

South Cambridgeshire Hall  
Cambourne Business Park  
Cambourne  
Cambridge  
CB23 6EA

t: 03450 450 500  
f: 01954 713149

[www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk)



20 January 2015

To: Chairman –Tim Wotherspoon

Members of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee – Councillors Brian Burling (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Ed Cearns (Cambridgeshire County Council), Barry Chapman (Cambridgeshire County Council), Lynda Harford (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Bill Hunt (substitute for Peter Hudson (Cambridgeshire County Council)), David Jenkins (Cambridgeshire County Council), Alex Riley (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Hazel Smith (South Cambridgeshire District Council) and Douglas de Lacey (substitute for Edd Stonham)(South Cambridgeshire District Council))

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **NORTHSTOWE JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**, which will be held in **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **WEDNESDAY, 28 JANUARY 2015** at **2.00 p.m.**

Members are respectfully reminded that when substituting on committees, subcommittees, and outside or joint bodies, Democratic Services must be advised of the substitution *in advance of* the meeting. It is not possible to accept a substitute once the meeting has started. Council Standing Order 4.3 refers.

Yours faithfully  
**JEAN HUNTER**  
Chief Executive

**South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you.**

---

## AGENDA

## PAGES

- 1. Appointment of Vice-Chairman**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**  
To receive Apologies for Absence from Committee members. Apologies have been received from County Councillor Peter Hudson and District Councillor Edd Stonham.
- 3. Declarations of Interest**

- |           |   |                |
|-----------|---|----------------|
| <b>4.</b> | <b>Minutes of Previous Meeting</b><br>To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2014 as a correct record. | <b>1 - 6</b>   |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>Northsstowe Phase 2 Consultation responses</b>   | <b>7 - 88</b>  |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>Risk Register</b>  | <b>89 - 90</b> |
| <b>7.</b> | <b>Date of next meeting</b><br>Wednesday 25 February 2015 at 2,00pm in the Council Chamber, South Cambs. Hall, Cambourne  |                |

## **GUIDANCE NOTES FOR VISITORS TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL**

### **Notes to help those people visiting the South Cambridgeshire District Council offices**

While we try to make sure that you stay safe when visiting South Cambridgeshire Hall, you also have a responsibility for your own safety, and that of others.

#### **Security**

When attending meetings in non-public areas of the Council offices you must report to Reception, sign in, and at all times wear the Visitor badge issued. Before leaving the building, please sign out and return the Visitor badge to Reception.

Public seating in meeting rooms is limited. For further details contact Democratic Services on 03450 450 500 or e-mail [democratic.services@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@scambs.gov.uk)

#### **Emergency and Evacuation**

In the event of a fire, a continuous alarm will sound. Leave the building using the nearest escape route; from the Council Chamber or Mezzanine viewing gallery this would be via the staircase just outside the door. Go to the assembly point at the far side of the staff car park opposite the staff entrance

- **Do not** use the lifts to leave the building. If you are unable to use stairs by yourself, the emergency staircase landings have fire refuge areas, which give protection for a minimum of 1.5 hours. Press the alarm button and wait for help from Council fire wardens or the fire brigade.
- **Do not** re-enter the building until the officer in charge or the fire brigade confirms that it is safe to do so.

#### **First Aid**

If you feel unwell or need first aid, please alert a member of staff.

#### **Access for People with Disabilities**

We are committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to our agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you. All meeting rooms are accessible to wheelchair users. There are disabled toilet facilities on each floor of the building. Infra-red hearing assistance systems are available in the Council Chamber and viewing gallery. To use these, you must sit in sight of the infra-red transmitter and wear a 'neck loop', which can be used with a hearing aid switched to the 'T' position. If your hearing aid does not have the 'T' position facility then earphones are also available and can be used independently. You can get both neck loops and earphones from Reception.

#### **Toilets**

Public toilets are available on each floor of the building next to the lifts.

#### **Recording of Business and Use of Mobile Phones**

We are open and transparent about how we make decisions. We allow recording, filming and photography at Council, Cabinet and other meetings, which members of the public can attend, so long as proceedings at the meeting are not disrupted. We also allow the use of social media during meetings to bring Council issues to the attention of a wider audience. To minimise disturbance to others attending the meeting, please switch your phone or other mobile device to silent / vibrate mode.

#### **Banners, Placards and similar items**

You are not allowed to bring into, or display at, any public meeting any banner, placard, poster or other similar item. Failure to do so, will result in the Chairman suspending the meeting until such items are removed.

#### **Disturbance by Public**

If a member of the public interrupts proceedings at a meeting, the Chairman will warn the person concerned. If they continue to interrupt, the Chairman will order their removal from the meeting room. If there is a general disturbance in any part of the meeting room open to the public, the Chairman may call for that part to be cleared. The meeting will be suspended until order has been restored.

#### **Smoking**

Since 1 July 2008, South Cambridgeshire District Council has operated a Smoke Free Policy. No one is allowed to smoke at any time within the Council offices, or in the car park or other grounds forming part of those offices.

#### **Food and Drink**

Vending machines and a water dispenser are available on the ground floor near the lifts at the front of the building. You are not allowed to bring food or drink into the meeting room.



# Agenda Item 4

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee held on  
Wednesday, 26 November 2014 at 10.00 a.m.

Present: Brian Burling (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Ed Cearns (Cambridgeshire County Council), Douglas de Lacey, Simon Edwards, and Lynda Harford (South Cambridgeshire District Council), Peter Hudson (Cambridgeshire County Council), David Jenkins (Cambridgeshire County Council), Alex Riley (South Cambridgeshire District Council) and Hazel Smith (South Cambridgeshire District Council)

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

Lois Bowser	Northstowe Team Leader
Jo Mills	Planning and New Communities Director
Stephen Reid	Senior Planning Lawyer
Juliet Richardson	Business Manager (Growth and Development)
Ian Senior	Democratic Services Officer
James Stone	Principal Planning Officer

### 1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING

Councillor Alex Riley nominated Councillor Simon Edwards as Chairman of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee for this meeting. Councillor Douglas de Lacey seconded this nomination and, there being no further nominations, the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee

**resolved** that Councillor Simon Edwards be appointed Chairman of the meeting.

### 2. COUNTY COUNCILLOR JOHN REYNOLDS

Members noted the sudden death, earlier in the week, of County Councillor John Reynolds.

The Chairman invited Councillor Douglas de Lacey, a Member for Girton, which was covered by Councillor Reynolds' Cambridgeshire County Council Electoral Division of Bar Hill, to say a few words about his colleague. Councillor de Lacey noted that Councillor Reynolds had been Vice Chairman of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee, a County Councillor for 33 years, and had served, among others, on the Police Authority and East of England Regional Assembly. Councillor de Lacey paid tribute to Councillor Reynolds as "a man of the people", who would be sadly missed, not least within the community of Girton.

Councillor de Lacey invited those present to stand and observe a minute's silence.

### 3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Edd Stonham (South Cambridgeshire District Council) and Tim Wotherspoon (South Cambridgeshire District Council) sent apologies.

### 4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In respect of the items on this agenda:

Councillor Simon Edwards declared a non pecuniary interest as a Member of Oakington & Westwick Parish Council, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Hurlingham Polo Association, Member of the British Association of Shooting and Conservation, the Old West Internal Drainage Board, the National Trust and as a resident of Oakington. Non-Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as a shareholder in a Company that owns property in Oakington. Non-pecuniary interest as a member of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet that had previously considered the Section 106 issues referred to in the current agenda, but now considering the matter afresh.

Councillor Lynda Harford declared a non-pecuniary interest as having given technical advice about the Appeal against the Local Planning Authority's failure to determine the application, made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 at recent meetings of both Oakington & Westwick and Rampton Parish Councils.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey declared a non-pecuniary interest as Chairman of Girton Parish Council.

Councillor Alex Riley declared a non-pecuniary interest as having been present at a recent meeting of Longstanton Parish Council where the Gallagher application for the removal of condition 14 (Phase 1 room sizes) had been discussed. Councillor Riley had not been consulted and he took no part in the debate.

## 5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee authorised the Chairman to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 29 October 2014 as a correct record, subject to the following:

### **Minute 4 - Northstowe Phase 1 Outline Planning Consent: Earthworks Reserved Matters submission ref S/1654/14/RM**

In the final sentence of the second paragraph, between the words "...unable to attend the site visit" and "...Councillor Douglas de Lacey..." delete the word "and" insert the words "...as it had been scheduled at a time when he had been attending the Liberal Democrats' National Conference, albeit because of a desire to give priority to the availability of nearby residents and the local Member. He was minded, therefore, not to vote..."

The final sentence now said:

"...Councillor Ed Cearns was disappointed that he had been unable to attend the site visit as it had been scheduled, albeit because of a desire to give priority to the availability of nearby residents and the local Member, at a time when he had been attending the Liberal Democrats' National Conference. He was minded, therefore, not to vote. Councillor Douglas de Lacey explained that, while he had not attended the site visit either, he had not been expecting to be at this meeting as a substitute."

Councillor Simon Edwards said that, although it was not usual practice to keep near-verbatim Minutes, he would accept the amendment as it now stated that Councillor Cearns did not vote, and explained why.

**Minute 5 - Proposed primary school, phase 1, Northstowe: Application by Cambridgeshire County Council for detailed planning consent ref. S/1777/14/CC**  
Condition 16 shall be expanded to say that the school shall not be operated as a school until it is compliant with the South Cambridgeshire District Council policy relating

to car and bicycle parking provision.

**6. CONSIDERATION OF THE GROUNDS FOR CONTESTING THE APPEAL AGAINST THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY'S FAILURE TO DETERMINE THE SECTION 73 APPLICATION FOR THE REMOVAL OF CONDITION 14 OF THE OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION S/0388/12/OL, WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME PERIOD (APPLICATION REF S/2097/14/VC)**

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee considered a report suggesting the grounds for contesting the Appeal against the Local Planning Authority's failure to determine the application, made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, for the removal of condition 14 of the outline planning permission S/0388/12/OL, within the prescribed time period (application ref S/2097/14/VC).

The Planning and New Communities Director introduced the report by outlining the timeline leading to the application.

Councillor David Jenkins noted that the Committee's desire was that the development should proceed as quickly as possible. He was concerned that the determination of this Appeal, especially by means of a Hearing, might run counter to that aspiration. In reply, the Planning and New Communities Director referred to the benefit of preserving Condition 14 in that such a Condition would help to avoid the construction of small bedrooms, which had been much criticised at Orchard Park. Councillor Jenkins said that Orchard Park had been developed at a time of economic recession in the building industry, whereas the aspiration now was to promote Northstowe as an exemplar New Town.

There followed a brief discussion about the most effective way to distribute information to Members.

Councillor Ed Cearns said that conditioning room size was an essential element in securing exemplar status for Northstowe, and would contribute significantly to the sense of wellbeing of those living there. He urged the Committee to instruct officers to defend this Appeal, but to do everything in their power to ensure this was by way of a public Hearing. The Planning Lawyer explained the importance of securing within the emerging Local Plan a policy on room sizes. Therefore, a delay in the Appeal process had the benefit of giving the Council the chance to put in place, through the Local Plan Examination, an appropriate evidence base to support the proposed Room Size Condition.

Members discussed the risk posed by the Appeal, and went on to discuss the merits of taking a more proactive role in monitoring the Northstowe aspect of the risk register. The Planning Lawyer cautioned Members about considering everything on the Risk Register in public, and the Committee accepted that certain issues should be discussed in private, with Members having a discretion to go public, having taken appropriate advice. The Committee instructed officers that, in future, it would expect to be given an opportunity to review the risk register on a quarterly basis, and more frequently where appropriate. The Committee also instructed officers to inform Members about the receipt of planning applications, and dates for determination.

The Planning Lawyer confirmed that the Room Size Condition did not guarantee garden size. Plot sizes would remain the same, and proportions would have to be balanced within those plots.

In response to Councillor Riley, the Chairman said it was appropriate that officers themselves should draft the Councils' response to the Appeal. However, Members asked

that officers engage more closely with them, and share with them the response before submission.

Officers explained the desirability of getting a Policy on room sizes endorsed by the Inspector currently examining South Cambridgeshire District Council's emerging Local Plan for soundness. Such a Policy would provide an essential evidence base when imposing Conditions about room sizes. The Committee noted though that national policy would take priority and that, should a national standard subsequently be established, local policy would have to be amended to reflect the standards set out in the national policy. Even without a national guideline, the Inspector might require revision of the proposed Local Plan Policy. Councillor Lynda Harford said that the Condition was legal, and was necessary to ensure one particular aspect of Northstowe Phase 1 as exemplar. She was keen to establish the number of each house type envisaged, and added that each dwelling must be "fit to live in, not just exist in."

The Planning Lawyer considered that Condition 14 was lawful, and passed the six tests, namely:

1. Is it necessary?
2. Is it relevant to planning?
3. Is it relevant to the development to be permitted?
4. Is it enforceable?
5. Is it precise?
6. Is it reasonable in all other respects?

He emphasised the significance of the emerging Local Plan, and reminded Members about the circumstances in which costs might be claimed against the Council. In response to a question from Councillor de Lacey, the Planning Lawyer said that the question of exemplar would not influence the outcome of the Appeal or of the Local Plan Examination. Any Policy on room sizes would apply across the District (not just in Northstowe) and would take into account provisions contained in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

Councillor Cearns said that the Councils needed to be much more assertive when demanding elements needed to ensure an exemplar development. The Chairman reminded him that the Northstowe Area Action Plan had been that bold statement of intent, but had been diluted at the Inquiry.

Councillor Riley was minded to support officers in asking for the Appeal to be dealt with at a Hearing. However, he insisted that the overriding issue was the Appeal process must be transparent and open to the public. Officers answered Members' questions relating to the possible extent of a Costs award against the Council, timescale for the Appeal, and the Appeal's implications for the commencement of the development. Councillor Riley noted that Phase 1 had lower Dwellings per Hectare density, which suggested that there was no need for smaller rooms.

Members made a number of comments about points raised in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director.

The Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee **resolved** that

1. the Local Planning Authority contests the appeal against non-determination of the application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and submits an Appeal Statement accordingly;
2. the Local Planning Authority requests a Hearing of the Appeal; and



3. Members note the issues as set out in the report from the Planning and New Communities Director, and endorse officers' recommendation of refusal to remove Condition 14 had this decision been made prior to the lodge of the Appeal.

**7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Members noted that the next scheduled Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee was on Wednesday 28 January 2015 at 2.00pm.

---

**The Meeting ended at 12.10 p.m.**

---

This page is left blank intentionally.

# Agenda Item 5

South Cambridgeshire District Council / Cambridgeshire County Council

---

**REPORT TO:** Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee 28<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**AUTHOR/S:** Planning and New Communities Director, South Cambridgeshire District Council

## Northstowe Phase 2 Consultation Responses

---

<b>Parishes:</b>	Longstanton, and Oakington and Westwick
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline application for up to 3,500 dwellings together with education and community facilities, road and cycling network, town centre, water and drainage network, sports and public open space, and full application for southern access road West. Ref S/2011/14/OL
<b>Site address:</b>	Land to the east of Longstanton and west of the guided busway occupying the northern part of the site used by the former Oakington barracks.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Homes and Communities Agency
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Members are asked to note the report.
<b>Presenting Officer:</b>	James Stone, Principal Planning Officer, Northstowe Joint Team

## Northstowe Phase 2 Consultation Responses

### Executive Summary

1. This report sets out the responses received to the public consultation on the outline planning application for Northstowe phase 2 which took place during September – November 2014. It includes comments from 27 statutory and non-statutory consultees, and from local residents. Consultee responses from internal officers at South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have not been included. Cambridgeshire County Council's final response, as a statutory consultee, is subject to decision by the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee on 3rd February. It is expected that the papers for this committee will be published around 26th January. County Council officers have discussed their comments extensively with SCDC. Comments from SCDC officers will be received by Cabinet on 17 February. Comments from 48 residents are set out in the Appendices and include views submitted using the publicity leaflet (as attached) that invited commentary on different topics. The received consultation responses have been reported to the applicant, and are informing our assessment of the application and ongoing negotiations on the application. The consultee responses are listed in alphabetical order, for ease of reference.

