

CHAPTER 4: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
---------------------	------------------------

QUESTION 4: Do you Support or object to the proposal by Histon and Impington Parish Council for 'Station' in Histon and Impington?	
--	--

Support: 74 Object: 13 Comment: 62	
--	--

- | | |
|--|--|
| | Support <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Considered response to identified need for this community;• We need to make Station area of Impington centre of our community providing amenities that can be enjoyed by residents and visitors alike;• Bring back character to the area;• Positive that included business premises and opportunity for employment within proposal;• Imbalance of services in village as most of amenities are in Histon, proposal would help to redress balance;• Should be a mixed development with residential and business use taking advantage of Guided Bus;• Must not threaten viability of existing shops;• Would like part of area retained as open space as community amenity, possibly used as regular farmers' market;• It has history as commercial land it also deserves revival. Cafe is a delusion but late night shop feasible;• More shops and restaurants would be useful;• Guided bus stop currently isolated after dark, should enhance use of the guided bus;• Would stimulate the economy, and invigorate the area;• Triangle of land to East of New Road and West of Bridge Road is well wooded and should be retained and designated as a public open space;• Enables use of brownfield site;• Support the Parish Council's idea to do something creative;• Need to include parking as not everyone will use guided bus;• Guided Busway provides good access, use should be maximised;• Good idea provided it will not harm residents of this quiet area;• SCDC and RIBA should organise a design competition to generate ideas;• Cambridgeshire County Council - Support this initiative by the Parish Council to encourage redevelopment of this area to improve its appearance and return some commercial uses to the area;• Caldecote Parish Council; Foxton Parish Council, Oakington and Westwick Parish Council, Orwell Parish Council, Rampton |
|--|--|

Parish council, Shepreth Parish Council, Teversham Parish Council, Comberton Parish Council, Waterbeach Parish Council - Support;

- **Histon and Impington Parish Council** - Only negative comments arose from misunderstanding that whole of PC1 area was being proposed for development. Not the intention of the Parish Council which thought it useful to delineate the area that would be directly affected by the requested site specific policies on the three nominated sites within the PC1 area. Many adverse comments to proposal to replace warehouse employment site (ref H2) with residential development. Too valuable a keystone site within the gateway area to the settlement that to use for pure residential development was a shameful waste of site.

Object

- The former Bishops Site is suitable to support residential function only. There is real opportunity to deliver a residential scheme on the site in the short-term, a mixed use proposal would compromise the opportunity to deliver a meaningful residential solution, and potentially frustrate the opportunity to redevelop the site. The owners have evaluated mixed use potential for the site and concluded that there is no such option which lends itself at all suitable. The former Bishops site should therefore be removed from the mixed use zone;
- Infrastructure cannot cope e.g. schools, doctors.
- What about a car park for the guided bus?
- Most people are not at the stop long enough for new facilities there is already plenty of housing and employment nearby;
- Station house is of great character and I cannot see the need for such an ambitious proposal;
- Housing (max 10) acceptable. Rest will detract from 'village' atmosphere enough already in Vision park;
- There are too many places to eat competing with each other;
- Concern about loss of Green Belt and farmland around villages;
- The villages are already almost Cambridge.

Comment

- Local people should decide;
- Need more information on the scope of the project;
- Seems to suggest quite a large development;
- Not more housing;
- Consider impact on infrastructure;
- Need to consider traffic impact;
- The Bishops site is an eyesore and needs redevelopment;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope that local residents would be given the opportunity to have input into the design of the area; • Histon does not need to become a tourist attraction; • No objection provided the A14 is improved; • I agree that this area could do with 'tidying up' but with regard to it being a gateway, I have my doubts. And as for restaurants and cafes, just how many do you think this area could support. There is already a pub there; • Will it be economically viable? • What is really needed is a car park for users of the guided bus; • Not everyone can walk there - it is a very long way from the other end of the village; • Cannot see how the need for large parking spaces would be dealt with without spoiling the area; • Will only make small contribution to overall dwellings requirement; • Many villages have been involved in Community plans supported by ACRE. These plans should be incorporated into your big plan, ensuring that all aspects of sustainability (economic, resource use, biodiversity and social aspects) are integrated in the plan. • What about places that don't have anything such as Cambourne; • Girton Parish Council – Development around the guided bus felt to be more appropriate to a town rather than a village; • Natural England – No objection to the proposal
<p>QUESTION 5: Do you support or object to the developments proposed by Cottenham Parish Council ...and if so why?</p>	
<p>Support: 124 Object: 569 Comment: 503</p>	
<p>Questionnaire Question 1: Do you agree that the Plan for Cottenham should be based upon the need for a) Jobs, b) Affordable Housing, c) Shops and Offices?</p>	<p>a) Jobs (Yes: 41, No: 102)</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misguided to assume availability of new industrial units and offices will produce new businesses and jobs and those jobs will be filled by people living within walking or cycling distance. Already many units of varying sizes in local area sitting empty, some for considerable time, where they have additional benefit of better transport links, most notable Cambridge Research Park and Glenmore

