Community Action-</b> A limited expansion may be acceptable if careful attention is given to height massing &amp; materials (inc colour). The site can be seen from higher ground to the south. Any development must safeguard the amenity of adjoining housing to the north, be no more than 2 storeys and incorporate a green roof to minimise visual impact from the higher ground and respond to environmental considerations.</li> </ul>
--	--

#### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE GB4**

**Representations: Total 102 ; Object 28 Support 25 Comment 49**

##### **Key Issues:**

- xi. Adverse impact upon the Green Belt due to its location on rising ground
  - d. The site options does not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes. It is located at the bottom of the hill and makes a very minimal encroachment.
  - e. It is likely to be developed for employment and could be cut into the hill side in the same way as the Peterhouse Technology Park meaning that it would not be seen from higher ground to the south.
  - f. Appropriate planting and landscaping would be undertaken on the southern boundary
- xii. Likely to lead to coalescence with Fulbourn
  - b. Disagree it is a considerable way from Fulbourn
- xiii. Impact on setting
  - b. This can be mitigated by planning and design and by setting any

development into the hillside limiting it to two storeys possibly with a green roof to minimise visual impact from the higher ground.

- xiv. Biodiversity- Adverse impact ecologically and visually on the SSSI and Nature Reserves on Lime Kiln Hill
  - b. If it is developed for employment use this is less likely as domestic pets are not likely to stray into the reserve
- xv. Will compromise the value of the nature reserve by increasing isolation from open countryside
  - b. An wildlife corridor could be established as part of the development to retain any routes to open countryside for wildlife
- xvi. Recreation Active and Passive-The Ramblers Association have long campaigned for safe off road path from Fulbourn Road south to the Roman Road avoiding the dangers of Lime Kiln Hill
  - b. Improved rights of way could be negotiated as part of the development of this site to provide safer access to open countryside
- xvii. Traffic and access issues
  - d. If used for employment access could be achieved from the Technology Park
  - e. Other traffic issues raised would not be an issue
  - f. General problems with the Robin Hood junction can be addressed by the County Council's Transport Strategy which is being prepared in tandem with the Local Plan
- xviii. Other Infrastructure Issues
  - c. If the development is for employment as planned it won't place pressures on local infrastructure and will bring new employment
  - d. It is at low risk of fluvial flooding. Site investigation will be needed before any application to check any contamination. Relevant pollution measures will be required for employment uses.
- xix. Loss of agricultural land
  - a. Over 80% of the site is classified as urban land in the agricultural land classification the remainder being equally split between Grade 2 and Grade 3
- xx. Development should safeguard the amenity of adjoining new housing to the south.
  - a. Should be possible to mitigate with good planning and design
- xxi. Some of this land may help ARM Holdings meet its future space requirements over the next 10 years
  - b. It will be important to continue to support high technology firms which, contribute significantly to local employment.

The balance of representations supported the proposed allocation.

**Site Number: GB5**

**Total representations:**

**Object<sup>10</sup>: 77**

**Support: 19**

**Comment: 14**

**KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION**

**Site Option GB5 :  
Fulbourn Road East**

District: SCDC  
Area: 6.92ha  
Use: Employment  
development

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** (number of similar comments in brackets)

- Support if well designed as a small development adjacent to the urban area. **(14)**
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** - Support the proposed employment use for this site from an economic development perspective. It forms a logical extension to the existing Peterhouse Technology Park and presents the opportunity to provide additional quality employment development for high tech related uses. **(1)**
- Support because accessible by public transport and bicycle, close to services so preferable to development in villages which would contribute to more commuting, traffic congestion, pollution, environmental impact. **(1)**

**OBJECTIONS:**

- Development of Site GB5 would be an unsympathetic "ribbon" development of commercial premises on rising ground, which would be contrary to the fundamental Green Belt purposes and functions bringing a "finger" of urban sprawl out into the Green Belt countryside. The development effectively further reduces the separation between Cambridge and Fulbourn. The development would be highly visible from the high ground to the south - the roofs of the existing Technology Park are already prominent when viewed from Shelford Road. **(46)**
- The Parish Plan is opposed to changes to the Green Belt around the village to retain the environment and ambiance of Fulbourn. **(1)**
- This is green belt land. Building here will impact on wildlife and farmland, and people's pleasure in the countryside. It will add to existing heavy traffic on Fulbourn Road. This