## Northstowe Phase 2 Consultee Responses, (Ref: S/2011/14/OL)

Abbreviations:

South Cambridgeshire District Council: SCDC

Cambridgeshire County Council: CCC

### 1. Anglian Water

- A high level option has been identified to connect the proposed development site to the Water Recycling Centre at Uttons Drove via a to-be-constructed pumping station and rising main. This can be delivered under section 98 of the Water Industry Act. To ensure that the detail for this option can be defined and implemented Anglian Water request that an appropriate condition is imposed on the planning permission. The wording of the condition should ensure that the development is not commenced until a strategy is submitted and agreed, and that there is no occupation until the strategy has been implemented.

Water Recycling Centre

- The receiving Water Recycling Centre has capacity to treat the phase two proposal for 3,500 dwellings and associated uses. This capacity is dependent on necessary discharge consents to accommodate additional flow being permitted.

Surface Water Network

- Anglian Water have held discussions with the applicant and their developers on the adoption of surface water SUDS infrastructure. There is not yet a formal agreement in place.
- Anglian Water request that an appropriately worded condition is imposed to ensure that the development is not commenced until a strategy is submitted and agreed, and that there is no occupation until the strategy has been implemented.

### 2. Cambridge Cycling Campaign

- Object because the scheme does not meet the requirements of the Department for Transport:
  1. *Permeability of Private Motor-Vehicles*
    - The grid layout with has no restraint on permeability of motor-vehicles. The proposal encourages car traffic to rat-run through residential secondary streets.
  2. *Insufficient Width of Cycle Routes*

Primary Streets

    - The cycle routes are of insufficient width. The cycle lanes on primary routes will narrow from 2.1m on phase 1 to 2m in Phase 2. The effective width of the cycle track is reduced in reality by 0.5m because people would not be able to cycle next to the water feature. A cycle lane needs to be 2.5m without any obstructions within 0.5m of this space. The space allocated to the primary streets is sufficiently wide enough to accommodate such widths of cycle lanes and all other features required except the water features.
    - The transport assessment states that the primary roads will be 7.3m in width but the design and access statement suggests 6.1m.

### Secondary Streets

- Some secondary streets have been shown as having bicycle routes. In contravention of Department for Transport guidance these are shown as single bi-directional lane.
- It is questioned where the car parking would be provided on secondary streets.
- A cycle lane that has an effective width of just 0.5m, and in the 'dooring zone' of the parked cars cannot be considered acceptable.
- There are concerns that on-street parking which is not shown will eat into the pedestrian space. If 3m of space is provided for pedestrian movements then this should not be reduced to less than 1m by anti-social parking. More detail is needed as to how anti-social parking of private cars will be managed and controlled.

### Busways

- There is insufficient detail of the bus stops and how they would be designed, both in terms of pedestrians crossing the cycleway and in terms of the provision of cycle parking at these stops.

### Greenways

- It is not understood how the DfT's guidance for the minimum width of 3m for a bi-directional cycle track that are non shared with pedestrians has become a 2m wide shared use space for people cycling and people walking. There should be a minimum of 3m of cycle track and 2m of pedestrian footpath that are segregated both in space and in levels and surface materials.

### *3. Lack of Connectivity with Wider Region*

- The proposed plans for linking the development to the outside world are lacking in clarity.
- There is concern that bicycle routes are categorised into three different types: commuter routes; leisure routes and quiet roads. It isn't understood why there is the need for such classification as everyone should be encouraged to cycle. There is no traffic assessment of the roads or streets within or outside of Northstowe that would support such a classification. It is recommended that such an assessment is performed to replace the arbitrary classification that has been used.

### *4. Too many conflicts between people walking and people cycling*

- There are many places where it is assumed that those not in cars can successfully share the same space.
- Within the town centre there appears to be no bicycle infrastructure at all. All access to the town centre appears to be using secondary streets of unknown design and therefore it is assumed that there would be no bicycle infrastructure.

### *5. Very low cycle parking provision*

#### Residential

- Whilst the plans suggest that 1.5 car parking spaces will be provided per dwelling, there is no equivalent statement for bicycle parking spaces. The only statement given is that there will be a 'minimum 1 secure space to be provided, within the curtilage where possible.' Clarification is needed on this point.
- The 3,500 houses will provide 4,420 secure car parking spaces and 857 unallocated car parking spaces, there is no similar breakdown for secure bicycle parking and on-street bicycle parking.
- The standard cycle parking provision, according to the developer is one space per residence. If each bedroom of a five bedroom house had one person in then this would allow each person in that house to have one fifth of a bicycle.

- Assuming one person per bedroom, secure bicycle parking provision should be over 10,000 and not the 5,867 proposed. On the assumption that a couple will live in a master bedroom this number would need to be closer to 13,000.

#### On Street Cycle Parking

- The provision of bicycle parking on all streets with the same absolute number of spaces as car parking must be provided within this planning application.

#### Education

- The ambition of 30% of primary school and 60% of secondary school children cycling to school is exceptionally low. Space for secure cycle parking for students should be provided on a one per student basis.
- There is no secure cycle parking for teachers or other staff at schools.

#### Town Centre

- The town centre is said to provide 57,500 m<sup>2</sup> of retail space. Given that cycle parking would be provided at one secure space for each 25m<sup>2</sup> this equates to 2,300 bicycle parking spaces. Such a large number of spaces would require more than just on-street bicycle parking. Structures similar to the Cambridge railway multi-storey cycle parking structure should be used. The developer is only proposing one space for each 50m<sup>2</sup> of retail space which is against policy.

#### Other facilities

- Many facilities are being planned within the development and many don't mention secure bicycle parking (e.g.) the sports hub and water park. Additional text is required to describe the level of secure provision.

#### Car Clubs / Car Sharing Schemes

- There is no mention of car clubs or car sharing schemes.

#### Policy TI/3 Parking Provision

- Conditions should be placed on the development (eg) buildings cannot be occupied until the levels of secure cycle parking have been proven to have been provided, both on-street and within the curtilage of the buildings, and that no town centre buildings can be occupied until secure parking is provided and can be used that meets the requirements of the local policies.

#### *6. Excessively high design speeds for roads*

- The design speed for the primary roads is stated to be 30 mph which is too high for a primarily residential development with housing on both sides of the street. Such a scenario will encourage people to drive instead of walk/cycle to their destination. The primary roads should have a design speed of 20 mph.
- The secondary streets should provide only 5.5m of space for motor vehicles and should have a design speed of 20mph.

#### *7. Unsafe designs for the access road*

- There are concerns about the design of the southern access road. These concerns are around the route into the developments, and the junctions with the Airport Road, Wilson's Road, the B1050 and the Phase 1 Cycleway.

#### Route into the development

- The volume of traffic on the secondary road out of Northstowe will be such that bicycle traffic will be intimidated and significantly delayed. The delays to the bus

traffic may have a highly detrimental effect on the use of the bus. It is requested that the eastern primary road in this area is routed either out via Phase 1 only or via the line for the eastern primary road set out for Phase 3.

- There are concerns that the western primary road will dump all its traffic on the secondary road. It is requested that the western primary road is fully built at this time and that the secondary road is used as the haul road.
- There are concerns about how the bicycle traffic would be routed through this junction in the future. Large roundabouts, as proposed here should not be expecting bicycle traffic to join the main flow of motor vehicle traffic to negotiate the junction. A long term solution is that this roundabout is built slightly higher than ground level such that a bicycle underpass can be built.

#### Airport Road Junction

- The main southern access road appears to be four lanes wide at its junction with the existing Airport Road. It is unacceptable that a major bicycle route should be given only a Pegasus crossing and not a toucan crossing or similar. It is not understood how somebody on a bicycle travelling north would be able to cross over this road.
- There are concerns that the 'bus only access' ramps from the access road will be illegally used by ordinary motor vehicles.
- Given that the transport assessment does not propose any buses travelling along this road, it is questioned why such a junction is needed in the first place. It is therefore requested that this junction is removed.
- Given that the access road will have significant flows of traffic there are concerns that any signalised crossing at this point will prioritise the movement of motorised vehicles over sustainable modes of transport. It is requested that this junction is converted into a grade separated junction that allows bicycle and equestrian traffic through at ground level and that the road goes up and over the cycle route 24 without disruption.

#### Wilson's Road Junction

- The provision of a 'straighter' Wilson's Road is welcomed. If this route is considered as a serious cycle route then it must be properly surfaced. Details are requested of the design of Wilson's Road as a cross-section.

#### B1050 Junction

- On the assumption that the junction would not be signalised the cycleway should cross at ninety degrees to the flow of traffic without any sharp corners just before or just after.
- The bicycle crossing of the side of the road is too close to the junction. Therefore the bicycle crossing point should be moved back far enough that all vehicles will be able to stop in the distance between the roundabout and that crossing point. The bicycle crossing point should have a central refuge area that allows for the queuing of bicycle traffic waiting to cross the other lane. This should be a minimum of 2.5m long and 4m wide and protected with kerbs.

#### Phase 1 Cycleway Junction

- The drawings that show the B1050 junction with the southern access road do not show any details about the Phase 1 cycleway along the B1050. It has been mentioned that this route is being provided, yet according to the proposed planning application, this cycleway will be removed from the junction and terminated at communications town.
- On the assumption that this cycleway will be drawn onto the diagram when plans are amended it would have to be questioned how this cycleway will be able to access the proposed 4m wide cycleway being provided by the A14 improvements. Any proposed solution should either be completely signalised or grade separated.

- Access to New Close Farm, Business Park
- It is requested that provision is made for non-motorised users to access New Close Farm Business Park.

### *8. Additional Considerations*

- During all stages of this development temporary road closures should privilege pedestrians and cyclists over motor vehicles. Cyclists should never be required to dismount at an obstruction.

### **3. Cambridge Meridian Education Trust (CMET)**

- Proposed area set aside for the schools is inadequate
- Schools should share facilities for economies of scale
- The adjacent sports hub should share facilities with the school.
- A S106 agreement is needed to establish facilities including a subsidy to ensure sustainability for the community sports provision in the early years of establishing the new community.
- There is a Lack of consistency between documents as to what facilities will be provided where.
- Schools should not be constrained to two-storeys.
- The sports fields may be prone to flooding.
- The secondary school should be an exemplar building that lends itself to teaching about the latest sustainable technologies (this should be in the S106).
- Clarity is needed on which facilities could be co-located with the school eg what will the leisure (10,000m2), health, community, fitness centre (6000m2) and youth facilities (2000m2) be?
- Where will indoor sports be located (i.e. swimming pool, 8 court sports hall, fitness suite, squash courts and indoor bowls)? Can they be co-located with the secondary school?
- Where will cultural facilities for the education uses that the planning statement refers to be located? Would like funding for a 400 seat theatre venue with high-quality projection facilities, gig venue, art gallery, and dance studio in the S106 agreement. Subsidy to ensure the sustainability of this provision should be included in the S106 agreement alongside a commitment to fund and Arts and Community Development Manager.
- Proposed parking for the schools is inadequate. Parking provision should not encroach on the 12Ha allocated to the secondary school.
- The drop-off / pick up zones should be separate from the parking area.
- Require guaranteed access for primary and secondary curriculum to education zone at the water park.
- NEAP on edge of schools site should be explored about how to integrate it with the sports hub.
- The developer should commit to offering apprenticeships in all areas of the build as part of the S106 including a post for the management of this.
- The developer should offer guaranteed job interviews to local unemployed people.
- The schools area should be included in the public art strategy and there should be S106 funding for the project management of this type of activity.
- Clarification is needed as to where pedestrian crossings will be placed and commitment is needed to safety of students.



#### **4. Cambridgeshire Constabulary**

- Part 5 DAS (page 89) indicative drawings are poor because they show rear gardens of terraced plots backing onto the fronts of terraced house. Block design with active frontages providing good surveillance of public spaces and through routes should be encouraged.
- Page 133 of DAS shows houses with alleyways at the back. This should be avoided.
- The layouts on page 135 are much better.

#### **5. Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council**

- The CEC is interested in the possibility of shared space. These historic denominations are accustomed to working together and already share church buildings across the county (for example, Bar Hill and Cambourne), and there are usually no major obstacles in the way of sharing more widely with other Christian groupings.
- Size is a particular concern: what may be adequate for Sunday services may not be large enough for major festivals or special services (e.g. weddings) and we see in Cambourne that the church is often uncomfortably crowded and sometimes 'standing room only'. There is also a need to take into account the requirement for permanent fittings and adequate storage space, to say nothing of meeting/quiet rooms, kitchens, toilets etc.
- Suggest a church-managed community centre.
- Of particular relevance to buildings, Shared Churches (Ely) Limited has the matter of faith provision at Northstowe as a standing item on its agenda and as a legal entity is able to own property and issue contracts on behalf of the mainstream churches in the County.
- On the question of wider faith involvement, the other major faith groups have been informed (those who are involved with the Faith Reference Group for NW Cambridge) about the proposal for Northstowe. To date responses have been received from three of them (Ba'h'ai, Buddhism and Judaism) who have all expressed some interest but have made no specific suggestions.
- Sharing buildings presents major difficulties for some faith groups and that overcoming some of these difficulties (e.g. gender separation, provision of washing facilities, separate kitchens).

#### **6. Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service**

- Adequate provision should be made for fire hydrants either by way of a s106 agreement or planning condition.
- Access and facilities for the Fire Service should be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16.
- An increase in call volume and emergency incidents will result from road networks in and around the new development along with increased volume on the major networks providing access to it.
- There is not capacity to deal with the estimated need. Attendance times to the location would be from existing stations located at Cambridge and Cottenham for the first response calls. The risk profile for the new development is likely to require a higher level of response which is not achievable from existing locations, and would

impact on the services ability to maintain existing risk cover to Cambridge and the surrounding areas.

- Consideration will be required for the deployment of additional resources during the construction phase in order to provide adequate emergency cover and response capability.
- Provision of a fire station for use by on-call staff is needed. The station will need to include a garage space for a fire engine. Cost of construction is £640,000. If alternative training facilities can be readily accessed the site could be reduced in size with a build cost of £507,000.
- The fire engine will need to be housed in the garage space 24/7. Crews will need to attend the station as a minimum of one evening of 3 hours per week. Access and attendance will then be dependent on call frequency to the local area.
- In order to mobilise the fire engine a minimum of 4 staff must be available within 5 minutes of the fire station. The optimum crew is 5 personnel. In order to achieve this across 24/7 365 days of the year approximately 12-15 new staff members would be required. All of these would be new staff who would require recruitment, selection and base training.  
Using an equivalent size station and expected training need and call rate, the annual staffing/running costs would be approximately £140,000.
- The training, management and supervision of the new station would be integrated into existing staff structures.
- The first 12 months would require an additional resource to coordinate and support new staff, whilst providing enhanced cover in the area, awaiting a fully functional crew and station. This resource could be based at nearby Cottenham or in temporary accommodation on site. The approximate cost would be £45,000.

## **7. Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum**

- The way in which the development fits into the wider landscape is unclear.
- Not much attention has been paid to ensuring the future occupants will be able to access the wider region.
- There appears to be only one main road that will join up with the existing road past Noon Folly and onto the A14. Although there is a proposed new road to the South West to link to the A14 it may not be complete for several years and should have a cycle lane alongside for accessing the neighbouring villages over the A14.

Adequate arrangements for access and crossings to the development on the other side of the main through route by the Longstanton Park and Ride should be included.

- The amount of green space is less than previously proposed. Children need local green spaces rather than drainage areas etc. Green areas should be distributed between and adjacent to the residential areas they support. If it's necessary to take a 20 minute walk to a green space the route should be separated from the traffic by a wide verge/bank.
- There needs to be all-users level access over the guided busway towards Rampton.
- Welcome the proposed bridleway leading off the road to Rampton.
- The longstanding issue of travellers on the Aldreth Causeway should be addressed to make using the route to and from Aldreth feasible.