	<p>Business Park on A10 north of Waterbeach.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you surveyed Broad Lane industrial site to establish what percentage of local people are employed? • Not primarily. No serious issue of unemployment in Cottenham. If Parish Council wants to improve employment prospects, its energies would be better spent on campaigning for improved public transport. • Live so close to Cambridge that employment issue are minimal. I wouldn't want to stay and work where I grew up. Most young people will go to city. <p>b) Affordable Housing (Yes: 87, No: 70)</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include some additional affordable housing, but find it hard to believe that local need is as outlined. Affordable housing should be built close to village amenities and public transport routes. • Need for affordable housing could be achieved with an additional 500 or so houses. • Only provide for village (Northstowe should provide for wider area) • How does it stay affordable? • What is meant by affordable? This is relative to local house prices, and still way beyond many young people. Should include social housing and part-ownership for young people. • All 3 schemes are too committed, e.g. option 1 - 500 homes with 40% - 200 affordable is excessive. <p>c) Shops and Offices (Yes: 47, No: 85)</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a village not a commercial centre. We don't want a town! <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenahm particularly well served with variety of shops and services. • No – Tesco Bar Hill and Milton, few if any shops would survive and office premises usually stay vacant a long time. • Currently empty shop and office space in Cottenham.
<p>Questionnaire Question 2: Do you agree that the Plan should be looking to create a) a new village centre b) another industrial area?</p>	<p>a) Yes: 16, No: 164, Possibly: 4</p> <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good co-op, butchers, green grocers and now an excellent community centre. Improve on existing area do not divide the village with one elsewhere.

- Village already has a centre which has developed historically and forms an intrinsic part of village's character, readily accessible to majority of residents. New centre would necessarily detract from this and possibly lead to its partial destruction.

COMMENTS:

- Need for new health centre but this should be accommodated within heart of existing village. One possibility might be for Durman Stearn to move to a new industrial site and their existing site be re-developed as health centre.

b) Yes: 19, No: 141, Possibly: 17

OBJECTIONS:

- No demonstrable need for the industrial area. Already vacant commercial premises in village and many more within local area.
- Current centre is excellent and well used, whilst industrial area, in contrast, feels run-down and in need of modernisation - but not necessarily expansion.
- Need to strengthen existing industrial estates - achieve quicker results and send signal that Cottenham keen to be promoted as business centre.
- Businesses are better located at present, interspersed within existing village. No guarantee that firms will move to new industrial area, and if they do, no guarantee they will be staffed by village residents.
- Create further employment sites but not another industrial estate per se. Currently maybe five industrial estates in village, small scale industries might be better integrated than one large estate, and certainly not one at wrong end of village which would potentially make traffic through village worse and require good number of villagers to drive to it.