<sup>10</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

	<p>would put increased pressure on schools, and Addenbrooke's and the Rosie. (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would increase traffic at peak times (cars already queue along Fulbourn Road, concerned about safety and environmental impact). It may be 'easily accessible' by bike but not safely plus currently Fulbourn Road serviced by one bus route only. (6)</li> <li>• There is no need for this development, which would adversely affect the Green Belt setting of Cambridge as there is an acknowledged surplus of allocated employment land in South Cambridgeshire. (2)</li> <li>• Development of the full site would harm the character and appearance of the nearby Conservation Area. Strongly recommend that the site does not extend to the east of Yarrow Road and that the southern boundary gets further consideration to ensure development is not built on the crest of the hill that rises to the south of the Fulbourn Road. (1)</li> <li>• Site could be developed but only up to the roundabout. (1)</li> <li>• Sites GB3, GB4 and GB5 lie close to nationally and locally designated sites including; Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit SSSI, Limekiln Hill, LNR and Netherhall Farm Meadow CWS. NE would only be satisfied with these sites being allocated if it can be demonstrated that development will not have an adverse effect. (1)</li> <li>• Any development close to Cambridge will put pressure on the City Centre and local infrastructure. (1)</li> <li>• It is possible that a case can be made that these sites meeting the requirement for 'very special circumstances' but the argument to support the release of Green Belt has not yet been made. Until a strong case is made, such as the extension of ARM, then both sites should be opposed on principle as they are in the Green Belt. (1)</li> <li>• Object to loss of Green Belt land. (9)</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land. (1)</li> <li>• Loss of view south when driving down Yarrow Road (1), visible from Fulbourn Road (1).</li> <li>• Site is too big, if it were half the size it could be supported. (1)</li> <li>• Object as there is no assessment of traffic impacts. (1)</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move employment growth to other parts of the UK that need it more. (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option seems practical with minimal impact. (2)</li> <li>• Woodland screening will be required, consideration should be given to the provision of public open space, which the area is deficient in. Regarding transport, the current narrow shared use pavement on the Fulbourn Road needs to be converted such that both sides of Fulbourn Road have proper on-road, cycle lanes, which continue around Gazelle Way. Cycle provision also needs looking at on routes into the City and into Cherry Hinton village centre to encourage residents or employees to not use cars. This bit of the Fulbourn Road is not on a bus route. (1)</li> <li>• Low fluvial risk. Groundwater beneath site is valuable resource needing protecting and improving. Site investigations and risk assessments needed. Infiltration drainage potential. (1)</li> <li>• Do not object to this site. Although development is Green Belt land it aligns with the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park site. Part of the proposed site might be considered suitable for employment development consistent with the adjacent existing employment areas provided that the boundaries of the site are widely buffered and wooded or otherwise screened to merge with the adjacent rural landscape. (2)</li> <li>• Low impact development. (1)</li> </ul>
--	---

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE GB5**

**Representations: Object 77 Support 19 Comment 14**

**Key Issues:**

- xxii. Adverse impact upon the Green Belt due to its location on rising ground
  - g. The site option does not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes. It is located at the bottom of the hill and makes a very minimal encroachment.
  - h. It is likely to be developed for employment and could be cut into the hill side in the same way as the Peterhouse Technology Park meaning that it would not be seen from higher ground to the south.
  - i. Appropriate planting and landscaping would be undertaken on

the southern and eastern boundaries.

- xxiii. Likely to lead to coalescence with Fulbourn
  - c. Disagree, it is a considerable way from Fulbourn
- xxiv. Impact on setting
  - c. This can be mitigated by planning and design and by setting any development into the hillside limiting it to two storeys possibly with a green roof to minimise visual impact from the higher ground.
- xxv. Traffic and access issues
  - g. If used for employment access could be achieved from the Technology Park
  - h. Other traffic issues raised would not be an issue
  - i. General problems with the Robin Hood junction can be addressed by the County Council's Transport Strategy which is being prepared in tandem with the Local Plan
- xxvi. Other Infrastructure Issues
  - e. If the development is for employment as planned it won't place pressures on local infrastructure and will bring new employment
  - f. It is at low risk of fluvial flooding. Site investigation will be needed before any application to check any contamination. Relevant pollution measures will be required for employment uses.

**Conclusions**

- avoids land at risk of flooding

The site is in a sustainable location and could be developed with little impact on Green Belt purposes. It should be allocated for development.