- The best leisure journeys will be towards Swavesey and the RSPB reserve at Fen Drayton.
- The cycle network is on the road from Longstanton to Swavesey which will not be pleasant.
- The airfield road could become a useful within-town exercise-promoting cycle route or dog walking/jogging track.
- A booklet of walks and rides around Northstowe should be produced and included in promotional material.
- Any reclassified footpaths should be of appropriate width.
- The existing public right of way routes should be maintained, reclassifying them to bridleway from footpath where possible to enhance usability by riders/cyclists as well as walkers.
- Safe through access should be maintained for horse riders and cyclists between Longstanton and Oakington who currently use the airfield road.
- A circular perimeter natural boundary with perimeter bridleway/cycleway should be created, similar to that at Cambourne. The circular route should be in addition to the guided busway bridleway.
- The town should have a green border in between its houses/built environment and the busway. There is no need to build right up to the edge of the busway.
- Where surface improvements such as hard surfacing are carried out on bridleways for cyclists, a soft regularly-mown grass or cinder-type surface should be kept alongside too, for enjoyment by walkers and riders.
- With regard to riders, the views of Keeble Cottage Equestrian Centre, Charlotte's Riding Stables in Oakington and the livery yard at the Longstanton end of Rampton Drift public bridleway/byway should also be sought.
- The old airfield road at Oakington should be made a Right of Way and should be designated a bridleway.

## **8. CTC Right to Ride Network**

- Objections concern the following unacceptable elements of the proposed design:
  1. The proposed grid network of roads is too permeable for motor vehicles. In particular, the design should limit the number of roads that cross and/or connect to the central busway spine.
  2. The secondary road sections show a carriageway that is too wide, which reinforces their inappropriate use as through roads for motor vehicles.
  3. The standard of cycle provision is too low. It fails to align with the planned cycle provision in Phase 1 and it is unacceptable for Phase 2 provision to be built to a lower quality than Phase 1.

- In general, it appears that the Design and Access Statement favours journeys by cars over other modes. This is also reflected in the detailed design: the proposed road network will allow cars to travel at 30mph along an unrestricted and fully connected grid network of roads while providing a poorer quality of provision for cycling than is proposed for Phase 1.
  - All of the roads, including all the primary roads, should be designed as 20mph roads in line with national guidelines for urban roads.
  - All of the secondary roads should be designed as no through routes for motor vehicles to minimise vehicle movements on these roads. These roads can be designed for mixed use where cycles safely share the carriageway with motor vehicles.

#### OBJECTION 1:

The internal road design is too permeable for motor vehicles.

The following changes are essential:

1. There should be no through routes for motor vehicles on any of the secondary cross routes, while remaining fully permeable for cycling and walking.
2. Motor vehicle permeability should be limited to the two primary access roads. Plus at most one or two primary cross route between the western and eastern primary roads.

#### OBJECTION 2:

The primary road alignment and the associated cycle path provision alongside the primary roads should be more consistent with Phase 1.

The following changes are essential:

1. The primary road alignment should reduce the length of straight alignment. These roads should be designed as 20mph residential roads and this requires the alignment to be changed to include multiple horizontal deviations and other more effective speed reduction measures.
2. Segregated cycle paths are needed on both sides of the primary roads. The Phase 2 primary road cycle paths must be at least 2.5m wide. This is wider than Phase 1 to reflect the more central location where higher levels of cycling are expected.
3. An additional width of 0.5m should be added on any sections where the cycle path is adjacent to a vertical barrier.
4. The detailed design of the primary road cycle paths should align to the design for Phase 1.

#### OBJECTION 3:

The secondary road design is inappropriate. The carriageway section is too wide and none of these roads should be a through route for motor vehicles.

The following changes are essential:

1. All of the secondary roads should have a narrower carriageway and should be designed for low vehicle speeds and for low numbers of vehicle movements.
2. There should be no through routes for motor vehicles along any of the secondary roads. There must be no connection to the central busway spine and no through motor traffic on any of these secondary roads.
3. A bidirectional cycle path on one side only is not acceptable for any of the secondary roads. The secondary route can be redesigned as a shared space and no segregated cycle paths are needed. But, if segregated cycle paths are included, there should be a cycle path on both sides each with a minimum width of 2.1m to provide continuity with the primary road cycle paths.

#### OBJECTION 4:

The central busway cycle path design is poorly designed and inconsistent with Phase 1.

1. The cycle path width should be increased to at least 3.5m and ideally to 4m. This is wider than the corresponding path in Phase 1 to reflect the more central location.
2. An additional width of 0.5m should also be provided on any sections where the cycle path is adjacent to a vertical barrier.
3. The cycle path should be located on the same side of the busway for the whole of the Northstowe development. It is understood that the west/south side will be used for Phase 1.
4. An additional cycle path of similar quality should also be added to connect between this busway cycle path and the NCN24 cycle route along Longstanton Road.  
This connection is needed to provide an alternative direct cycle route to Cambridge (an alternative to the Guided Busway bridleway).

#### OBJECTION 5:

The primary road connections to the southern access road are unacceptable and inconsistent with Phase 3.

The plans indicate that there will be a total of 3 primary access roads that link to the southern access road. Only the central access road will be built initially but all 3 are planned at a later stage. There is a suggestion that the initial central road will be closed at some point in the future but this creates an unacceptable conflict in the short term and has the potential to maintain this conflict in the future.

The following changes are essential:

1. The primary connection to the southern access road should be along one of the two long term alignments
2. The proposed addition of a third (central) primary access road is unacceptable - even as an interim step - and it must be removed.
3. If part of that third (central alignment) primary road is retained for providing access, it must be converted into a secondary street with no through connection to the central busway for motor vehicles while (of course) retaining full permeability for cycles and pedestrians.

#### OBJECTION 6:

The junction/ crossing between the southern access road and Longstanton Road must be redesigned to provide a safer and more convenient crossing for cyclists using NCN24.

- The proposed crossing design is potentially dangerous and unacceptable. In part, this problem is related to objection 5 where the third central primary access road creates this dangerous crossing. However, a similar crossing will still be needed to cross the other realigned access roads and a better junction design is needed.
- Separately, there should be a good quality cycle route added to provide a direct desire-line connection between the central busway cycle path and Longstanton Road. The redesigned junction must support this alternative cycle route.

#### OBJECTION 7:

The proposals for additional cycle routes outside of the Northstowe site are too limited in scope. The plans include some welcome elements outside of the development but the proposed new routes are too limited in scope and there are some undesirable gaps.

The following changes are essential:

1. The proposed cycle path alongside the new southern access road is welcome but the proposed width of 3m is the minimum for this location. The cycle path should be separated from the carriageway by a verge with a width of at least 1m and ideally 2m. This verge should include some light and sound screening.
2. The outline of new cycle routes north of the guided busway should be more detailed. This development should be expected to fund the completion of a new cycle path between the villages of Rampton and Willingham. This development should also fund some widening and general improvements to the existing cycle path between Rampton and Cottenham.
3. The development should also include improvement to the byway/bridleway connection between Northstowe and Rampton to provide access to these new cycle routes.

## 9. Cottenham Parish Council

Questions arising from Cottenham PC:

- What provision of recreation services supplementary to local services, could Cottenham benefit from?
- What provision of transport, commuter, and leisure routes for non-motorised users could Cottenham benefit from?
- Transport routes for motorised users - considerations:
  - Road access – no direct access from Oakington, or Longstanton, to Northstowe in Phase 2 re: the development framework document.
  - Mitigation of traffic impacts – Section 106 traffic monitoring.
- Haulage routes - potential concerns:
  - Reiterate the need for adherence to agreed preferred haulage routes guidance.
- Drainage - potential concerns:
  - Flood mitigation – Cottenham Lode is in Flood Zone 3.
  - Potential concerns – delivery of the attenuation pond timing, sufficient water holding capacity, telemetry failure events.
  - Current flooding locations according to the Flooding Memories study.
  - Leisure and wildlife amenity of lakes and swales – a positive opportunity.
- A14 considerations and impacts potentially, alongside the Northstowe Phase 2 Development: haulage routes and traffic capacity on local roads. Concerns..?

Recommendations from Cottenham PC:

Transport:

- Stress the importance of construction traffic keeping to route agreements during the extended construction phase
- Stress the importance to local communities on a firm decision being made regarding the closure and maintenance status of Longstanton Road, the old airfield road
  - Suggestion has been made that a raising bollard might be an option
  - If the road is to be used, it may impact on traffic volumes through Oakington, and potentially through Cottenham.
  - And the current road surface has been deemed unsuitable for that level of traffic;

- Stress the importance of the Northstowe permanent and temporary monitoring traffic data recording sites, in particular to evaluate impacts on local traffic
- Stress the health and economic benefits of cycle access to Northstowe by a safe route, to encourage commuters, youth, horse riders, and local walking groups
  - support for cycle infrastructure improvements from King Street to the guided busway, and then beyond and across the CGB 'raised' horse crossing to Rampton Drift.

Drainage:

- Stress the importance of early delivery of the attenuation ponds, and flood mitigation measures:
  - The importance that the maintenance and condition of the raised banks of the Cottenham Lode are inspected regularly during the construction phase for Northstowe, and any unexpected flood events resolved and mitigated.
- The attenuation ponds, water parks, and incorporated SUDS features are seen as positive flood mitigation measures, and the earliest feasible delivery is supported.
- Greater detail to be included in relation to flood risk specific to Cottenham and the Cottenham Lode.
- Uncontrolled Flow in the higher catchment at Bar Hill, Oakington, Girton and Histon all of which will be taking increased development with rapid run off in varying degrees.
- Secondary flow from Northstowe via Reynolds Brook entering the Lode via a gravity control flap in the Rampton side Lode bank. Whilst the Old West IDB will negotiate payment for pumping excess water when Lode levels are high the PC should seek assurance that Old West IDB has the pumping capacity to deal with flooding in the interim period until Reynolds Brook is? or maybe ?  
Superseded as a surface water drain in Northstowe Phase 3. In short, based upon the flooding in 2001 / 2003 when properties in Rampton were flooded any failures in this system could threaten Cottenham.
- To this the controlled main discharge from the Northstowe reservoirs is added directly to Beck Brook. Highlight potential telemetry failure which could lead to overtopping of the Lode bank at Rampton. Cottenham Lode discharge to the Old West is NOT CONTROLLED. Any failure of high level flood banking or of either of the two under lode low level culverts at Broad Lane and Smithy Fen will threaten Cottenham residents. If the containment at Northstowe has water above the surrounding land then it will come under the Reservoirs Act
- Should ask for robust downstream Flood Risk Assessments including Breach Modelling and guarantees that any required betterment downstream in the IDB catchment and EA main river is adequately funded by S106 payments.
- The drainage issues are in hand, as long as the telemetry works and the maintenance after the system is delivered is appropriate. The maintenance needs to cover outside of the immediate area such as maintenance of the flood defence 'levees' along Cottenham Lode. There should be a process, and accountability for remediation and error checking as long as there is a process, and accountability, for remediation and error checking.
- Cottenham Parish Council note the following statement from the Old West River Internal Drainage Board:
- 'Old West Drainage Board:  
'Without mitigation the proposed development would significantly impact on the surface water environs and compound the flood risk to the District'

'During high flow conditions overtopping of the Cottenham Lode potentially results in flooding of the District. Similarly, during low flow conditions Reynolds Drain discharges to the Cottenham Lode (via a flapped valve) and hence any increase in base flow to the Cottenham Lode could reduce this discharge and increase the burden on the Board's drainage and infrastructure.'

'The Board requests that a holding objection is lodged to these reserved matters until additional detail is provided. Whilst we have no objection in principle to the works proposed, there is insufficient detail provided regarding the phasing and provision of risk mitigation'.

## 10. English Heritage

- No objection subject to condition.
- The applicant has correctly identified the heritage assets, both designated and undesignated.
- In respect of the undesignated heritage assets it is welcomed that the proposal aims to retain the Officer's Mess, The Guardhouse and the Water Tower as this enables future residents/visitors to understand the history of the site.
- In respect of designated heritage assets, namely the Oakington pillboxes, it is noted that the proposal will result in some change to their setting but that they will remain in an essentially open landscape. These changes will not result in significant levels of harm to their significance and their interlocking fields of fire will be discernible.
- The development site boundaries incorporate part of the designated Longstanton Conservation Area. It is important that the reserved matters proposals preserve and enhance the character and appearance of this space.  
A condition is required to requiring the treatment of this part of the Green Separation to retain the areas existing character and appearance.

## 11. Environment Agency

### Development and Flood risk

- The surface water drainage scheme submitted is in line with those agreed under the strategic drainage scheme and is in accordance with the policies of the Northstowe Area Action Plan (NAAP). The EA have no principle objections concerning Phase 2 of Northstowe, although further information regarding the detailed drainage design would be required prior to the commencement of works onsite. It should be noted at this time (November 2014) that the Webbs Hole Sluice Pumping station and the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) have yet to be completed. It is essential that these are completed prior to the habitation of Northstowe as the foul drainage system is reliant upon this work being completed. Planning conditions are required. The first condition regards ensuring the completion of the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) within the Swavesey Drain system. The LDS shall include the installation of a pumping station, to the prior agreed specifications of the local planning authority, at Webb's Hole Sluice. A further condition requires the submission of a detailed surface water drainage strategy for the application site prior to commencement of that Development Phase to which the drainage relates. A third condition requires a detailed scheme for the future responsibilities for the management of the surface water drainage.

### Groundwater & Contaminated (GW&CL)



- This site is partly located above a Principal Aquifer, WFD groundwater body, WFD drinking water protected area and is adjacent to a surface water course. It is considered that the previous military airfield and barracks land use is potentially contaminative. The site is considered to be of high sensitivity and could present potential pollutant/contaminant linkages to controlled waters. Potential contamination risk to the Principal Aquifer from current or historic contamination in areas of the proposed Phase 2 development overlying the Principal Aquifer should be addressed. The EA consider that planning permission could be granted providing conditions are implemented. Without these conditions, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and the EA would wish to object to the application. The first of these conditions relates to provision of a remediation strategy and provision of a remediation strategy if contamination is identified.

#### Area Environmental Planning (AEP)

- Water Quality/wastewater. The condition mentioned under the development and flood risk section with regard to ensuring the completion of the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) within the Swavesey Drain system is needed to ensure adequate infrastructure. The scheme shall have reference to how the drainage pipe-work and infrastructure shall be monitored during implementation, fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority. It is important for the efficient and effective operation of drainage systems – both on-site and in the wider catchment of the Utton's Drove wastewater treatment works - that clean and foul drainage remains separate.
- Waste. The application has presented a comprehensive Waste Management Strategy for the proposed Phase 2 development at Northstowe. The Waste Strategy has presented an excellent approach to the management of waste from the construction through to the operational phases.
- Water resources.

The EA could not find a reference to a specific Water Cycle Strategy (WCS), however the targets mentioned above would comply with what we expect to see in a WCS.

The development lies within the area traditionally supplied by Cambridge Water Company. It is assumed that water will be supplied using existing sources and under existing abstraction licence permissions. The planners should seek advice from the water company to find out whether this is the case, or whether a new source needs to be developed or a new abstraction licence is sought. The Agency may not be able to recommend a new or increased abstraction licence where water resources are fully committed to existing abstraction and the environment.

It is assumed that new houses will be constructed with water meters fitted. Other water saving measures that we wish to see incorporated include low flush toilets, low flow showerheads, water butts for gardens etc. The Environment Agency also supports the idea of greywater recycling as it has the potential to reduce water consumption in the average household by up to 35%.