COMMENTS:

- Need for small to mid-scale commercial units. Like idea for start-up units linked to education and training. Not in estate but spread through village like existing businesses. Large estate does not mean large numbers of employees so less job creation.
- Another industrial area is best located along Beach Road, enabling access to A10 without travelling through village.
- If new area is created would existing industrial sites be moved from Millfield and Broad Lane?
- 'Vision Park' experiment in Histon - few local jobs resulted, empty premises and some loss of village

<p>Questionnaire Question 3: Do you agree that a By-pass would be a satisfactory solution to the various traffic problems?</p> <p>Yes: 24, No: 149</p>	<p>community.</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we do not get a by-pass Cottenham traffic will become intolerable. Northstowe residents will cut through to A10 and new development around Waterbeach. Waterbeach residents will cut through to A14/M11, as doubt A14/M11 junction will be modified. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <p><u>Address source of problem</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need cohesive traffic management plan for area as whole, focusing on A10 to reduce 'rat running'. Transport links should look wider/further to incorporate new developments. Invest in cycle ways and pedestrian routes. • A14 and A10 are in much need for upgrade. No monies for these routes, so no funds for a by-pass. Not needed or necessary. • A14 and A10 should be bypass for Histon & Impington, Cottenham and surrounding villages. Any road linking A14 through Northstowe, Cottenham, A10 to Waterbeach would act to reduce congestion on A14 to detriment of all local villages. (3) <p><u>Bypass doesn't address problem</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1049 - Proposal will create more traffic problems for Histon at village green - already at breaking point and bottle necks at Histon and Haddenham cannot cope. (2) • Make traffic worse somewhere else, either in another village or in different part of our own village. Coupled with known effects on village centres elsewhere these are only really a solution to crippling traffic problems where no other issues will arise from loss of through traffic. • Option 2 is a by-pass through a village. Commuters won't stomach 6 roundabouts for long and will come through village. If they don't shops will close. • By-pass would not stop lorries going to Broad Lane. <p><u>Shifts focus of village</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even if bypass was practical and desirable, proposal not only shifts focus of village away from historic centre, but divides proposed new housing development, with new park and recreation ground on opposite side of bypass to majority of village. <p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No real traffic issues in Cottenham. • Improvement to High Street Cottenham to reduce speed and reduce through traffic (rat run) for A10 could easily be carried out. (2) • To solve traffic issues have village as a 20mph zone, not just Lambs Lane at school times.
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better public transport, links to guided busway, (parking at Oakington or Histon stops) and cycle paths that connect into village would be better use of money to reduce traffic. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current traffic problems are rooted in speed rather than quantity. Main speeding areas of my concern are the Rampton Road, Lambs Lane and 'CO-OP' corner of High Street. Entrance / exit of the CO-OP would benefit from signage and parking restrictions to aid viewing also. • Could only be funded by something like scale of growth proposed in option 3. Lead to disastrous increase in traffic both in Cottenham and neighbouring villages, and change village to town. • Improved enforcement of current car parking would help - especially round the CO-OP. Don't have very many lorries going through village - no problems on my bicycle. • Need to slow traffic and enforce no lorry route (lorries use B1049 instead of A10). • Busiest routes are Rampton Road/Twenty Pence Road/ Histon Road. By-pass needs to provide direct link from Rampton Road to Twenty Pence Road. Proposed route risks not being used by this traffic (including future Longstowe traffic). • Suggest by-pass coming off B1049 North of Cottenham to link A10 North of Waterbeach and improvements of A10 into Cambridge. Consider linking into new railway station at Chesterton.
<p>Questionnaire Question 4: Do you agree that the provision for perhaps as many as 4500 new houses is a price that should be paid to provide jobs, social housing and full amenity for the village?</p> <p>Yes: 10, No: 175</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reluctantly Yes. Do not think an increase of only 1,500 will generate enough resources to improve infrastructure and amenities to a satisfactory level. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For majority of villagers, these proposals would almost certainly lead to some loss of community, amenity and quality of life. This number of houses would ruin the village character and split the village in two. • Options 2 and 3 are ludicrous in their assumptions. • No evidence that more houses will create more business for shops or jobs. In fact over the last 20 years the reverse has happened. • Reality - people can, do and will work outside of village - no amount of development is going to rectify this fact. Increase in house numbers is likely to make matter worse rather than better. People want to work in Cambridge, not Cottenham. • Better to improve transport links by increasing cyclepath networks and providing faster commuting