<b>Site Number: GB6</b>		
<b>Total representations:</b>		
<b>Object<sup>11</sup>: 177</b>	<b>Support: 24</b>	<b>Comment: 24</b>

<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>	
<p><b>Site Option GB6: Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road (NIAB3)</b></p> <p>District: SCDC</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whichever site is chosen will not make traffic situation any better, but support NIAB3 as less housing built on that side of town than Fulbourn / Worts Causeway sites.</li> <li>• Ideal site with access from Histon and Huntingdon Roads - should include a link road</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> Object support and comment as allocated in the JDI schedule

	<p>to both.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support all sites so long as well considered and do not detract from setting of Cambridge. What do they offer in compensation for loss of Green Belt?</li> <li>• Option seems practical with minimal impact. (2)</li> <li>• Support as only extending existing built up areas. (3) / Limited Green Belt development. (1)</li> <li>• Large developments should be kept nearer to Cambridge (within A14/M11 corridor). (2)</li> <li>• Accessible by public transport and cycle, close to employment and services – preferable to new houses in villages which contribute to commuting, congestion, pollution, environmental impact. (1) Access to Park &amp; Ride, guided bus and Addenbrooke’s Hospital and Science Parks as employers. (1) Proximity to centres of employment, good public transport schools and facilities. Thereby putting minimum strain on road congestion. (1)</li> <li>• Most of the sites look suitable for housing.</li> <li>• Most suitable site – current development in area, proximity to A14, could also be considered for Community Stadium.</li> <li>• Would lessen traffic travelling into Cambridge.</li> <li>• Road network better with access to A14.</li> <li>• Since most jobs in north of city, further development in the north seems logical.</li> <li>• Best place for community stadium – road access and transport easily improved – good use of site. Move pylons if an issue. Restrict housing to high density and away from A14.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further housing, nor a proposed Community Stadium, should be built on land adjacent to existing NIAB development sites 1 and 2. (143)</li> <li>• Protect Green Belt - Object to all sites that encroach onto Green Belt land. (4) No Green Belt unless exceptional circumstances (2) Green Belt can never be replaced. (3) Better alternatives. (1)</li> <li>• Air Quality – How does encouraging families to live in areas of poor air quality tally sustainability and environmental agendas? (1) Green Belt needed to protect air quality. (1) Development within AQMA caused by high</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>exhaust emissions is unacceptable - remain green space to assist with carbon absorption to aid improved air quality. (1) No sense to develop site if issue for living and working there. (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not suitable for residential – too close to A14 – not fair or healthy for future residents. (2) / commercial would encourage long distance commuting. (1)</li> <li>• Coalescence - Loss of separation with Histon &amp; Impington – turn into suburb of Cambridge. (3) Create coalescence – loss of remaining small, but important gap and increase urbanisation along Histon Road due to Orchard Park. (1) Impact on Girton and surrounding villages to become part of Cambridge. (1)</li> <li>• Infrastructure needed may be unaffordable and/or delayed.</li> <li>• No to NIAB 3 - area cannot cope with more. (4) Overcrowding of residential area (1)</li> <li>• Health issues with pylons. (2)</li> <li>• This side of city will experience greatest impact of development already envisaged. Further development will be straw that breaks camels back. 'Community stadium' would threaten amenities of residence close by.</li> <li>• On NIAB 3 infrastructure, the effect on Girton would be too deleterious for the Parish Council to approve it.</li> <li>• Object to residential – could be considered for improvement for open space purposes.</li> <li>• 1. Green Belt - threat of coalescence. 2. Much of site in Air Quality Management area, and unsuitable. 3. Likely to require noise barriers from A14 - unacceptable visual impact. 4. No demand for employment development - unlikely to be mixed use development.</li> <li>• Only remaining open land separating City and Impington – don't want to lose identity, be seen as extension to Cambridge. Community Stadium will generate traffic from north through Histon and Impington adding to existing traffic issues.</li> <li>• Impact on Roads - Commercial development off Madingley Road greatly added to congestion and increased journey times because of new traffic. (1) Strain on roads into Cambridge and Histon's High Street, already</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>congested. (1) Increase traffic into Cambridge – already nearing breaking point. (1) Exacerbate traffic problems. (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage - How can be confident that SUDS will work for NIAB 1, 2 and 3? Orchard Park required £7 million surface water attenuation scheme - underground strata is identical. Unless addressed, ground water will saturate award drain and Beck Brook catchments with serious threats to properties and businesses in Histon, Westwick, Rampton and Cottenham. Surface water flow in northwest direction towards Westwick. Ditches already overflow, during heavy rains.</li> <li>• Impact on species identified in SA - retain and enhance biodiversity. NPPF – allocate sites with least environmental or amenity value &amp; consider benefits of best agricultural land.</li> <li>• Not suitable for housing due to poor air quality and noise problems.</li> <li>• Support for industrial but not residential due to AQMA.</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land and Green Belt. (2)</li> <li>• Impact on Green Belt purposes – coalescence. 2. Air quality issues. 3. Visual impact. 4. Public transport overcrowded and unreliable. 5. Histon Road unsafe for cycling &amp; congested (even before NIAB 1&amp;2). 6. Overdevelopment. 7. New community facilities required.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Near motorway and Park &amp; Ride.</li> <li>• A14 capacity - needs upgrading. (1) Worry about adding to the overload on A14, especially if Cottenham developed. (1)</li> <li>• Object in principle, but if absolutely necessary, NIAB3 least worse (3). Area nearest A14 should be restricted to non-domestic development / leave southern part for amenity space for residents of NIAB developments - allows access close to A14 and not add to traffic congestion on Histon Road.</li> <li>• Not supportive of employment development given its relative isolation from other employment areas. Support some residential development linked to 'NIAB' 1&amp;2.</li> <li>• Do not replicate mistakes of Orchard Park. (2) Looks scrappy, unfinished, poor streetscapes, bad cycle permeability, being completely cut</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>off from Cambridge by hostile King's Hedges Road. (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NIAB 3 site close to Hauxton is seeing huge development already with Great Kneighton and site next to Waitrose. More development will cause serious traffic problems - queuing at dangerous levels on M11 during morning rush hour.</li> <li>• While A14 will ensure no real harm to setting of Cambridge, important northern boundary of site kept sufficiently distant from A14 to allow landscape corridor and avoid repeat of poor relationship between Orchard Park and A14.</li> <li>• Groundwater beneath site important base-flow to local watercourses and for local abstractions - need to be maintained and protected. Potential for contamination needs investigating. Potential to use infiltration drainage. Pollution prevention measures are likely for any employment use.</li> <li>• Area near junction 31 of A14 may be suitable but concern that Histon Road and Huntingdon Road are becoming far too busy.</li> <li>• Housing on NIAB site is appalling and too crowded – presumably NIAB3 would be similar.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE GB6</b>	
<b>Representations: Object 177 Support 24 Comment 24</b>	
<b>Key Issues:</b>	
xxvii.	<p>Adverse impact upon the Green Belt</p> <p>a. The NPPF provides for Green Belts to be revised by Local plans. The current boundary was established in 2002 and was expected to endure until 2016 and beyond. However circumstances change and major development at Cambridge East will no longer be deliverable for the foreseeable future. Good progress is being made with the current strategy with the exception of Cambridge East but insufficient land has been found within the urban area of Cambridge to meet identified objectively assessed needs. The NPPF requires that Green Belt boundaries are established in Local Plans, that the boundaries can endure beyond the end of the plan period (2031) and that consideration is given to the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the inner Green Belt boundary, towards villages within the Green Belt and towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. The LPA's have taken and will continue to take a sequential sustainable approach to the location of growth using City brownfield land first before considering land on the edge of Cambridge (including land in the</p>