- Fisheries, Biodiversity & Geomorphology (FBG)

Any wetlands or waterbodies proposed as part of the development should be designed and managed in such a way as to positively contribute to the nature conservation value of the sites. Measures should include establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged. The EA requires four conditions. One condition will require a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the bat populations found on site are protected whilst another conditions will be needed to protect the badger population on site. The other two conditions require a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the lizard and grass snake populations found on site are protected and a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the bird populations found on site are protected.

### Environment Management (EM)

The key documents, from the E&M perspective, namely the Drainage Strategy and the Outline Site-wide Construction Environmental Management Plan, appear to present a considered and thorough approach to managing the risks of pollution from the construction phase and the longer-term surface and foul drainage solutions. The EA would not have any objections. In order to deliver it will be important to secure full agreement with the sewerage undertaker regarding the foul water drainage design, capacity and permitting, as well as approval from our colleagues regarding SUDs and contaminated land issues. The EA requires a condition to ensure the implementation of an approved Construction Environmental Management Plan.

### 12. Highways Agency

- No objection subject to condition:

*No part of the proposed development beyond that referred to as sub-phase B in section 7.7 of the Northstowe Phase 2 Transport Assessment Main Report (dated August 2014) shall commence prior to the opening of (i) the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme; and (ii) the widening of Hattons Road to dual carriageway between its junctions with the A14 at Bar Hill the proposed Northstowe southern access route.*

***Reason(s) for the direction given at b), c) or d) overleaf and the period of time for a direction at e) when directing that the application is not granted for a specified period:***

*To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the A14 Trunk Road*

### 13. Histon and Impington Parish Council

Objections fall under three headings;

Retail:

- The scheme does not allow for major changes in consumer behaviour that are happening.
- The scale of provision is significantly higher than required by the development itself and will therefore put the viability of other centres at risk.

- Large amounts of free parking will attract shoppers from a wide area.

Affordable Housing:

- 20% affordable housing is too low, it should be 40%. Low levels of affordable housing will affect the ability of new low paid workers to live in the area and will harm businesses.

Transport & Traffic:

- The airfield road must be physically closed and as soon as possible.
- The overall traffic plan is unacceptable because no information has been given on queue lengths at junctions in Histon & Impington that would permit a validity test of the model; no consideration has been made with regard to the impact of excessive queue lengths at the Histon & Impington junctions; the modelling basis makes a false assumption (i.e. that the total number of jobs in South Cambridgeshire is fixed) and therefore is likely to be an underestimate.

#### **14. HSE**

- The proposed development site lies within the consultation distance of the former Home Office Immigration Reception Centre at Oakington Barracks, Longstanton, which is a major hazard site by virtue of the quantity of LPG held on site. The Immigration Reception centre closed in 2010 and hazardous substances are no longer present on the site. HSE withdraws the consultation distance unless SCDC advises that this site does currently hold hazardous substances consent under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992, as amended. If there is an existing hazardous substances consent for this site then SCDC should consider formally revoking it. On the assumption that the consultation distance is withdrawn there will be no need for SCDC to consult HSE on any developments in its vicinity including those associated with the Northstowe development.

#### **15. Longstanton & District Heritage Society**

- Applicant should make a firm commitment to providing a building and funding for a heritage centre and café in the former Guardroom. Developer contributions should be used to maintain this facility for the duration of the building works via a S106 agreement.
- There needs to be some acknowledgement of the LDHS archives and heritage protection for these.
- Require a town park with a war memorial.
- Former Station HQ should be retained.
- Longstanton Conservation Area should not be urbanised at all and should remain as natural as possible.
- Welcome the retention of the Officers Mess, the Guardroom and water towers.
- Welcome the uses for the Listed pillboxes.
- Welcome the applicant's acknowledgement that not all archaeological sites have been identified and that watching briefs will be put in place.
- Impact of the development on the residents and village of Longstanton has not been adequately addressed.
- Funding should be provided for the refurbishment of St Michael's Church.
- Longstanton conservation area paddocks should be formerly designated as green separation.
- Concerned about the high level of development on land that lies between Rampton Road and the Phase 1 area. Additional planting should be provided along its route.

- Extent of sports pitches is a concern. They should be removed and replaced with informal green space.
- Landscaping in the areas of the pillboxes and along the boundary with Phase 3 is insufficient.
- Green separation adjacent to Long Lane is insufficient.
- Insufficient green corridors to allow wildlife and walkers to cross the town without coming into contact with cyclists
- Landscaping of the heritage core area and town centre is insufficient especially as there is no town parkin either the town centre or adjacent to the heritage core.
- Insufficient green separation between land designated for residential areas and parts of the conservation area including Long Lane.
- Proposed density of 35-40 per hectare is too high for land adjacent to Long Lane.
- Density of 61 dph for the Station HQ site is a clear indication that it will not be retained.
- Character of Longstanton paddocks should be retained and cycle tracks should not go through them.
- Public access to Longstanton paddocks should be carefully controlled.
- Important for the disabled, dog walkers and those with young children to have access to informal open space without having to avoid cyclists.
- Long Lane should be redesignated as a footpath or bridleway (footpath preferable because of the damage horse's cause in wet weather).
- There should be no street lights erected along Long Lane because it will harm the conservation area.
- Object to the closure of the track that runs from Rampton Road to he Guided Busway because it is an historic route which, like Long Lane, plays a vital role in maintaining some of the historic character of Longstatnton.
- The plans don't show a safe and disability friendly crossing point of the GBW.
- The provision of a 5 storey building on the site of the Station HQ is not in keeping with the surrounding area and would detract from the conservation area. Building of 5-6 storeys should be restricted to the town centre.

## **16. Longstanton Parish Council**

- The bridleway crossing the Guided Bus from Rampton Road is dangerous. This needs investigating.
- The town centre needs to be in place at the beginning of the development to eliminate the first several thousand homes being 'dormitory' residences.
- Town square is too small.
- Lack of green space in town centre. This space should not have sport provision.
- Lack of car parking consideration on the town centre. Nothing to show that adaption for growth has been considered e.g. car parks that can become multi-storey
- Car parking needs to be adequate at recreation grounds.
- No provision for burials.
- No provision for landmark buildings in the town centre.
- Commuters from Northstowe using the Southern Access Road will have trouble joining the B1050 as traffic flows from Willingham. Need clarification on how pedestrians and agriculture will share the bridge on Wilsons Road.
- No provision for care homes or lifetime homes. The 5% of shared housing seems to be of a better standard than the private housing.
- The conservation area that belongs to Longstanton should not be included in the plans and it distorts the amount of green space Northstowe actually has.
- Very few green spaces in Northstowe.
- Unacceptable for cars and buses to share busway.
- Should be minimum of 2.5 car parking spaces per house. National average for car ownership is 2 cars per household with 16% having 3 cars. This area has a higher

than average car per home average with over 35.4% of homes having 2 or more cars (2011 Census – ONS).

- Any turbines should be located to the NE of Northstowe
- Maximum number of roofs should face south to support solar panels.
- Environmental standards should exceed the minimum standard.
- Established trees, especially around Rampton Drift should be maintained.
- Increasing building heights in town centre should be explored to reduce density around the outskirts of the town.
- Buildings adjacent Rampton Drift should not exceed 2 storeys in height.
- Minimum room sizes condition required. Reject the under occupancy argument.
- No provision for a hotel.
- Clarification is needed in respect to access to Longstanton throughout the construction process and the routes for Rampton Drift.
- Rampton Drift sewers to be connected to the Northstowe sewer network.
- Confirmation that Rampton Drift will have street lighting once classified as a road.
- Residents need to have assurance that flooding protection has been considered for Rampton Drift.
- Consideration needs to be given for the effect the construction. Need to consider working out from Rampton Drift.
- The green spaces of Rampton Drift need to be maintained by Northstowe.
- As with Northstowe, Rampton Drift needs to have fibre broadband installed.
- Plans of the town centre need to be more detailed in order that the residents of Rampton Drift will have some idea of its impact.
- Need better consultation on the requirements of the town centre and what should be included.
- Supermarkets should be towards the outskirts of the town to minimise traffic in the town centre.
- Clarification of the scheme to bring homes in Rampton Drift up to the environmental standards expected in Northstowe.
- There is a clear lack of green space and separation around Rampton Drift.
- The currently unadopted road in Rampton Drift needs to become adopted and maintained along with the others.
- What is being put in place to help reduce the impact construction will have on Rampton Drift residents?

## **17. National Grid**

- National Grid has identified that it has apparatus in the vicinity of the enquiry which may be affected by the activities specified.  
National Grid should be informed as soon as possible about the decision the Local Planning Authority is likely to make regarding this application. Due to the presence of National Grid apparatus in proximity to the specified area, the contractor should contact National Grid before any works are carried out to ensure that the National Grid's apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works. This assessment solely relates to National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) and National Grid Gas plc (NGG) apparatus.

## **18. Natural England**

- Areas allocated to informal green space are relatively modest in extent compared to the amount of housing.

- The developer should compensate for loss of farmland bird habitat by having off-site creation.
- At least 3 of the greenways should be informal to allow for wildlife habitation
- Natural England ANGSt (accessible natural green space standards) need to ensure:
  - 1) the larger greenways of 50m or more are should be included as natural green space to ensure the majority of dwellings are within 300m of a green space of at least 2ha although some housing in the town centre would be 300m from a green space
  - 2) The proposal does not meet the requirement to have a minimum of 1ha of Local Nature Reserve (LNR) per 1000 population.

## 19. NHS

- For Phase 1 GP services will be provided from the existing Longstanton surgery which will have to be expanded whilst children's services would be located for the first 5 years at the first Northstowe primary school.
- A new health facility is needed for Phase 2, probably in the town centre area.
- Objection to current phasing proposals because there is a need for health infrastructure to be implemented earlier.
- Need a health building with a minimum floor space of 1740 m<sup>2</sup> and an option for expansion of 1000m<sup>2</sup>.
- Further detail needed on parking for health facilities.
- Developer contribution needed to mitigate provision of health infrastructure and establishment of health services in Northstowe.

## 20. Oakington & Westwick Parish Council

Comments fall under numerous headings:

Transport:

- Of the three scenarios for Phase 2, the 'Do something 1' scenario is preferred.
- Support the closure of the Airfield Road to normal vehicular traffic. Needs to be strict control with a physical barrier.
- Should be an allowance of two parking spaces per property to follow the Local Plan recommendation and to minimise the wide scale erratic and dangerous parking prevalent at Orchard Park.
- The description of amenities and facilities in Oakington is incorrect. There is a village store and sub-post office, and there is no Crossways Hairdressers, and there is a public house.
- Description of the Citi 6 bus schedule is incorrect, it runs weekdays from 0700 to about 1830, not 2300. The Citi 5 hourly evening service diverts through the western end of Oakington between 1900 and 2300.
- The traffic model appears to be deficient. There are obvious discrepancies (for example the assertion that closure of the Airfield Road in DS1 will increase traffic at the Longstanton Road/Dry Drayton Road junction in Oakington).

Flooding & Drainage:

- The additional attenuation ponds each side of Dry Drayton Road should be implemented as part of the phase 2 design, and not delayed until phase 3.
- The two 2014 flood events in Oakington and Westwick need to be further considered when determining the drainage strategy for Northstowe. Any development causing

water back up or reduced flow in the Beck Brook downstream from Westwick needs to be avoided.

- The failsafe position should be no discharge from Northstowe attenuation ponds into Beck Brook.

#### Framework Travel Plan:

- The same mistakes in Oakington retail outlets and bus service times exist here as commented in the transport section.
- Do not believe a target of 0% bus use within Northstowe by 2031 is sensible if the bus services are properly deployed.
- We have long pressed for a vehicle turning point at the Oakington Station Road/CGB junction. If designed correctly to allow for Citi 6 buses and other vehicles to turn it might receive our support.

#### Construction:

- Concerns that work on the Southern Access Road (West) and particularly the roundabout near Longstanton Road will be disruptive for residents nearby.
- The area of the Southern Access Road (West) and particularly the roundabout near Longstanton Road are in the one area of Phase 2 that drains towards Oakington. Provision of adequate drainage and water attenuation should be a condition.

#### Waste:

- The UWS (Underground Waste System) should be used.

#### Health:

- Provision of counselling support for residents during the construction and early occupation phases needs to be robust, pro-active and capable of expansion until the town matures.

#### Utilities:

- There appear to be requirements for major expansion of utilities. The parish requests that disruption should be minimised with local roads not closed during such works.

#### Environment:

- Suitable measures should be put in place to prevent rat-running through local villages, and particularly across the Airfield Road, when works to the B1050 occur.
- The Southern Access Road (West) should be built as a dual carriage way initially, rather than built single and widened later as it will reduce costs and would be less disruptive.
- The potential noise and negative visual impact from the Southern Access Road (West) should be reduced by suitable tree and hedgerow planting.
- It is stated that for a number of local roads in the nearby villages that 'this route already experiences high traffic volumes and some HGV traffic and as such users of this route would be used to these traffic flows.' The parish does not believe that this constitutes justification for planning to maintain or increase such traffic levels.

### **21. Rampton Drift Residents Association**

- Broadly positive about becoming residents of the new town and welcome the facilities that will come.
- Feel that the developers have been forthcoming with information

- Housing adjacent Rampton Drift shouldn't exceed two storeys
- Inadequate parking provision for new town. 1.5 spaces per dwelling not enough.
- Rampton Drift needs to retain access to Longstanton until residents have full access to the Southern Access Road (West).
- Needs to be a clear route out of Northstowe to the north to enable access to Longstanton.
- Rampton Drift sewers should be connected to Northstowe's at an early stage in Phase 2.
- Residents need safer access to the busway. Access to the busway cycle path is currently via a very dangerous crossing.
- Rampton Road, once part of Northstowe, should be classified as a road and have appropriate street lighting installed.
- Concerns that raising the land at Northstowe will result in flooding issues for Rampton Drift
- 
- Phasing should ensure housing is built out from Rampton Drift rather than towards it.
- The planning authorities need to resolve whether or not Rampton Drift is part of Northstowe. At present the residents of Rampton Drift are having to privately negotiate with developers.
- The maintenance of Rampton Drift green spaces should be taken over by Northstowe.
- Rampton Drift should be fitted with fibre-optic cable at the same time that it is laid for Phase 2.

## **22. RSPB**

- No objection providing sufficient mitigation can be identified to address potentially significant impacts on sites of nature conservation interest.
- Concerns regarding:
  1. Lack of analysis regarding impacts on Ouse Washes Special Protection Area (SPA) and other site with regard to changes in hydrological nature of the area
  2. Lack of analysis regarding likely increases in recreational pressures on sites of nature conservation (SNCI) in the surrounding area
  3. Potential need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) with regard to points 1 and 2
  4. Level of off-site mitigation and enhancement of an appropriate scale to adequately deal with the impact on farmland birds
  5. Lack of detail regarding the cumulative impact on farmland bird species and increased pressure on SNCIs

## **23. Sport England**

- Object at present due to lack of outdoor space provision and out of date facility strategy.



- The Original Sports facility strategy for Northstowe 2008 has not been reviewed. An updated strategy needs to be approved following consultation with Sport England and other stakeholders.
- Lack of detail on types of facility that will be provided in each hub.
- Provision of outdoor sport space at 10.66 ha is well below requirement of 14.4 ha. It is stated that additional provision could be brought forward in Phase 3 if sport provision is not meeting demand. Sport England reject this approach because additional provision could not be guaranteed.
- Indoor sports. The original 2008 strategy highlighted the need for the following facilities to meet demand from the new population:
  - 8 court sports hall
  - 6 lane 25m swimming pool
  - Health and fitness suites
  - 2 squash courts

It was proposed that the indoor community sports facilities would be provided as a 'dual use' facility at the proposed secondary school with detailed management arrangements to be agreed at a later date. Sport England needs confirmation that the broad outline of proposed sports facilities will remain. It was also proposed that one of the full size AGP's would be provided at the school site and a further full size AGP at the central sports hub. Other areas that need reviewing are the provision of multi-use games areas, bowling greens and youth facilities such as skate parks and BMX tracks.

