

**Matter Number 9**

**CCC Respondent Personal Reference ID: 1801**

**SCDC Respondent Personal Reference ID: 20942**

**Name of Representor: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (CambridgePPF)  
represented by Robin Pellew**

**Date: 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2015**

## **Matter 9**

**Areas of Major Change/Major Development Areas  
On the Edge of Cambridge**

## **Written Statement from CambridgePPF**

### **Matter 9A: General Principles:**

CambridgePPF supports the general approach of identifying key areas within the City to promote and manage change. CambridgePPF recognises the general principle that if the City is to remain compact with the integrity of its Green Belt maintained, then the City plan must seek sites within the urban area for regeneration and densification. It therefore supports City Policy 13.

This support is dependent on:

- i. Selecting sites that reinforce a coherent spatial strategy for the City, particularly the provision of adequate public transport. New development should not overload existing infrastructure, and where possible, improvement of the infrastructure should precede development
- ii. Giving preference to brownfield sites to promote renewal and effective use of land
- iii. Selecting sites where the local community will benefit from the sensitive regeneration
- iv. Ensuring that new development is of a quality in terms of its urban planning and architectural design to create vibrant new communities with a high quality of life. This means providing the necessary services and facilities, like green space, children's play areas, and local shops, to produce an attractive environment in which people will want to live.
- v. Ensuring that selected sites incorporate the 40% target for Affordable Housing
- vi. Avoiding sites where development will result in a significant reduction in employment space unless effective steps are included for the re-location of displaced businesses. Schemes should aim to create vibrant mixed-use developments.
- vii. Ensuring that new development is fully sustainable, including its impact on the character and heritage of Cambridge
- viii. Ensuring that all major development schemes conform to a site-wide masterplan that has undergone an extensive public consultation process
- ix. Protecting public assets that are deemed important to the local community, like green spaces, recreational facilities, and buildings of local heritage significance. Where the loss of assets like local shops, pubs, and other social meeting places cannot be avoided, the scheme must include their effective replacement.

### **Matter 9A: West Cambridge, North West Cambridge, and Orchard Park**

#### **West Cambridge:**

- i. A revised masterplan for this site is urgently required.
- ii. A comprehensive transport strategy, including cycle access, is also needed: this must be integrated with the transport strategy for NW Cambridge.
- iii. The area lies adjacent to the Green Belt and is important for the views of the City from the higher ground to the North and South of Coton, and the approach to the City from the South West. Building height should be restricted to not more than the proposed 16m, and less for the buildings to the West of the area on the Green Belt boundary. Extensive landscaping will be required to minimise the visual intrusion

#### **North West Cambridge:**

CambridgePPF has commented extensively on the masterplan and the different phases as these have come forward for planning permission.

The only issue we would like to raise now is the need for a comprehensive transport strategy to link the development with the rest of Cambridge to prevent it becoming an isolated development sitting uncomfortably on the edge of Cambridge.

CambridgePPF's Representation 58895 objected to the release of Green Belt land adjacent to Histon Road and the A14 (Policy SS/2) on the grounds that the Councils had failed to demonstrate the 'exceptional circumstances' required by the NPPF. It is our understanding that this site was consulted on through the Council's '*Responding to a Housing Shortfall*' in October 2008, and that the Inspector concluded that the site should be allocated to the Site Specific Policies DPD (Policy SP/2) and was excised from the Green Belt. As this decision has already been made, CambridgePPF withdraws its objection.

#### **Orchard Park:**

We have no further comments to make

#### **Matter 9B: Cambridge East and South of Coldham's Lane**

CambridgePPF commented on the 2008 Cambridge East Area Action Plan. This will need updating when the Local Plan has been approved.

#### **Cambridge East:**

We support the proposal that the Cambridge East site at the Cambridge Airport should be safeguarded for longer-term development beyond 2031, and should not be returned to Green Belt status. The green corridor linking Teversham with Coldhams Common should remain Green Belt.

