

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS
QUESTION: General Comments	
General Comments Support: 1 Object: 6 Comment: 36	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support paragraphs 17 and 1.9 and guiding principles of sustainability and guidance in NPPF influenced issues and options / general approach. • Welcome commitment to key principles of ensuring jobs and homes provided in right areas and reducing overreliance on cars. Essential to fully meet objectively assessed needs of area. • Natural England – support approach - committed to sustainable development, high quality, meets challenges of climate change. Welcome recognition of value of existing environment and positive approach to protection / enhancement. Section 1.3 strikes right balance growth / conservation. • Welcome Figure 2 to portray options for development in context of existing / proposed infrastructure. Clear logic in identifying growth to north east of Cambridge around Fen Ditton. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council misguided in need to put expansion as priority for development. Continued growth of Cambridge should be controlled to those endeavours that make special. Encourage secondary growth further away. • Paragraph 13.2 refers to countryside within conservation area and green separation at Longstanton being included in new Local Plan. Not included in consultation – no opportunity to comment on important matter – serious omission. • Appears no notice has been made of Stapleford Parish Plan. Why? <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – important that Minerals and Waste Plan designations are formally acknowledged in Local Plan. • Anglian Water - Findings of Detailed Water Cycle Strategy to 2031 Major Growth Areas and around Cambridge (July 2011) should inform options. Work with partners on Water Cycle Strategy to ensure water / wastewater infrastructure considered. • Poor bus service in Caldecote – would like County Council to introduce outer village transport service. • Important consultation – significant impact decisions will have on lives. Having moved to Cambridge 2 years ago to start work cannot find somewhere to live and settle down. • Arthur Rank Hospice Charity - new site needed

	<p>in southern fringe for hospice to relocate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess impact of development on road system, improve connection to Cambridge Road before housing. Poor quality roads – potholed. Bus services / shop deliveries / parked cars cause problems. • Cambridge City Council – effective joint working to date – work collaboratively on Local Plans and Transport Strategy for Cambridge area – address cross-boundary issues consistently, in joined up manner. Joint evidence base & work on options. • Cambridge City Council Labour Group – need robust, resilient, visionary, joint plan (& evidence) to ensure good decisions, policies, no under-delivery – to deliver major housing sites, strategic choices on jobs, transport and Green Belt. • Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce – achieving desired economic growth needs plans to be coordinated and cover larger area than Cambridge and South Cambs, ideally in one plan. Need long-term strategic cross-party vision across sub-region, better collaboration & connection between different issues. • Conservators of River Cam – Figure 2, 4.5, 4.7 - disappointing no recognition of River Cam corridor as piece of Major Green Infrastructure. • Countryside Restoration Trust – Council must work closely with others to develop vibrant communities, transport infrastructure. Any diminution of living standards threatens Cambridge. More timely investment in provision / maintenance of infrastructure. • Greater Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership – set proactive growth strategy, prepared in collaboration with Cambridge City, to ensure consistency. Need consistent evidence base and align processes, policy aspirations and outcomes. • Hauxton Parish Council – residents have had to tolerate nuisance from Bayer Cropscience construction. Parish Council increased precepts to cope with increased workload but no compensation from developers. • Hertfordshire County Council – Cambridge has major sub-regional, regional and national role – Local Plans pivotal in driving role forward – need to be developed together, as complementary package. Welcome commitment to work together. • Histon and Impington Parish Council – 3 related and dependent consultations running – City, South Cambs, Transport Plan. Collaboration / coordination needed – houses, jobs, transport, infrastructure, City boundary review. • Huntingdonshire District Council – Note SCDC
--	---

	<p>using LEFM forecasts for jobs. Hunts DC is using EEFM – more appropriate for us to model impacts of redevelopment of Alconbury airfield on employment prospects in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Icknield Primary School – Sites 8 & 9 (and others) in Sawston would significantly impact on school – capacity issues require extension / improvement. Wish to be involved in discussions. • North Hertfordshire District Council – with duty to cooperate in mind, not too much that would require detailed discussion – most growth / options away from south of district, except Bassingbourn / Melbourn area. Unlikely to impact North Herts. • If new building on Fulbourn Hospital site, it will be necessary to transfer existing footprint from Ida Darwin site - height restrictions / less footprint will reduce capacity of houses. • Nowhere does it state District's views that commuting to London is to be discouraged. Consultation states work predominantly to be found in Cambridge hence stress on new housing at City edges. Need considerable investment in infrastructure. Commuter housing would provide much-needed revenue. • Forecasts always accurate for 1-2 years but 10 years were disaster. Work on 5 year plans. Vital to start without delay to help economy. <p>Comments on consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Found the website obscurely organised and difficult to navigate. Complicated online submissions. • Make things less ambiguous – selection box should make clear that support/object/comment should state what is being supported/rejected. • Long response forms good that they allow detailed responses, but few people find them accessible. More direct and varied ways needed to involve people. • This is an annoying program. If I've said I support, what more do you want me to say? • Gamlingay Environmental Action Group – long and complex document ideally should be discussed with local organisations / individuals. Consultation period too short, over summer. Little publicity over village meetings. Online form difficult to understand and use for many. • Proposals have significant implications for residents - why were they not brought to people's attention in writing to all residents. Object to having to provide a summary – is it too much to ask SCDC to read 200 words? • Not informed of consultation even though we
--	---

	<p>adjoin a site option. Find this incredible and request details of rules / guidance for consultations. Inform us of future consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Object to providing a summary – cannot remove anything – all comments important to reduce, and what would be the point?• Need better and more timely information on development applications. Missed exhibition – did not know it was on. Would like notice by mail/email of future events.• Complexity of website made it difficult to make representations – could not find a way of making my feelings known and eventually got a message saying the consultation period was over. As it was still 28 September I find this unreasonable.• Questionnaire is pretty complex.
--	--