

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<b>Have Your Say</b> Have Your Say (general Comments)  <b>Support:</b> 1 <b>Object:</b> 2 <b>Comment:</b> 125  (128 representations)	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of affordable housing due to shortage of house building recently. Young people currently struggle to find affordable housing, buying and renting. Although loss of green fields is regrettable it's necessary. The village has grown over the years and for people to do nothing about it is selfish.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to the stadium being built as there will be possible problems with supporters on our streets.</li> <li>Process is over complex. Consider using brown fields more. Last year's options pushed down the pile.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cycle path Hauxton A10 to Cambridge very poor. Design of 2 into 1 for new hospital road very poor.</li> <li>A10 improvement and Northstowe will remove the need to build extensively elsewhere.</li> <li>Website is a nightmare.</li> <li>Current lack of facilities has not been taken into account.</li> <li>Traffic needs to be considered, could Cottenham bypass be extended direct to the A14?</li> <li>Transport should be higher on the agenda.</li> <li>Motor vehicles should not be the prime consideration, provide safe facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>We are one of the driest parts of the country so will we have enough water.</li> <li>Watch were we build because area prone to flooding.</li> <li>A map showing the locations of the sites mentioned being included in the survey would have been helpful.</li> <li>Must be employment opportunities to match development.</li> <li>Online system is far too complex.</li> <li>Need to ensure all present residents are catered for before bringing in new people. Duty to protect city and surrounding area from becoming crammed with building and standing up to demands that allow that.</li> <li>More notice should be taken of Parish Council and District Council.</li> <li>Congestion charge might be a good idea.</li> </ul>

- Thin Internal walls in housing cause problems.
- Interests of one council, in particular the City Council does not override the interests of the others.
- Waterbeach has recently had developments of 100 houses and various small infill sites therefore it is unfair to consider more developments.
- Provision of a heritage centre and appropriate compensation for Longstanton and Oakington for the imposition of Northstowe.
- Population shift. Jobs should be created where people live; Yorkshire and Scotland, not the other way around.
- The ‘wing’ was not part of the consultation so go back to phase one on this. Improve infrastructure before developing.
- **Anglia Ruskin University:** University looking to deliver purpose-built residential accommodation for students in locations which enable access to Milton and the city centre. University considers that locations on northern side of Cambridge and/or southern side of Milton would be well-placed to take advantage of excellent cycle network and public transport connections (including guided bus). Sites in this area could also support delivery of student accommodation related to CRC. Sites on northern fringe, land south of Cambridge Road, Milton and north of A14 would be well located to provide such accommodation.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council:** Issues are economic development, education, library service, public health, rights of way and transport.
- **Barton Parish Council:** Barton Parish Council joins with Coton, Grantchester and Madingley in wishing to preserve and enhance the Quarter to Six Quadrant as a very significant part of Cambridge’s “rural lungs”.
- **Environment Agency:** Detailed comments on water policy issues for local plan.
- **Foxton Parish Council:** We found the questionnaire confusing because the answer form seems to bear little resemblance to the document.
- **Campaign for Real Ale:** Councils policy should ensure that pubs are protected even when they are not the last one in the community. Policy currently does not protect pubs from changes that don’t require planning permission or protects pubs from demolition when they are not listed building or in conservation areas. Planning policies should address the need for community facilities, including pubs in new developments.
- **Cottenham Environment Audit Group and the Fen Edge Footpath Group:** We have identified