We support the development of the proposed sites in Cambridge East, including the Wings development in SCDC to the North of Newmarket Road, as well as City sites R40, R41 and E4.

In our Written Submission for Matter 2, Appendix A, we identified a strip of land linking sites R40 and R41 to the North of Teversham Drift and Church Road as a potential additional site for development. It could, we believe, provide some 12-14ha of land, sufficient for some 400 additional houses. CambridgePPF notes the reference to this land in the Statement of Common Ground signed between the two Council and Marshalls (RD/SCG/210), Paragraph 4.5, which confirms its development potential. Because of the size of this site, it should not be included as part of the Windfall provision but should be progressed to the stage where its contribution can be incorporated into the City's housing target.

#### **South of Coldhams Lane:**

We support the creation of an urban country park at Cambridge Lakes as an important element in the regeneration of the area. We look forward to contributing to the masterplan.

The development of the old landfill sites as a public recreation area depends on resolving the health and safety issues, particularly relating to the water quality at Cambridge Lakes. A plan is needed that sets out how the site contamination is to be mitigated.

#### **Matter 9C: Cambridge Northern Fringe:**

Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) Area of Major Change has the potential to create a new development area of a scale and size that will regenerate the northern fringe of the City. We are encouraged that both Councils are now working together to progress the Area Action Plan, and CambridgePPF looks forward to contributing to this.

The potential of this site has been highlighted in previous Local Plans yet development has not progressed, despite the critical lack of development land within the urban area. So what circumstances have changed for it to be included in the 2014 plan with any realistic chance of it actually being developed? Specifically what assurances can the Councils give that the odour contamination and the noise and dust pollution from the current uses of the site will be mitigated

adequately to enable development to proceed? Are these assurances sufficiently compelling for the site to be included?

CambridgePPF has consistently lobbied the Councils for these sites to be progressed as a high priority. As issues of general principle concerning this Major Development Area, we stress the following points:

- i. The boundary of the area should be extended to the East right up to the River Cam, and to the West to include the Science Park on the other side of Milton Road.
- ii. An Area Action Plan is required for the whole of this area including the Cambridge Business Park, Cambridge Science Park, and the St John's Innovation Centre.
- iii. A masterplan is also required for the spatial planning and phasing of the development of the area demarcated in Figure 3.3 of the City plan.
- iv. Development of this whole site should be progressed in a coordinated and integrated way across different land ownerships. The move by Network Rail to advance development its holding around the Chesterton Sidings out of sync with the planning of the rest of the area, should be resisted. Development adjacent to the new station must be integrated into the whole site in a way that does not restrict the development of the rest of the area.

The development of this site will also raise a number of issues that will need to be covered by the Area Action Plan. Amongst these, we would highlight:

- v. Access to the site is currently restricted to Cowley Road and is grossly inadequate. A comprehensive transport strategy for the whole area is essential as part of its masterplanning. A possible new junction on the A14 between Milton Road (A10) and Horningsea Road (B1047) should be considered to serve this major development, even linking to the South with the Newmarket Road alongside the railway.
- vi. A dynamic high-quality mixed-use development is proposed. Adjacent to the new Science Park Station, residential use should dominate with mixed B1, B2 and B8 uses across the rest of the area. The opportunity should be taken to provide start-up and wet lab space which is lacking elsewhere in Cambridge.
- vii. Particularly adjacent to the new Science Park station, a vibrant and dynamic new community with supporting retail and leisure facilities should be created rather than just commercial development that is dead at night.
- viii. The new railway station must be progressed as rapidly as possible. Without the station, this scheme will not progress.

The residential element of this site was raised by CambridgePPF in our written submission on Matter 2, Appendix A, as an alternative site to further city fringe development. As part of a major new mixed-use development, we believe the site has the potential for a minimum of 1,000 new homes which do not appear to have been incorporated in either the City or SCDC plans.