	<p>bus into city to serve existing residents than build a larger village. Northstowe and large development proposed at Waterbeach are nearby and we should be aiming to take advantage of our proximity to these as well as to Cambridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased risk of flooding and underground water drainage system to Cottenham cannot cope. • We submitted site 113 which could have been used 100% for affordable housing it adjoins site 260 & 003 and was declined because it was too large!! Now suddenly we want 4500 houses! <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4500? The amount is very questionable. • Any expansion should be gradual and organic. • Existing infrastructure ok for current village population, though school already needs more capacity.
<p>Questionnaire Question 5: Which option do you support if any?</p> <p>Option A: Yes: 71, No 19 Option B: Yes: 19, No 42 Option C: Yes: 13, No 44 Option D: 66 (Limited development / infill: 55, other 11) Option E: Yes: 64, No 5</p>	<p>Option A</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPC support this option as alternative to SCDC SHLAA proposal. Critical to this option is expansion of primary school, provision of a fuel station and store. • Option 1 is about the ideal max growth for Cottenham. • If any I would pick option 1, minimal disruption to the village. • Primary school would need enlarging and increased traffic calming in the village. • Fields surrounding Mill Field and Long Drove frequently flood. • Sensible because it places most new housing in a location which gives access to guided bus and A14 without need to travel through village. • Areas west / south west of village preferable. Development to north should be disregarded. <p>Option B</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the duration of the plan to 2031, CPC continues to support its plan as illustrated by option 2. • 1,500 sounds a lot but will be over quite a long time span so a gradual increase should be manageable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase size of this village to that of Bar Hill is totally unnecessary with Northstowe, and possibly Waterbeach going ahead / under consideration. • No guarantees of a bypass or any other amenity being built by developers, plus creation of many new jobs in village is highly debateable.

- Scale of development proposed not necessary to restore the status of village to a Rural Centre.
- Significant loss of best agricultural land - most Grade 1 land.
- Detached from village.
- Significant negative impact on townscape character, intrusion into open countryside. Detrimental impact on Grade 1 church and Conservation Area.
- New 'village centre' could lead decline existing shops and services - adversely affect vibrancy and character of Conservation Area.
- Options 2 and 3 would see lane bisected by bypass and swamped by new housing estates, and valuable amenity lost. Lane couldn't cope with additional houses and vehicles. Increase in traffic would result in it no longer being viable or safe for walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders, many families with young children.

Option C

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- Option C is best as it has a sensible by-pass. Better to have a bigger project over longer time than one that may not meet need and has to be extended.
- Village has grown but infrastructure not kept pace.

OBJECTIONS:

- Scale of development proposed not necessary to restore the status of village to a Rural Centre.
- Potential impact on air quality and by-pass would increase road traffic noise.
- Create largest Rural Centre, but only served by 'B' road and generate significant traffic through Histon and onto A14.
- Significant loss of best agricultural land - most Grade 1 land.
- Detached from village.
- Significant negative impact on townscape character, intrusion into open countryside. Detrimental impact on Grade 1 church and Conservation Area.
- New 'village centre' could lead decline existing shops and services - adversely affect vibrancy and character of Conservation Area.
- Options 2 and 3 would see lane bisected by bypass and swamped by new housing estates, and valuable amenity lost. Lane couldn't cope with additional houses and vehicles. Increase in traffic would result in it no longer being viable or safe for walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders, many families with young children.

COMMENTS:

- Producing an Ely sized town is contrary to any current planning policy / requirement.
- Would support if Cottenham becomes a town with the facilities that Ely has with a similar potential population.
- Would extend by-pass to Rampton Road as in some early maps.

Option D OTHER

COMMENTS:

- Full assessment of housing needs, mixed-use possibilities, schools provision, transport implications, sewerage capacity, electricity network, and other issues needed. Only then could further development be considered.
- Limited housing in keeping with current village character focusing on enhancing current village community. New properties should be interspersed.
- Development (small) should be south or south-west of village to avoid additional through traffic and not more than 50-100 houses.
- Some need for affordable housing - prioritised for those already in village / with immediate family in village and mainstream housing - limited to 350-400 homes maximum, dispersed throughout existing village rather than huge chunks of development which retail a village feel.
- SHLAA preferences offer an acceptable scale of growth.
- District council plan for up to 370 new homes is good.
- Consider housing on site-by-site basis, and integration with existing village / impact on character. Most appropriate locations are 2012 I&O consultation SHLAA sites 003, 123, 124, 129, 234, 260 and 263, site to north of Rampton Road (SHLAA site 128). Parish Council object to preferred SHLAA sites because Green Belt. New bypass through Green Belt would be far worse.
- Particularly object to houses at Rampton fields - would obliterate view from top of cycle track.
- Not Rampton site - huge implications on traffic issues on Rampton Road, better to adopt SCDC proposal to utilise land south of Oakington Road as more integral part of village and does not encroach on arable land, traffic would be able to access via Oakington and Histon Road.