Sport England consultation with National Governing Bodies of Sport (NGB's):

FA (Football): No response received

ECB (Cricket): - Swavesey Village College is the education establishment that will be linked initially and which needs much improved cricket facilities to cater for both the internal programmes they run and the partnership they have established with Over CC.

- Ultimately two cricket pitches would be needed but this is a long term plan.
- There is a need for provision on the development which caters for junior cricket developed in partnership with the (new) schools in particular and supported by the local club.
- The game of cricket is changing to a shorter format with less emphasis on clubs and more on teams who look for venues to hire. The current plan would not appear to serve that sort of opportunity.

RFU (Rugby Union)

- The RFU would prefer to see investment prioritised into existing clubs in the area to increase capacity.

England Hockey – No comments.

#### **24. Swavesey & District Bridleways Association**

- Maintain existing public right of way routes, reclassifying them to bridleway from footpath.
- Maintain safe through access for horse riders and cyclists between Longstanton and Oakington
- Create a perimeter natural boundary with perimeter bridleway/cycleway, similar to that at Cambourne for enjoyment of all. The circular route should be in addition to the guided busway bridleway.

- The town should have a green border in-between its houses/built environment and the busway to give a nicer environment for everyone to be in.
- Where surface improvements such as hard surfacing are carried out on bridleways for cyclists, a soft regularly-mown grass or cinder-type surface should be kept alongside too for enjoyment by riders and walkers.

## **25. Swavesey Internal Drainage Board**

- The IDB objects because the application is premature. The IDB will continue to oppose any development which will increase the rate of run-off and volume of treated effluent discharge into the Swavesey Drain system until the outstanding issues have been resolved. The main concern is about the increased rate of surface water and the increased volume of treated effluent discharging into Swavesey Drain or its associated tributaries. These watercourse are either main rivers, under the control of the Environment Agency, or Award Drains, under the control of South Cambridgeshire District Council. None of them are under the Board's jurisdiction. They form part of a 'higher level' drainage system that borders and bisects the Board's area, placing it at risk if they were to breach or overtop. These systems can influence the Boards' operation, as the Swavesey Drain system approaches capacity during relatively low rainfall events, and restricts the operation of its pumping facility, and has previously and continues to cause flooding in the area due to overtopping of the adjacent flood defence embankments particularly when Webbs Hole Sluice becomes 'tide locked' by high water levels downstream.
- The western section of the Southern Access Road (West) is within the catchment of Longstanton Brook and other tributaries of Swavesey Drain. It is noted that the stated rate of discharge from the associated balancing ponds is 1 l/s/ha, which is considered to be below the current Greenfield rate of run-off, regulated by a Hydrobrake. However, given that the lowest rate achievable using such a device is 4-5 l/s it is uncertain how this will be achieved when the largest catchment appears to be below 4ha. The use of such devices is a potential maintenance issue that will require regular attention.
- No final decision on the provision of conveyance through Mare Fen, how this conveyance will be maintained, if provided, or installation of the required pump at Webbs Hole has been made. It is imperative that a hydraulic model of Swavesey Drain and associated tributaries that includes these additional discharges is undertaken before planning permission is granted by SCDC.
- A drainage strategy must be included to demonstrate that suitable consideration has been given to ensure surface water drainage treated effluent disposal can be accommodated within the site, and that issues of ownership and maintenance are addressed.
- The discharge of surface water treated effluent from developments should be designed to contribute to an improvement in water quality in the receiving water course or aquifer in accordance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive.
- All proposals should have regard to the guidance and byelaws of the relevant Internal Drainage Board.
- The development must not have a detrimental effect on existing flood defences or inhibit flood control and maintenance work.
- The requirements under the Land Drainage Act must be complied with before any work is commenced on site.

## **26. Wildlife Trust**

- Not commenting as unlikely anything meaningful by way of biodiversity enhancement can be achieved. The development is not sustainable from a natural point of view.

## **27. Willingham Parish Council**

- Recommend refusal because of increased use of B1050. Regulating the traffic lights at the Over Road/Berrycrofts/High Street/Station Road crossroads is too simplistic.

### **Recommendation**

That members note the comments made during the consultation period

### **Background Papers:**

- Northstowe Area Action Plan 2007
- Development Framework Document, July 2012
- Exemplar Document, October 2012
- Draft Local Plan submission, July 2013

### **Report Author:**

James Stone  
Telephone Number:

Principal Planning Officer  
01954 732904

**APPENDICES OF RESIDENTS COMMENTS:**

*Please note that these comments are word-for-word as submitted to SCDC.*

**Appendix 1.0 - THE TOWN CENTRE**

**Appendix 2.0 – THE TYPES OF NEW HOMES**

**Appendix 3.0 – RECREATION, SPORTS PITCHES AND OPEN SPACES**

**Appendix 4.0 – THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

**Appendix 5.0 – PLANS TO MAKE THE DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY**

**Appendix 6.0 – THE LAYOUT OF WHAT’S GOING WHERE**

**Appendix 7.0 – THE SEPARATION BETWEEN NORTHSTOWE AND THE EXISTING COMMUNITIES OF LONGSTANTON, OAKINGTON AND RAMPTON DRIFT**

**Appendix 8.0 – NEW ROADS, FOOTPATHS, CYCLEWAYS AND BUS LINKS, INCLUDING THE GUIDED BUSWAY**

**Appendix 9.0 – PLANNED IMPROVED DRAINAGE**

**Appendix 10.0 – OTHER ISSUES**

## Appendix 1.0

### 1 THE TOWN CENTRE - RESIDENTS COMMENTS

- Ensuring the early delivery of social, amenity and retail space to prevent early occupants becoming car dependant
- Needs to facilitate and help provision of independent shops and services to support a new local economy
- I suggest covered walkways round the shops, as it seems that one of the reasons people like superstores is that they remain in the dry.
- "Ok"
- A park near the central Town Centre would be a nice feature too!
- There must be early engagement with the market/companies to allow them adequate time to research their requirement and plan their developments. For example M& simply food mini store, Costa Coffee, David Lloyd gym and pool/LA Fitness, Greene King/Marston pubs, Tragus group restaurants (Café Rouge, Bella Italia & Strada, Nandos, Frankie and Bennys), Cineworld, Kids unlimited nursery, Kid Zone softplay, B&Q diy, Currys electronics, Ikea furniture, Dunelm furnishings, best Western/Mercure hotels, independents etc.
- There must be an open green area in the town centre for 'breathing space' among the very high concentration of buildings. This North of Cambridge area desperately need a large open country park and woodland area where people can escape to walk freely with their family/dogs away from the new built up area and sports ground. The land around the new alleviation ponds along the B1050 would be ideal
- I like the picture of the town centre
- Clause D1.7 of NAAP states and I quote exactly as it is written, "the town centre will be THE main defining feature....". Clause D1.9 goes on to state that "an early start on the development (by which it means construction) of the town centre will be important". Clause D1.8 concerns the Town Council, but this does not seem to figure in the documents anywhere.
- Ergo, an early start on this element of the development is a requirement. By no stretch of imagination can the time table for the Town Centre, as set out in the Construction Programme contained in the Environmental Statement (E.S), be described as taking any precedence in the development (construction). Even listing the Southern access road as starting some five years from when preliminary planning permission could be granted should be changed.  
**Town Centre**
- 3. Parking provision for cars and cycles will be included in the form of public car and cycle parks for the town centre of a size consistent with its role as a small market town.
- 4. A Town Centre Strategy for Northstowe will be submitted for approval by

the local planning authority as part of the application for initial planning permission. I do not recall this ever happening.

- P23 D1.7 "...Creating attractive landmark buildings and spaces will also be vital in order that Northstowe town centre will be a place worthy of its residents." Where are these buildings?

#### The Town Centre

- If you refer to my earlier representation based on the NAAP, there are several aspects of the Town Centre which the current application does not address.
- There seems to be inadequate provision for parking for non-residents of Northstowe who will wish to go there to shop.
- Where are the landmark buildings and spaces that the NAAP promises? Where is the Town Park?
- The parking provision for the whole of the site is inadequate. New homes should be built with a minimum of 2 parking spaces and the town centre should have more parking too.
- Current proposals do not look like they include adequate parking for the town centre. As residents of Rampton Drift, which is directly adjacent to the proposed site for the town centre, this concerns us as we already have problems with parking on the estate. Should visitors to the town centre start to park on the Rampton Drift estate then this will exacerbate the problem. We would like assurances that town centre parking will be adequate and plans put in place to accommodate any future growth. We would also like to know how you will prevent non-residents parking on the Rampton Drift estate.
- Current plans regarding the town centre appear vague and we would like to know what the proposed layout and use of space will be.
- We feel it is important that a multi-function art centre (not simply using a town council hall) is incorporated into the town centre at the earliest possible date. This should be designed to be suitable for music, art, theatre, etc. but should not just be a generic hall. It needs proper consultation with local artists and representatives from exemplar venues across the UK. A strong cultural programme, including festivals, exhibitions and annual events, will be key to creating a sense of community.
- We feel that there should be no large supermarkets within the town centre or surrounding areas. Any that are planned to be built within Northstowe should be on the outskirts of the town to minimise build-up of high volumes of traffic and movement.

#### Town centre supermarket

- This has been covered in the proposals in various ways, but it bears repeating that we think that a large supermarket (such as Tesco in Bar Hill or Morrisons in Cambourne) would not be appropriate and could stifle other retail development in the centre. Of course food retail space will be required, however more moderately sized stores would seem more appropriate as the

town develops, with some attempt to encourage diversity of provision.

- With Rampton Drift being so close to the town centre, it could easily become a place for people going shopping to park for free. Therefore Rampton Drift should either become a residents only parking zone (where residents should not have to pay for their permits), or parking should be free in Northstowe, meaning there would not be a need for people to park in Rampton Drift. I feel that the free parking could make the town a success. Parking in Cambridge is expensive. If you want to entice shoppers away from Cambridge and into Northstowe there need to be some obvious benefits as the Northstowe town centre is not going to be able to have the same range and quantity of shops that Cambridge has. If parking in Northstowe was plentiful and free, people would be more obliged to pop to Northstowe to get what they need, rather than drive to the busy and expensive car parks in Cambridge.
- The Northstowe area action plan states that: “The town of Northstowe will be developed to integrate Rampton Drift sensitively into the new town to preserve residential amenity.”
- I would like to see this developed for business, retail, leisure and general community use. This will not be easy because the use of the town centre will change over time as Northstowe develops. This calls for a very flexible design which has multi-purpose buildings than can morph over time to change from say small retail to medium size retail, office to retail, retail to office etc. Smaller sites will be needed initially but will need to expand as the population grows. As a school will be in place before anything else the town centre will no doubt initially be used by the students/parents going to and from school and at lunchtime. Doctor’s surgery, dentist, post-office and other essential facilities all need to be in place for the new residents as soon as possible. I run my business from home and I think there could be a real opportunity to develop some co-working spaces in Northstowe for small businesses and individuals to come together in a hub to benefit from a work location and synergy with other businesses. The town centre may not be big enough in the longer term to cope with all the variety of uses that are possible and to maintain the open space character pictured in some of the drawings. Car parking need to be flexible too to expand as necessary.

## 2 THE TYPES OF NEW HOMES - RESIDENTS COMMENTS

- That plots/sites are made available for affordable housing for all such as self-build and co-housing schemes. At least one site (2 acre plus) be available in the first phase of development
- A full range including affordable, self-build and co-housing
- Lack of bungalows sheltered accommodation and space for a care home. New towns are not only for young people
- Ensure there is a good quantity of social housing, not simply so-called 'affordable' housing. Don't build any of these hideous box-like flats that one sees these days (e.g. Park View on the Huntingdon ring road)
- Avoid (a) post modern business-park architecture and (b) flat roof glass and steel sheds for commerce
- There must be a divide, our houses are completely different to the houses proposed for Northstowe 2,3,4 and 5 storeys high! Really!
- It also worried me that at the Longstanton consultation last week.... no one had been to Rampton Drift? And on the Northstowe planning application phase 2 leaflet given out Rampton Drift houses had no gardens on the plan, how can that be? All answers I received from the consultations have been completely conflicting. no one knows what to say especially I have found to a Rampton Drift resident. If no answers are known why have consultations?
- I feel that the provision of an average of only 1.5 car parking spaces is inadequate. Similar (albeit smaller) developments in the area have, I believe, on average more than 2 vehicles per property and given that the majority of Northstowe residents are likely to be working elsewhere in Cambridgeshire, Northstowe residents are likely to be equally dependant upon cars for transport. I fear that road safety will be compromised if insufficient parking is provided (as inevitably this would lead to inappropriate parking and/or overly congested roads).
- Poor – there should be fewer single houses, more 3-5 storey apartments; build up and not out. Decent design would also be welcome
- Too modern and dense for this area with inadequate allowance for car parking in spite of the guided bus
- My grandsons (4) will soon be getting married and will need starter homes
- We were told that the amenity of Rampton Drift would be protected. We would therefore call on the developers to ensure that housing adjacent to Rampton Drift has the same density as the current houses and that houses are not more than two storeys high.
- The parking provision for the whole of the site is inadequate. New homes should be built with a minimum of 2 parking spaces and the town centre should have more parking too.



- The planning application states that the housing adjacent to Rampton Drift will be 'up to 3 storeys'. Houses on Rampton Drift are all 2 storeys high. Therefore, housing immediately adjacent to Rampton Drift should not exceed two storeys.
- New homes should be built to exemplar standards but we are concerned whether or not there is enough space to do this and fit 3500 homes on the land available. Many new estates cram houses in and do not provide adequate green space within their estates or provide outdoor spaces of any meaningful size with the houses themselves. This would be counterproductive and we think that the quality of the homes, and therefore the quality of life for those living within them, is far more important than the number of houses which can be built.
- 1.5 car spaces have been allocated per house. Whilst we agree with the environmental intentions behind this and in reducing cars on the road to encourage more environmentally-friendly modes of transport, we are concerned that this is not practical and that in reality this would create parking issues and, therefore, congestion issues on the roads across Northstowe. We feel that 2 spaces per property would be more logical.
- All houses which surround Rampton Drift should be no higher than 1.5 storeys. Residents are already losing beautiful surrounding countryside so they should not be overlooked by large buildings. Houses on Rampton Drift are 2 storeys and it seems reasonable to start from 1.5 and build upwards away from the estate. At the recent exhibition held in Longstanton on Saturday 1 November a HCA officer gave us assurances that houses surrounding Rampton Drift would be no higher than 2 storeys. We would like your commitment to the height of these homes in writing and included as part of the plans so it is clear for all to see.
- Housing surrounding RD is at present 'up to 3 storey'. No house in RD is above two storeys. The change in building height should be gradual moving away from RD with houses limited to 2 storey around RD and increasing further out.
- The planning application states that the housing adjacent to Rampton Drift will be 'up to 3 storeys'. Houses on Rampton Drift are all 2 storeys high. Therefore, housing immediately adjacent to Rampton Drift should not exceed two storeys.
- On the very first proposals that were put out to us while being a resident of Rampton Drift we were assured that any plans or proposals would only be allowed if they enhance the situation of Rampton Drift. So now to see that the plans are for the town centre to be adjacent to Rampton Drift with 3 to 5 story buildings virtually right up to the edge of the estate. How can this enhance this part of the settlement when at the moment they look out over uninhibited farmland and countryside? This needs to be treated with great care having only 2 storey building in the area that are going to be closest to the Estate.
- In order for the promises made here to be kept a number of things need to happen. First of all the housing in the town centre close to Rampton Drift should be low level so it is in keeping with the houses already there and

residents are not overlooked.