	<p>specific proposals for linking footpaths routes which would greatly benefit the scope for countryside access around the village and which could be realised at an early stage to help mitigate loss of green fields and countryside amenity. These proposed links are; Path connecting Tennison Manor and Les King Wood, Path along Lovers' Walk connecting Archie's Bridge/Archie's Way and Rampton Woods and Foot/cycle path on Beach Road connecting to Hay Lane and Landbeach paths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dry Drayton Parish Council:</b> Initially we said the most effective way of reflecting local aspirations may be to encourage parish councils to develop neighbourhood plans, where possible based upon earlier village plans. However, we noted not all parish councils will have resources or expertise to take a neighbourhood plan to formal referendum. Please the district council has been working with parish councils to explore how best to bring forward community aspirations, and has offered the opportunity to include community-led proposals in the local plan. Proposing further informal consultation in village.</li> <li>• <b>Essex County Council:</b> Wish to ensure that we are included in any further consultation database information and welcome formal and informal discussions as the district continues to develop the plan. Happy to undertake discussions that investigate implications concerning cross boundary issues both generally and within specific provisions of Duty to Cooperate. County Council want to bring attention to the issues regarding climate change adaption, renewable energy and low carbon, flood risk including surface water.</li> <li>• <b>Hertfordshire County Council:</b> Where residential development is proposed in village/rural service centres in close proximity to Royston the older children may look to Royston middle and upper schools to provide education. Depending on conformation of housing numbers, tenure and phasing HCC may require contributions from CIL or planning obligations to mitigate the additional impact on the Royston schools.</li> <li>• <b>Highways Agency:</b> I understand a joint transport modelling exercise is underway with County Council and neighbouring planning authorities to develop evidence base to test local plan scenarios. This would appear to be the most effective way forward and will ultimately inform our views on emerging proposals.</li> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Village Action Group:</b> Problems concerning traffic lights at the Green and</li> </ul>
--	--

- the dangerous roads. B1049 expected to take a huge amount of traffic. Urge planners to encourage County Council to develop a traffic management plan to identify issues and make creative ways for people to get around the village by bicycle or foot.
- **Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council:** At the Jan 2013 meeting Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom agreed the villages could benefit from having a small number of new build family houses. Currently we understand there are no plans for new housing in either village.
  - **Middle Level Commissioners:** No comments as issues and options appear to be outside the catchment.
  - **North Hertfordshire District Council:** No further comments at this part of consultation.
  - **Suffolk County Council:** Important implication of growth is assessed. Traffic impacts mitigated and public transport measures and highway improvements.

#### Consultation

- Minimal at best.
- No consultation that I am aware of and if we have been given it there was not enough notice.
- Badly advertised.
- Should have been given 6 weeks of consultation.
- **Histon and Impington Village Action Group:** Consultation process flawed. Doesn't engage people in active discussion about their vision for community.

#### Development (general comments)

- Pressure to over develop is overwhelming, focus on the poor road network and facilities for current residents.
- Future developments should focus on brown-field sites on a new town. Rural character of our village should be preserved.
- Support small extensions to existing developments not turning villages into towns.
- Stop filling the countryside with housing.
- Cambridge is already overdeveloped, ruining a beautiful city.
- Development should be throughout UK not just in East Anglia.
- How will Cambridge City Centre cope with traffic/facilities? New development must include basic facilities such as banks, medical services, workplaces and transport.
- Concentrate on large developments.
- All agreed housing should be as carbon-neutral as possible and have solar panels.

- Horrified by the quality of designs and layout of the streets in the new development in Trumpington Meadows.
- In this economic climate it seems unwise to plan large developments, we should learn from recent events in Spain where unchecked development resulted with millions of unoccupied homes contributing to the financial crisis in that country.
- Need to know what level of growth is necessary.
- Would be better to increase housing south of the city because sixth form education is better. Less of a commute for students.
- Development is inevitable but quality and density currently accepted is appalling.
- Keep new houses to a minimum.
- Enhance cycle ways.

#### Green Belt

- Parish Councils should be flexible about building on green belt.
- Important green belt areas are retained, separating villages from the city centre.
- Develop within boundaries and focus on refurbishing old properties first.
- No need for encroachment on green belt.
- Greatest of care must be given to any development on green sites.
- Once woodland has been developed it cannot be replaced.
- It is important to keep as much green belt as possible as farmland and still produce our basic needs of food from beef and dairy cows, sheep and poultry. Would be a shame to lose this means of food production.
- Protect green land and lakes.

#### Village Development

- Controlled village development, only build what is needed/required.
- Do not follow urban herd, protect character of South Cambridgeshire.
- Village democracy is essential, listen to the majority of the local people.
- Protect the character of rural village, place more housing in towns where the infrastructure is in place.
- Development forgets that current villages do not have infrastructure or the money to improve capacity to cope with flooding. Need new villages.
- Village cannot take more traffic/congestion.
- Bus services from village should be improved so the elderly do not feel isolated.
- Two of the nearest villages to Cambridge;

	<p>Grantchester and Barton have taken no affordable housing development for the last 20 years. Other parish councils have provided for their young people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cottenham Village has had 2 large developments recently, leave it to evolve naturally.</li></ul>
--	---