Green Belt), in new settlements beyond the outer Green Belt boundary and then in the most sustainable villages. A joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary has established that there is no scope for major Green Belt releases without there being very significant detriment to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The review did identify several small sites, which could be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge where the detriment would be limited in nature and scope. This finding together with the guidance in the NPPF concerning sustainability and the need to establish a durable Green Belt boundary provides justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development.

xviii. Likely to lead to coalescence with Histon & Impington

- d. Disagree, impacts can be mitigated. The site allocation will require the retention of hedges and woodland and a set back of the development from Histon Road and the A14 to provide effective visual separation between Cambridge and Impington.

xxix. Traffic and access issues

- e. Other traffic issues raised would not be an issue given the small amount of development proposed and because the overall amount of development on the NIAB 2 and 3 sites will be lower than the 1,100 homes previously planned.

xxx. Drainage Issues

- f. On site and water management as required by policy will effectively mitigate the risks of flooding on site and downstream.

xxxi Noise Issues

- g. Noise from the A14 can be mitigated effectively by the use of soil bunding, the set back of residential and the detailed design of dwellings.

xxxii Air Quality Issues

- h. Air quality issues can be mitigated effectively by a setback of residential properties away from the A14 and outside of the Air Quality Management Area.

### **Conclusion**

- provides homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge,
- avoiding land at risk of flooding

The site is in a sustainable location and could be developed with little impact on Green Belt purposes. It should be allocated for development.