- The outline application contains some vague positive language about integrating RD and maintaining its character etc. but it also states that RP will be immediately surrounded by buildings of 'up to' 3 storeys'. I strongly believe that, with more careful consideration of the green and separation and planting around RD, this must be revised to up to two storeys as all of the houses in RD are two storeys.
- Now, I may be jumping the gun in relation to my second point, which is about the density of the phase two Northstowe build. If I have you can let me know.
- A report produced by the Royal Institute of British Architects (Riba) states that Britain's new-build homes are the smallest in Western Europe and many are too small for family life. The Institute estimates the floor area of the average new three-bedroom home in the United Kingdom is 88 sq. m (947 sq. ft.) - some 8 sq. m (86 sq. ft.) short of its recommended space. The survey of new-home buyers in 2009 found that more than half (58%) said there was not enough space for furniture they owned, or would like to own and nearly 70% said there was not enough storage for their possessions. The average UK home, including older and new-build properties is 85 sq. m and has 5.2 rooms - with an average area of 16.3 sq. m per room. In comparison the average new home in the UK is 76 sq. ms and has 4.8 rooms with an average area of 15.8 sq. m per room.
- Once again my concerns are that Northstowe is going to consists of an awful lot of high density residential properties that will have been built to the minimum space specification architects, planners and builders can legally get away with. In my view if our architects and planners do not address such issues as the provision of adequate car parking and car spaces as well as building homes that are spacious in design both internally and externally, there is a danger that Northstowe will become a high density concrete ghetto that will never fully develop as a town with a developing and sustainable community.
- Choosing a home to rent or buy is probably one of the biggest decisions people make. How they live, where they live and the type of home they live in has a big influence on them and our communities. In December 2010, the **Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA)** commissioned a You Gov poll to test perceptions and preferences about newly built homes. It produced some interesting results. The survey indicated that whilst there is a clear preference for homes from earlier periods (**49%**), nearly a quarter of people would prefer to move to a home built within the last ten years. New homes are clearly taken seriously by consumers as offering good places to live, but respondents were concerned that they lacked outside space and that rooms were far too small.
- The survey found that:
  - **69%** of people who would buy a new home said that energy efficiency was the most important reason for them
  - **60%** of people who would not buy a new home said that the small size of the rooms was the most important reason for them

- The top three things people look for when moving home are outside space (**49%**), the size of the rooms (**42%**), and proximity to local services (**42%**).
- **31%** of people would not consider buying a home built in the last ten years, or would only consider it as a last resort. Of these, **60%** said it was because the rooms are too small, 46% said they lack style, and 45% were concerned about the lack of outside space.
- People believe that newly built homes fail [ ***Orchard Park in Longstanton***] to provide two of the top three things they are looking for when moving home: **adequate space inside and outside the home**.
- I have attached a copy of the '***Housing a Case for Space***' report, which you may wish to read.

**3 RECREATION, SPORTS PITCHES AND OPEN SPACES - RESIDENT COMMENTS**

- Access to all
- I welcome the proposals for significant sports, recreation and community facilities within the new town which should also be made available for the use by residents of Longstanton
- The recreation areas seem very limited to a few football pitches; provision of, say, a 'central park' area much like some of the parks in central Cambridge) would significantly enhance the proposal.
- Regarding the play grounds: on paper this looks impressive. However, more detailed enquiries suggest that the majority of the sites are intended to consist of a single play item for toddlers and young children. Experience of these elsewhere in Longstanton suggests that they are not popular and that fewer but larger playgrounds would be more successful and beneficial.
- I welcome the proposals for significant sports, recreation and community facilities within the new town which should also be made available for the use by residents of Longstanton
- My property at No.55 Woodside Longstanton is located immediately adjacent to the proposed parkland area between Northstowe and the village. I reserve the right to comment further when full details become available for the landscaping and planting proposals for this area. Proper and responsible arrangements should be included in the S106 Agreement for the effective long term management and maintenance of this public open space and landscaped area by a publicly accountable body and for the controls and restrictions over its future use
- More detail is required in relation to the composition of the 6,000m<sup>2</sup> allocated for health, community and fitness centre.
- There must be an open green area in the town centre for 'breathing space' among the very high concentration of buildings. This North of Cambridge area desperately need a large open country park and woodland area where people can escape to walk freely with their family/dogs away from the new built up area and sports ground. The land around the new alleviation ponds along the B1050 would be ideal
- Why is phase one sports ground such a long way from the main sports ground?
- I feel very strongly that Northstowe village centre should include a building for the use of the community. Just allocating space for the building is not enough: a structure needs to be actually built by the developers and then given over for ownership by the parish council or a board of trustees. Raising money to construct a building further down the line will be almost impossible to achieve and the building will be needed right away.
- The building will be used for the provision of vital community activities for the residents of Northstowe. These include baby and toddler groups and evening

fitness classes, the sort of which already takes place daily in Longstanton. In particular the toddler groups are a lifeline for young families, who I expect will form a large proportion of the new residents. The existing volunteer-run children's groups in Longstanton are already running near capacity in the Village Institute (a building which is nearing the end of its life in any case). They will not be able to absorb the numbers of new residents expected in Northstowe.

- In addition, the building could be used to hold craft fairs and coffee mornings for older residents. As someone involved with running the children's groups, I would be happy to advise on what would be needed from such a building - plentiful storage (for toys) and a full kitchen would be an excellent start.
- Community ownership of this building would be very important - commercial hourly rental rates would be extremely difficult to cover for the children's groups, which are usually volunteer-run and rely wholly on donations.
- The plans show the green area to the west of Northstowe (St Michael's Conservation Areas, along Long Lane) to become a part of Northstowe's green areas. I strongly disagree with this designation - these areas are what make our village of Longstanton a green and pleasant place to live, and removal of this area from our village to become nominally a part of Northstowe's recreation space will make both communities the poorer when considered combined. The smooth boundary along the edge of the air-field that currently exists between the areas has clearly been disrupted to effect this, in what looks like a blatant land-grab. I would suggest this is just to effect maximum profit by maximising building land and it is not fair on the residents of Longstanton.
- We currently have green areas and a playground within Rampton Drift. The latter will be on the edge of the town centre. It seems certain that these facilities will start to be used by Northstowe residents, not only those residing at Rampton Drift who currently pay a maintenance charge for maintaining these areas on the estate. Because of this we feel that the forthcoming Northstowe Town Council should take over responsibility for these areas
- On the same topic, not much of the remaining green areas designated on the plans are suitable as general recreation area - most are covered in water, with the remaining being sports pitches. That the plans make Rampton Drift look like a spacious low-density area is a testament to how dense the housing will be - in effect a tarmac jungle with very little green space at all.

#### Children's play areas

- The plans show a large number of "small" play sites, with a few bigger sites. While the number of sites may look at first glance impressive, I am concerned the majority will be similar to the "Home Farm Chicken". This is a single bouncer placed in the middle of the new estate in Longstanton - a facility almost laughable in its pathetic nature. Children need social spaces where they can play with friends - fewer designated areas with more playground toys in each would be more appropriate.
- I feel it would be useful if the secondary school included a pool for the use of the community outside school hours, along the lines of Impington Village College, which is the nearest pool otherwise.

### Town Park

- Policy NS/14 Landscaping within Northstowe
- 7. Pursuant to Policy NS/19 (Recreation) the town park will need to bring forward a high quality landscape which will enhance the setting of the town centre.
- D7.24 although primarily a recreational resource, the town park will be a crucial element in the design and setting of the town centre. The town centre will be the focus of the highest densities of development and therefore this open space will be one of the most defining features of Northstowe and it will have an important amenity value for those living or working in or visiting the town centre.
- Policy NS/19 Public Open Space and Sports Provision
- 8. A town park will be developed adjoining the town centre. It will be connected to the adjoining green ways and residential areas by high quality footpaths and cycle links. It will include some appropriate outdoor sports provision, such as tennis courts and bowling greens, and appropriate ancillary facilities.
- D10.15 A formal town park will be provided in the town centre where the highest densities will be developed and which will be a focus for activity. This will be a town centre use, serving a wider function than meeting the needs of the residential development. Therefore a town park does not fit into the definition of types of open space required in Policy SF/11 of the Development Control Policies DPD.
- D10.16 The town park will ensure that those living in, working in and visiting these areas have easy access to high quality open space, and it will act as a peaceful / vibrant area close to the centre of activities. It will also offer the opportunity to provide an outdoor venue for entertainment such as concerts and fetes close to the heart of the town thus contributing to its community development. To fulfil this function it is important that it is one continuous space rather than a series of interlinking green areas around the town centre which would not provide the same focus, attraction and opportunities for community events as a single larger high quality park.

### Public Open Space Provision

- D10.2 A high standard of public open space provision will be required in Northstowe consistent with its role as a town of significant size. Policy SF/11 in the Development Control Policies DPD sets a minimum standard for outdoor play space and informal open space in the district. This standard will apply to Northstowe. The standard comprises:
  - Outdoor Sport – 1.6 ha. per 1,000 people;
  - Children's Play space – 0.8 ha. per 1,000 people;
  - Informal Open Space – 0.4 ha. per 1,000 people.

### Green Spaces

- The Phase 2 site is extraordinarily short of internal green areas. There are School and public playing fields to the North and Phase 2 is laying claim to Longstanton's Conservation Area fields to the South

but the rest is just housing.

- There seems to be inadequate car parking arrangements for Sports fields.
- There does not seem to be adequate informal recreational space.

#### The Town Park

- I can find no mention of a Town Park. Where is it to be located?
- See comments culled from the NAAP. The NAAP does not consider this to be an optional extra.
- Note also that the space required for this Park is not to come out of other land budgets.
- We are surprised that the new town doesn't plan for a swimming pool facility. There is a severe lack of swimming facilities in the area in general and it would be an excellent amenity for existing residents and new residents.
- Green Space: Rampton Drift contains a large amount of green space that is owned and managed by the Rampton Drift Residents Company. In practice, this means that residents pay a 3-figure bill every year to pay for these grounds to be maintained. Furthermore, the south-eastern corner of Rampton Drift contains a large children's playground, the maintenance of which is also paid for by Rampton Drift residents. This playground will be very close to Northstowe town centre. Given the general paucity of green space within phase 2, Rampton Drift has the appearance of a green oasis. As such, the green spaces, especially the playground, are likely to be heavily frequented by all residents of Northstowe. We would expect the maintenance of Rampton Drift green spaces to be taken over by Northstowe. HCA have expressed interest in doing this but as of yet, there are no assurances. This more than any other issue highlights the anomalous nature of Rampton Drift within the planning process.
- We feel it is important that a multi-function art centre (not simply using a town council hall) is incorporated into the town centre at the earliest possible date. This should be designed to be suitable for music, art, theatre, etc. but should not just be a generic hall. It needs proper consultation with local artists and representatives from exemplar venues across the UK. A strong cultural programme, including festivals, exhibitions and annual events, will be key to creating a sense of community.
- Recreation, sports pitches and open spaces
- We currently have green areas and a playground within Rampton Drift. The latter will be on the edge of the town centre. It seems certain that these facilities will start to be used by Northstowe residents, not only those residing at Rampton Drift who currently pay a maintenance charge for maintaining these areas on the estate. Because of this we feel that the forthcoming Northstowe Town Council should take over responsibility for these areas
- Green Space: Rampton Drift contains a large amount of green space that is owned and managed by the Rampton Drift Residents Company. In practice, this means that residents pay a 3-figure bill every year to pay for these grounds to be maintained. Furthermore, the south-eastern corner of Rampton

Drift contains a large children's playground, the maintenance of which is also paid for by Rampton Drift residents. This playground will be very close to Northstowe town centre. Given the general paucity of green space within phase 2, Rampton Drift has the appearance of a green oasis. As such, the green spaces, especially the playground, are likely to be heavily frequented by all residents of Northstowe. I expect the maintenance of Rampton Drift green spaces to be taken over by Northstowe. HCA have expressed interest in doing this but as of yet, there are no assurances. This more than any other issue highlights the anomalous nature of Rampton Drift within the planning process.

- There appears to be a general lack of green space within the plans for phase 2 and we would like to see this remedied. Green space across Northstowe will be important to the feel of the town, the sense of community and the well-being of its inhabitants. To simply squeeze lots of houses into too small a space will be detrimental in the long run. There is an opportunity here to create an exemplar community and a wonderful town that is a blue print for other new towns across the UK and the world.
- RD contains green spaces and play areas for two different age groups. At present these are owned and maintained by the residents company, however proposals should be made for these to be adopted. Given the seeming lack of green space, and particularly considering RDs proximity to the town centre, it would seem very likely that these will be used by Northstowe residents from more than just RD, and so should be maintained collectively as well. It would also seem appropriate for the last unadopted road to be adopted in the process.
- Swimming pool
- There has been mention in the past of the potential for a pool to be sited within Northstowe. This could be at the sports hub or, potentially, closer to the town centre. we would like to ensure that this stays on the agenda as we think it would benefit the town, and the surrounding areas, a great deal. As a pool with extended facilities, for example flumes, waves etc, it could be a real attraction for the town and, in particular, the town centre. See, for example, the olympia pools in Dundee as an example (<http://www.leisureandculturaldundee.com/olympia/pools>).
- Arts facilities

There is general comment in a few places on the provision of 'cultural' facilities such as museums (particularly relating to some of the historic buildings). We could not find, however, one place with a more coherent strategy for general cultural provision, although given the quantity of documents we may have missed it. A successful town needs a character and a sense of place. The history of the area, both the military uses of the site and, potentially, what is discovered in the archaeological investigations, can contribute to this. Also important are contemporary cultural activities, theatre, arts, music etc. The proposals for the town square sound promising, and we think a similarly multi-purpose indoor space (art, theatre, music, education, etc.) would also benefit the town.

- The town needs to gain a sense of character and needs something relatively unique in the area to pull people in from the surrounding areas, be that sport



or cultural facilities or something else entirely.

Play Areas.

- On the plans I could not see any play areas for the younger residents. The sports field were clearly marked but could not see general play areas with equipment for the very young. With 3500 houses I would hope these are spread regularly throughout the settlement so families do not have long journeys to reach outdoor space they can use.
- There seem to be very few play areas with play equipment on the plans. I feel that for a development of this size, especially where many of the houses will have small gardens, that more play areas are needed in order to give children somewhere fun and safe to play. What has happened to the proposed town park that was promised in the Northstowe Area Action Plan?

I find the inclusions of the Longstanton conservation area into the allocation of green space for Northstowe to be underhand. This distorts the figures and results in much less green space for the actual residential area of Northstowe where it is needed. The other green spaces are largely the water parks and school/sports fields. I would much rather see green space created to better define the perimeter of Rampton Drift and ensure this area is not encroached on too closely by the houses and roads as shown in the current plans. A park near the central Town Centre would be a nice feature too!

Furthermore the creation of cycle ways and footpaths over an important historical site is not acceptable, I would much rather see the conservation area enhanced with display boards explaining the history of the area and pathways kept to the perimeter to avoid crossing important land features. I question whether the public footpaths are even needed through that area.

I see that a church is proposed but no space for a burial area, there is no space in Longstanton for extra graves to cope with Northstowe and I am not sure that Phase1 was allocated with any new burial grounds either. There needs to be some space provided for this within Northstowe phase2 rather than in some remote area outside of the town for phase 3

I note that allowance for 1.5 cars per house is being made. This needs to be increased to at least 2.0. Experience of our area in Home Farm is that most houses have 2 or more cars. Northstowe will have more people driving into the area compared to Home Farm and adequate space for residents cars will be needed to prevent parking on the streets or pavements blocking access

- The outline application shows very high density everywhere except in Rampton Drift itself and the school playing fields. Where is the Town Park promised in the NAAP? It seems that the planning application is using RDs' green spaces to make its overall density and provision of green space more favourable. RD residents own, manage and maintain all of their green spaces as well as the playgrounds within the neighbourhood; at some point, it would seem the only viable option will be for Northstowe to take this lead under its control.
- Magdalene Close. The relationship between housing and open spaces could be strengthened considerably. The arrangement of houses lining the playing fields seems to contradict the principle of strong frontages identified in the DAS because the playing fields do not appear well overlooked.