Option E NONE

COMMENTS:

- SHLAA should only be considered at this stage, if

any!

- In their present form the Design Group is unable to support any of the proposals.
- With Northstowe and new town at Waterbeach local development at Cottenham should be limited until road and infrastructure of these developments is assured.
- Your plans have cut our property in half. There should have been consultation with us before you decided to obtain 3 acres of our land.

General Comments

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- Appropriate and compatible with localism thinking, but perhaps same aims could be achieved with less upheaval, less expenditure, and in shorter time scale?
- Many young people are out of work - if apprenticeships could be a part of new employment opportunities this would be advantageous for young people in the community.

OBJECTIONS:

- Plan has not been backed-up with any feasibility studies to show it is viable or would deliver any benefits regarding jobs or affordable housing.
- Bypass proposal would have negative impact on natural environment, causing intrusion into open countryside and furthermore land is Grade 1.
- Proposals might work for inhabitants of Cottenham but disastrous for Histon and Impington. Even on low (unrealistic) estimates of extra commuter traffic this would swamp capacity of B1049, in particular traffic light crossing at the Green.
- Proposals 1 and 2 undermine existing work done in relation to village expansion at local primary school.
- Ecology of Cottenham is unique, muntjac, roe deer, grass snakes, lizards, green woodpecker and herons all seen in village.
- Strongly oppose "small" development of 50 houses down Church Lane in Option 1. Church Lane and Broad lane are currently only walking routes with access to countryside. Entrance of Church lane would not allow a 2 lane road. Current site of wood yard only partially used and majority is established woodland.
- Do not understand why land on Rampton Road (excluded by the Council) is included in all proposals. In third proposal land on Oakington Road is suddenly excluded and Rampton Road still included even though it is out on a limb.

COMMENTS:

- Very disappointed the Parish Council decided to reject the S.Cambs proposals before consulting residents of the village.
- Independent facilitator needed to lead workshops to decide whether Neighbourhood Plan is wanted. If so, how that should be arrived at. Workshop to identify what, where and when development should take place plus design issues.
- Serious concerns over implications for historic built environment and legibility of original linear plan-form of the village.
- Second Primary School will be divisive.
- Public Transport - Why no mention of this in Plan aims? Current service is not sustainable and perpetuates congestion. Need an 'outer ring' that connects to other villages and bus routes.
- Support amendments to Green Belt boundary to south east of village, would allow new development closer to village centre than proposed by Parish Council.
- Area to north, adjacent to existing industrial estate is isolated from existing village leading to poor integration of new and existing services. Area to east is potentially isolated because likelihood of sufficient connections being available into existing village. On Rampton Road preferred site of Parish Council sits on side of ridge and very visible on approach from Rampton, notwithstanding Les King wood planted just to west.
- Concerns about proposal to include large isolated plot of agricultural land to north-east of village Unless can be linked into rest of development and form an integral part, it should be excluded.
- Need to consider links with neighbouring villages - new off road cycle routes to Waterbeach, station, Roman Road, Science Park and Business Park.
- Need buffer zones to protect existing byways, tracks, bridleways and 'off-road' cycle routes [such as Long Drove and Church Lane]; and significant improvement of footpath network to provide linking and new routes.
- Given the location of several existing riding establishments and livery yards north of the village my suggestion would be for the creation of circular bridleway route, to north of village. Provide additional routes for walkers as well as new facilities for horse-riders and cyclists.
- Cottenham Lode floods - money from any financial gain should be allocated to old west drainage board to improve The Lodes capacity, Bar Hill, Northstowe - all this drains to Cottenham.