- A number of opportunities exist to improve the illustrative scheme. Rather than houses backing onto the playing fields, it is recommended that a local access road forms the Eastern edge of the open space, with houses fronting this street and by extension, overlooking the playing fields.
- There is also an opportunity to extend the east-west blocks so that they front the playing fields. This could allow a north-south mews into the middle of the blocks. This arrangement could create a more varied streetscape without reducing permeability.
- The formal greenways to the North and South of the site are weakly fronted. A response would be to extend the blocks to allow houses to front onto these spaces.
- Brookfield Farm appears to include a few gaps in development along the eastern edge of the site. It is recommended that houses are arranged so that the street running along the eastern edge of the site is fronted by housing. As at Magdalene Close, the east-west green corridor which runs through the south side of the site is not adequately fronted/overlooked by residential buildings.
- It would be beneficial to modify the street and block layout so that more could be made of the east-west corridor as an important master plan feature, with buildings fronting directly onto the space, rather than presenting back garden fences to this route. The sketch on page 135 of the DAS shows how this edge should be achieved.
- AXA REIM welcomes the positive working relationship with the HCA regarding the delivery of the site and hope to resolve issues regarding design, phasing and joint working in the forthcoming months.
- How many of the people that have drawn up the town plan know the site they are dealing with. It looks to me more like they have cut-and-pasted from a computer design “book”. I feel that it has been “plonked down” without any real thought of how people will spend their leisure time or how they will “get out” to go to work and school.
- I was shocked to see how much less green space this development has compared with the Grosvenor one we saw when peter Duthie was involved. I wouldn't want to live in this development at all. Playing fields, water drainage areas (and preserved air raid shelters to maybe use as art installations!) around the Southern edge are no good for roaming by children. They need local greens, even if they are only the size of a tennis court, to walk out onto from their houses and socialise. If you look at the west London suburbs (where I grew up) the houses were built around allotments, bowling greens, pocket parks etc. and there was always somewhere to get some fresh air and see trees and birds. I suspect the gardens of the houses in Northstowe will be tiny. If there is going to have to be a 20 min walk to a green space then could this route at least be separated from the traffic by a wide verge or slight bank along the main bit of the route? I'm afraid I really can't see it being likely that there will be room to keep any horses in Northstowe and visiting the town on a horse wouldn't be my idea of fun.

**4 THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT - RESIDENTS COMMENTS**

- Support and enhance. Planting to include fruits
- Currently a wide range of birds and animals (hedgehogs, frogs, toads, newts etc.) very concerned road would destroy this
- The main concern for me is the trees that are adjacent to my property and are around the Rampton Drift estate, are these trees staying? I was at the Oakington consultation today and no-one could answer my question, the answer I got was, we are unsure about these trees but Rampton Drift will be treated sympathetically?? In my view these trees need to stay, they are part of 'Rampton Drift' and as a resident of the 'Drift' I do not want to be swallowed up by Northstowe.
- Back to the 'trees in phase 1 it was stated that all the trees would stay, I recently visited the phase 1 site... trees....where?
- Avoid (a) post modern business-park architecture and (b) flat roof glass and steel sheds for commerce
- Do use pitched roofs and even domes!
- We do need a lot more trees and hedges on such a flat landscape
- With Hilary Stroud on the case this should be alright
- The planting schedule provided is very vague, showing a hedgerow and 'some' trees to be planted. Please confirm exactly what is to be planted and its height and density bearing in mind that it will carry a lot of traffic. Will there be road lighting on both roads?
- As residents of Mills Lane we have two main concerns regarding Northstowe Phase 2. These are a) that the conservation areas are maintained and b) that Long Lane is closed to motorised traffic.
- We are pleased to see that the conservation plots in our surrounds will be respected. However, we are concerned that the rural nature of Long Lane may be compromised. We hope that it will remain as is (with the possible addition of a couple of loads of gravel added to the perpetually muddy spots). These spots are particularly muddy due to improper use by youths on quad bikes and we would like to see the lane closed to motorised traffic.
- We would like to see all established and healthy trees across the Northstowe site, specifically around Rampton Drift and on Rampton Road, maintained and replacement trees planted where old and unhealthy trees are removed.
- We have very few trees and hedges around Longstanton. There are some superb trees and hedges on the left as you cycle on the airfield road from Longstanton to Oakington. How will South Cambs ensure that the majority of these trees and hedges are not removed as part of the phase 2 and 3 construction work?

- The green separation, particularly between Longstanton (St Michael's end of the village) and Northstowe, is inadequate. I have been informed that in places is as little as 50 metres.
- The question of the boundary. There are various green areas which, at present are shown as being part of Phase 2. These areas are currently within the Longstanton Conservation Area and as such should NOT be included/and/or used by Northstowe. We were informed at the outset that the boundary between the two would be Long Lane. This would give adequate distance between the two.
- According to the plans, the Northstowe phase 2 site includes what is currently the 'St Michaels Fields' Longstanton Conservation Areas. I feel this is wholly inappropriate as this land is surrounded on three sides by land and houses that will remain part of Longstanton civil parish; indeed this land contains a public right of way connecting one part of Longstanton to another. I therefore feel strongly that this land should remain part of Longstanton and NOT become part of Northstowe. The fact that the boundary of Northstowe phase 2, which otherwise exactly follows the edge of the airfield site along this side, has been artificially altered to include the conservation areas feels very much like a 'land grab' by Northstowe to improve the amount of green space included in the proposal. Given its location and surroundings, this land should remain under the control of Longstanton parish council, not Northstowe.
- The St Michaels Conservation Area fields – I have strong views about the acquisition of one of the communities Conservation Area by a neighbouring town. The realities, however, are that nothing in law can prevent any body from acquiring these fields. I have made no secret of the fact that I believe that these fields and Long Lane should remain part of the greatly-reduced Parish of Longstanton, after the Northstowe-related boundary changes have taken place. This might seem confrontational but let us look at the broader picture. If Long Lane and these fields remain part of Longstanton Parish, that in no way prevents the fields from being publicly available. What matters for me is that we do not get non-residents driving to these fields and parking along Long Lane, Mill Lane or St Michaels Lane, or even along St Michaels.
- These are narrow roads in a Conservation Area with a charm that is entirely compatible with even a very small number of cars parked along them. You will see that this ties in with the absolute prohibition of Long Lane motorised to traffic.
- I don't think that ownership is the big issue here- well not for me but the retention of this area within Longstanton is. So it's a boundary rather than an ownership matter. That and preventing it being swamped by cars.
- It is reported that one of the main negative impacts in some of the Oakington are would be due to traffic noise on the Southern Access roads and that creation of these roads "would form prominent new features in the local landscape and a noticeable change to the character of the North-Western corner of the village." recommend that this noise and the negative visual impact could and should be reduced by suitable tree and hedgerow planting between the roadways and the nearby residential areas and the improvement could be enhanced further by suitable landscaping between the road and

these areas.

- Additional features are needed to make Northstowe an interesting, successful and attractive place to live and visit. For example, a lakeside restaurant, pedestrian bridges over water, fountains, a pedestrianized lane for boutique shops, a market stall area, a country park, a central green space, an adventure play park, a retail park, small boating/activity/nature lakes, a family attraction such as a farm park or activity /science centre
- Long Lane is currently an ancient bridleway and is unmetalled with mature trees and hedgerows. If this becomes accessible to vehicles or is laid with tarmac or other hard surface, or otherwise upgraded in any way it will lose its unique and unspoiled character. I therefore request that this bridleway be kept as it is.
- I note that that the proposals proclaim "Protection of amenity of Rampton Drift by enhanced landscaping & early planting, etc". However I was horrified to see that a proposed road is shown directly at the rear of Nos49-56 Rampton Drift with no apparent landscaping or separation of any kind from the new development. Far from protecting the amenity of Rampton Drift the building of a new road so close to existing houses would be extremely detrimental. We care about our environment as much as everyone else so why are the houses at the rear of Rampton Drift being treated differently to those elsewhere on the development? I am deeply concerned that a potentially busy road with all the accompanying noise, pollution and potential safety issues could be constructed immediately outside our rear gardens and even more worryingly adjacent to a children's play area. If there is no separation between the playground and the proposed development children could easily run out into the road .
- Could you please clarify whether the existing perimeter fence is to be retained and also the belt of large mature trees on the airfield side of the fence. I would point out that the trees and the extensive area of brambles growing along the fence are an important habitat for a large variety of birds and other wildlife. Many of the bird species are in decline nationally making every area of habitat very important, no matter how small.
- The ARUP reports continually show that the Northstowe Site boundary includes the area of Longstanton Conservation Area. This is wrong. Northstowe site does NOT include Longstanton Conservation Area. The Government Inspectors' Report in Clauses 4.13 to 4.32 seems to make that clear, and the report itself seems to be being ignored, but it has to be acknowledged that Drawings 230781 - 21 do seem to indicate that the Conservation area is to be retained as Green Separation .
- The first relates to St Michael's fields: From the outset of the Northstowe planning process, Longstanton was assured by South Cambs planners that the intention was to ensure preservation of our village's character and separation. Subsequently, when areas, including St Michael's fields, were designated conservation areas that commitment appeared to provide assurance that our village would maintain effective separation. The current Phase 2 outline clearly regards these conservation areas as part of Northstowe and proposes to incorporate them as recreational areas and, thereby, remove all separation between the two communities and hence the character of Longstanton. This is not acceptable, nor subject to compromise after the assurances given to this village by the planners; the boundary

between Longstanton and Northstowe should be Long Lane, and St Michael's fields are important to the village character part of our Conservation Areas and must remain part of Longstanton after any boundary change.

#### Conservation Area fields and Long Lane

- C2 (Mitigating the impact of Northstowe on existing communities)
- Policy NS/4 para 2. Conservation Area, Longstanton St Michael's:
- Public access to countryside west of Long Lane will be controlled to protect the Conservation Area. The open aspect of the fields affording views of All Saints Church will be maintained. Elsewhere the landscape character of a series of hedged paddocks, small copses and tree belts will be maintained and enhanced.
- C2.4 The Conservation Area at St Michael's includes fields and paddocks adjoining the village, and bounded by the tree lined bridleway of Long Lane which lies further than 200m from the village framework. Historically this is an important area and includes fields which still demonstrate remnants of the early ridge and furrow field system. Long Lane is a long established right of way and its sylvan character is a key part of the setting of Longstanton.
- POLICY NS/20 Countryside Recreation..... Public access within the Conservation Area will need to be carefully managed.

#### Long Lane and the Longstanton Conservation Areas

- Long Lane forms a natural boundary between the Phase 2 site and the Longstanton Conservation Area to which it belongs. The NAAP has much to say about Long Lane and it is essential that this part of our Conservation Area is properly handled within the Phase 2 development. Unless all motorised transport is barred then we will inevitably have this lane being used by 4x4s as a dirt track (as has happened on the final section of Rampton Road down to the intersection with the CGB). It should only be used by pedestrians, bicycles and horse riders and it should be left alone to the greatest extent possible – e.g. no tarmac!
- Closing Rampton Road to traffic will prevent Long Lane being directly accessed by such traffic from Northstowe. However, it will also be essential to prevent such access from Mills Lane / St Michael's Lane in Longstanton. The NAAP requires the whole of this Conservation Area to be respected and that requires, among other things, the prevention of Northstowe vehicles driving down the sleepy roads of Mills Lane, St Michael's and St Michael's Lane, and parking there.
- If the HCA wishes to purchase the St Michael's fields, there is nothing in law to prevent them. However, these fields are part of the Longstanton Conservation Area because they are a vital part of the character of Longstanton and have no place as part of Northstowe. The community of Longstanton requires a total commitment from the HCA to preserve our village's Conservation Areas. That doesn't just mean promising not to build on them (as I have had reported back!)

#### Longstanton Conservation Area

- At present this area has been included in the phase 2 proposals as part of the green space. This seems completely unreasonable. First, geographically it is clearly part of Longstanton rather than Northstowe – it is enclosed on three sides by parts of Longstanton and ~80% of the area is closer to a part of Longstanton than to a part of Northstowe. Secondly it is too far away from much of Northstowe, again its proximity is clearly to Longstanton, to be practical as a town green space. Thirdly it is the Longstanton, not Northstowe, conservation area, I believe with the present boundaries adopted as SCDC Policy on 8 September 2005.
- Policy NS/14 Landscaping within Northstowe
- 5. Sensitive integration of Rampton Drift into Northstowe will be achieved through a variety of appropriate landscape treatments which will include additional planting to supplement the existing nearby mature trees.
- D7.22 Rampton Drift is an area that will effectively lie within Northstowe and will therefore be surrounded by urban uses. It will need a specific treatment which allows it to be sensitively integrated into the town whilst ensuring that an adequate buffer is provided in order to maintain its residential amenity.
- POLICY NS/25 Strategic Landscaping
- Early Delivery of Landscaping:
  - 2. In those areas of green separation for both Oakington and Longstanton, where mitigation is necessary early in the development, and also at the agreed boundary treatment for Rampton Drift, planting will take place in the first planting season after the grant of outline planning permission for Northstowe.
  - Finally tree planting needs to begin ASAP so that Rampton Drift residents have a natural screen from the building site that they will overlook for many years.
  - There are several elements to the heritage of Northstowe: the mitigation (fieldwork) required in advance of development, public engagement with archaeological fieldwork, the presence of designated and non-designated historic assets in and around the development area that will become part of the new town, and the presence of several existing heritage groups and interests in the area.
  - To begin, the mitigation of each phase of Northstowe will continue to be defined by the Historic Environment Team in discussion with each developer and their agents (D9/a of the NAAP). The delivery of these phases of work is a stipulation of the NPPF, and is to a great extent independent of other heritage activities at or around Northstowe. Nevertheless, the outcomes of these fieldwork phases will provide a great deal of information about the landscape that should be made available to new residents, existing populations and researchers alike (also in line with the NPPF) and D9/d of the NAAP.
  - The area in and around Northstowe is itself an asset that presents a great opportunity to enrich the new town, and make it more than another housing development. The historic station of RAF Oakington has stories and

connections to tell, and it is fantastic that the HCA are looking to keep three non-designated structures alongside the listed pill boxes; finding a sustainable future for all of these is important (D9/c of the NAAP). These are the Guardroom, the Officers' Mess and the Admin Block. Outside the airfield, there are the village cores and the area of Longstanton Paddocks.

- There is already a significant and active heritage presence around Northstowe in the surrounding villages. This includes the Longstanton & District Heritage Society, the Oakington & Westwick History Society, and the Churches Conservation Trust at St Michaels Longstanton, plus there is a new network of aviation museums and interests across Cambridgeshire being created.
- Therefore the heritage 'offer' at Northstowe has to achieve the following:
  - Tell the story of RAF Oakington
  - Provide a forum for the findings of the development – led archaeological work
  - Find a use for the designated and non-designated historic assets
  - Protect the integrity of the surrounding designated assets (D9/b of the NAAP)
  - Engage with new residents and existing populations
  - Provide a "sense of place" for Northstowe
- This is a broad vision for Northstowe's heritage, and would benefit from a proactive programme of delivery consistent across current and future phases. We would suggest the establishment of a 'heritage vision and master plan' for the new town that can be supported by all parties. This would contain objectives for the heritage assets in and around the development area, proposals for exhibition spaces and the roles of the various local societies. This master plan would be 'owned' by a heritage panel that in turn could give way to a Heritage Trust that ultimately could fundraise, manage and advise the new town.
- This approach has several advantages:
  - It provides for a joined up approach by all parties with a unified goal and direction for the conservation of heritage assets
  - Each member is part of the whole yet keeps their own identity
  - It allows heritage to be embedded in the new development at the outset
  - It gives a local voice to conservation matters
  - Heritage is a good news story: this provides a PR platform
  - Ultimately it offers a basis for a Heritage Trust to look after its own interests and find raise accordingly.
  - It can also provide better return for core funding.
  - It allows the town to document its own originals: how many places can say that?

The county council's S106 requests for heritage and archaeology can be viewed in line with this and also in line with the HCA proposal to use the Guardhouse jointly as a community facility and heritage centre. There are five elements:

1) Long term storage of archive: we envisage that the main 'bulk' archive will be lodged with the county council, for which appropriate costs will be payable; however



this archive would also form the basis for displays in the Guardhouse, although the storage requirements are better met elsewhere. This storage cost can be included in the developer funded archaeology costs.

2) Public Archaeology: the cost of providing display materials, exhibits and presentation/interpretation ASSUMING a suitable venue is available and suitably equipped.

3) Display areas: the cost of providing the venue for (2) above. This is an unknown at present.

4) Management of pillboxes: as designated heritage assets these will need to be looked after. A best estimate is £1k per year per site for regular work but not any one-off works on the concrete.

5) Longstanton Paddocks is a non-designated heritage asset that lies between the old and new settlements. It too needs to be managed, and an estimate of £5k per annum is made for this, plus one off costs of any fencing or access repairs required.

These sites and objectives will require someone on the grounds to deliver, oversee and guide the outcomes, plus to liaise with other stakeholders and views. Obviously there are also the other structures on site to consider.

For these and all the reasons above, I would suggest we propose the creation of a heritage panel with membership from local communities and societies, local authorities and developers. We can then drive the heritage of the area forwards as an integral part of the development.

- We object to the planning application in principle on the grounds that it will lead to further loss and damage to the countryside and long term harm to the environment and human health.
- In any event, housing of this nature will mainly be occupied by foreigners, so why should England's countryside pay such a high price for this invasion? The road systems needed to support such a town obviously harms the countryside and will lead to further noise and pollution (not to mention the vast destruction of the countryside when the A14 upgrade occurs!)
- Loss of countryside and habitat leads to a reduced wildlife population and human overcrowding
- Cambridge City is now manic when it used to be a lovely university town. I am sure that you are 'over egging the pudding' such that it will no longer be such an attractive place to work in, live or study!
- Currently it seems as if Cambridge is ring fenced by earth-movers and bulldozers. I think it's about time that Planners thought more about preserving the environment and not chasing dubious growth statistics. I believe that there is degree of planning irresponsibility in that the overall infrastructure will not cope with the increased population explosion caused by the massive house building programme now taking place.
- We therefore object to 'further development' for the reasons stated above.

**5 PLANS TO MAKE THE DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY - RESIDENT COMMENTS**

- Ensuring all buildings are designed to meet high energy and water efficient standards over and above current building regulations
- An advice and support service is put in place at the start of the development to help everyone understand the wider sustainability agenda
- Community energy schemes are missing from plans, why?
- Has to be priority design requirement connected with a less car dominant transport plan/system
- You need to ensure your plans achieve reality
- If South Cambs Council want something near to an eco town, each house should be built with fixings for either a PV or solar water heater. The panel, the expensive bit, should be left for the purchased to fit according to their life style – bathing morning or evening.
- Please ensure the houses are insulated to the highest standards.
- In terms of environmental-friendliness, again there needs to be great clarity over the specifics of long-term management of green spaces and green separation, as well as trees and hedgerows. Adequate funding for this in the long term should be a statutory requirement rather than depending on the generosity of volunteers and/or charitable bodies such as wildlife groups. (I am still unclear as to the exact siting of the flood mitigation ponds towards the A14: part of phase 1)!
- But the greatest "friendliness to the environment" has to be through design and maintenance of energy-efficient homes and active planning for car-free transport systems.
- I believe that each building (not just residential homes) should have a full array of photovoltaic panels and exemplar passivhaus energy insulation standards, as well as an integrated greywater collection/use system.
- I would place even more emphasis than there is in supporting car-free travel in the new community. I would indeed actively discourage car ownership among the new residents and all employees working in Northstowe. There needs to be a mandatory - and enforceable - speed restriction of 15mph throughout the town, and a reduction on speed limits on all new approach roads to it.
- Only through such a radical approach is Northstowe going to serve not only its future residents (generation by generation) but also the surrounding villages upon which it is about to have such a huge impact.
- We think that it is important that Northstowe has exceptionally high environmental standards far surpassing minimum standards.
- We would be happy to see wind turbines as part of the Northstowe community but it needs to be made clear where these will be located. There should be

acceptable distance from the nearest homes; ideally they would exist on the outskirts of the town within green space or near to industrial areas.

- There was a scheme to retrofit houses in Rampton Drift to bring them up to the environmental standards of other homes within Northstowe. We are not sure what happened to this plan but we would like to see a commitment that this will happen and all homes within Rampton Drift will benefit from this.

**6 THE LAYOUT OF WHAT'S GOING WHERE - RESIDENTS COMMENTS**

- In principle support. At detail we should see small retail units spread across development. Recreate the corner shop offering real local services local independent retailers
- Unexceptional
- Local corner shops to be allocated across the phase to encourage local economy, local shopping and less car use.
- I believe they the amenity of Rampton Drift would be better protected by new housing backing on to us or by extending the school fields to the back
- How close to the houses in Rampton Drift, in particular mine no.83 and no.86 are the new houses going to be? No one seems to know! We need a buffer . The trees need to stay.
- Additional features are needed to make Northstowe an interesting, successful and attractive place to live and visit. For example, a lakeside restaurant, pedestrian bridges over water, fountains, a pedestrianized lane for boutique shops, a market stall area, a country park, a central green space, an adventure play park, a retail park, small boating/activity/nature lakes, a family attraction such as a farm park or activity /science centre.
- Phase 2 seems to include the fields either side of the Toad Acres park home site in Mills Lane. This is part of Longstanton parish and the St Michaels conservation area and should remain so. I am deeply concerned that if this land becomes part of Northstowe it will be at risk of development or at least turning into public amenity land that loses the rural and unspoilt nature of the fields, I therefore object to the proposal to make this part of Northstowe.
- Long Lane is currently an ancient bridleway and is unmetalled with mature trees and hedgerows. If this becomes accessible to vehicles or is laid with tarmac or other hard surface, or otherwise upgraded in any way it will lose its unique and unspoiled character. I therefore request that this bridleway be kept as it is
- I am concerned that housing on the proposed new development is too densely built and there are insufficient green spaces within the development itself (as opposed to just on the edge). I am also concerned that not enough allowance is made for vehicle parking within the new development.
- What safeguards will be in place to ensure that the area on the Longstanton side of Long Lane, in particular Mills Lane and St Michaels does not become overflow car parking for Northstowe residents while still allowing visitors to houses in Mills lane and St Michaels to park freely.
- Rampton Drift will be transformed from being surrounded by fields and countryside to being hemmed in by the town centre, a school, a main road and houses. We feel that this will have a detrimental rather than positive impact on the residents. We would like to see the plans revised as per our other points to prevent this from happening.
- Magdalene Close. The relationship between housing and open spaces could

be strengthened considerably. The arrangement of houses lining the playing fields seems to contradict the principle of strong frontages identified in the DAS because the playing fields do not appear well overlooked.

- A number of opportunities exist to improve the illustrative scheme. Rather than houses backing onto the playing fields, it is recommended that a local access road forms the Eastern edge of the open space, with houses fronting this street and by extension, overlooking the playing fields.
- There is also an opportunity to extend the east-west blocks so that they front the playing fields. This could allow a north-south mews into the middle of the blocks. This arrangement could create a more varied streetscape without reducing permeability.
- The formal greenways to the North and South of the site are weakly fronted. A response would be to extend the blocks to allow houses to front onto these spaces.
- Brookfield Farm appears to include a few gaps in development along the eastern edge of the site. It is recommended that houses are arranged so that the street running along the eastern edge of the site is fronted by housing. As at Magdalene Close, the east-west green corridor which runs through the south side of the site is not adequately fronted/overlooked by residential buildings.
- It would be beneficial to modify the street and block layout so that more could be made of the east-west corridor as an important masterplan feature, with buildings fronting directly onto the space, rather than presenting back garden fences to this route. The sketch on page 135 of the DAS shows how this edge should be achieved.
- The main concern for me is the trees that are adjacent to my property and are around the Rampton Drift estate.. are these trees staying? I was at the Oakington consultation today and no-one could answer my question, the answer I got was, we are unsure about these trees but Rampton Drift will be treated sympathetically?? In my view these trees need to stay, they are part of 'Rampton Drift' and as a resident of the 'Drift' I do not want to be swallowed up by Northstowe. There must be a divide our houses are completely different to the houses proposed for Northstowe 2,3,4 and 5 storeys high! Really!
- It also worried me that at the Longstanton consultation last week.... no one had been to Rampton Drift? And on the Northstowe planning application phase 2 leaflet given out Rampton Drift houses had no gardens on the plan, how can that be? All answers I received from the consultations have been completely conflicting .. no one knows what to say especially I have found to a Rampton Drift resident. If no answers are known why have consultations?
- Back to the 'trees in phase 1 it was stated that all the trees would stay, I recently visited the phase 1 site... trees....where? Another question –
- How close to the houses in Rampton Drift, in particular mine no.83 and no.86 are the new houses going to be? No one seems to know! We need a buffer .. the trees need to stay.

- I was told I could air my views online.. easier said than done, HOW?? Are you making people unable to leave feedback for a reason, because unless you have the planning application numbers and dates you have no way of leaving feedback! And finally the A14// when is this upgrade going to be completed, mixed answers again today, not convinced by the professionals at the consultations! Not happy constantly 'fobbed off' as if we don't matter!! (we are living here now)
- AXA REIM welcomes the positive working relationship with the HCA regarding the delivery of the site and hopes to resolve issues regarding design, phasing and joint working in the forthcoming months.
- I am writing with reference to the above document and wish to register my concerns as the development may have a long term adverse impact on my family/livelihood.
- I would like to make the point that on Northstowe Phase 2 planning document houses are shown on my land. This is misleading as I have not sold my business/land/home or asked for it to be promoted.
- Regarding my boundaries and point of access to my business/home. On the attached Appendix A if the map is shown as accurate in its relationship to my property, then it clearly shows the proposed road will join Phase 1 to 2 as taking out my west side boundary hedge. This is clearly not acceptable and as the hedging needs to remain, a Root Protection Zone will need to be adhered to.
- With regard to the road to the south of my property the Design and Access Statement shows the closing of Rampton Road in sub phase C 2019 onwards. This closure will deny me access to my business/home from Rampton Road and therefore will need to be amended
- There is a ditch within my eastern boundary which in addition to drainage of my land takes the run off from Rampton Road. The hedge on the outside of the ditch does not belong to my property and will be part of the Sub Phase B mid 2-17 development (Appendix B) Ideally the hedging will remain for screening and security purposes or an appropriate alternative provided.
- There was no map I could see that fitted the development into the wider landscape, perhaps it was one of the other extra documents but you can't tell what is in them from the names. I remember what we were shown at the LAF meeting and I wasn't convinced that a lot of time/though has recently gone into ensuring that the occupants will be able to easily get out into the wider region. Is this in fact being discouraged in order to "preserve" the quiet of the existing villages? How many of the people that have drawn up the town plan know the site they are dealing with. It looks to me more like they have cut-and-pasted from a computer design "book". I feel that it has been "plonked down" without any real thought of how people will spend their leisure time or how they will "get out" to go to work and school. Regarding the latter I expect many of the secondary school pupils will be placed at schools outside the settlement (I suspect the town's secondary school won't be built and functioning in time for the first phase occupants anyway).

**7 THE SEPARATION BETWEEN NORTHSTOWE AND THE EXISTING COMMUNITIES OF LONGSTANTON, OAKINGTON AND RAMPTON DRIFT - RESIDENT COMMENTS**

- That a 'locals only' connection site is set up between Oakington and Northstowe
- Local connection system such as raised barriers
- Seems adequate
- The houses proposed near where marked on the map seem very close to Rampton Drift, we were given to understand there would be greater separation.
- Rampton Drift (RD) itself. The problem I have is the disparity between the highly reassuring statements that pepper the NAAP and which occur in the Phase 2 documentation and the potentially reality on the ground. The literature talks about enhancing the RD setting, whereas elsewhere it says RD will be surrounded by buildings of "up to 3" storeys. The plans you have published – as you mentioned at the recent joint parish meeting – do not do justice to the actual proposals you have in mind. That's all very well but I think that what is needed is to have rather more reassurance in black and white. There are other RD-related issues surrounding the regularisation of their status with N/S (getting their grass-cutting and play area maintenance managed by N/S town rather than by their own management company, adoption of their roads (re-) introduction of street lighting etc.) which I also believe should simply be done as part of the process of integrating RD into N/S. The sums of money involved are tiny but it would help remove any "them and us" issues
- The important thing is not to rely on the opinion of only one RD resident. Andy Batey, I know, takes the line that "everything is fine" but several others are not so sanguine. This doesn't mean that they are very annoyed but it does mean that there are aspects of the current proposals which need resolving. My own view is that you don't want to start off with an enclave of discontent within Phase 2
- The St Michaels Conservation Area fields – I have strong views about the acquisition of one of the communities Conservation Area by a neighbouring town. The realities, however, are that nothing in law can prevent any body from acquiring these fields. I have made no secret of the fact that I believe that these fields and Long Lane should remain part of the greatly-reduced Parish of Longstanton, after the Northstowe-related boundary changes have taken place. This might seem confrontational but let us look at the broader picture. If Long Lane and these fields remain part of Longstanton Parish, that in no way prevents the fields from being publicly available. What matters for me is that we do not get non-residents driving to these fields and parking along Long Lane, Mill Lane or St Michaels Lane, or even along St Michaels.
- These are narrow roads in a Conservation Area with a charm that is entirely compatible with even a very small number of cars parked along them. You will see that this ties in with the absolute prohibition of Long Lane motorised

to traffic.

- I don't think that ownership is the big issue here- well not for me but the retention of this area within Longstanton is. So it's a boundary rather than an ownership matter. That and preventing it being swamped by cars.
- The question of the boundary. There are various green areas which, at present are shown as being part of Phase 2. These areas are currently within the Longstanton Conservation Area and as such should NOT be included/and/or used by Northstowe. We were informed at the outset that the boundary between the two would be Long Lane. This would give adequate distance between the two.
- Phase 2 seems to include the fields either side of the Toad Acres park home site in Mills Lane. This is part of Longstanton parish and the St Michaels conservation area and should remain so. I am deeply concerned that if this land becomes part of Northstowe it will be at risk of development or at least turning into public amenity land that loses the rural and unspoilt nature of the fields, I therefore object to the proposal to make this part of Northstowe.
- Long Lane is currently an ancient bridleway and is unmetalled with mature trees and hedgerows. If this becomes accessible to vehicles or is laid with tarmac or other hard surface, or otherwise upgraded in any way it will lose its unique and unspoiled character. I therefore request that this bridleway be kept as it is.
- From the documents, it is unclear to me what steps have been taken to ensure community development and cohesion, so that new arrivals integrate effectively into a growing community.
- The ARUP reports continually show that the Northstowe Site boundary includes the area of Longstanton Conservation Area. This is wrong. Northstowe site does NOT include Longstanton Conservation Area. The Government Inspectors' Report in Clauses 4.13 to 4.32 seems to make that clear, and the report itself seems to be being ignored, but it has to be acknowledged that Drawings 230781 - 21 do seem to indicate that the Conservation area is to be retained as Green Separation .
- The first relates to St Michael's fields: From the outset of the Northstowe planning process, Longstanton was assured by South Cambs planners that the intention was to ensure preservation of our village's character and separation. Subsequently, when areas, including St Michael's fields, were designated conservation areas that commitment appeared to provide assurance that our village would maintain effective separation. The current Phase 2 outline clearly regards these conservation areas as part of Northstowe and proposes to incorporate them as recreational areas and, thereby, remove all separation between the two communities and hence the character of Longstanton. This is not acceptable, nor subject to compromise after the assurances given to this village by the planners; the boundary between Longstanton and Northstowe should be Long Lane, and St Michael's fields are important to the village character part of our Conservation Areas and must remain part of Longstanton after any boundary change.



### Rampton Drift

- There are many references to Rampton Drift in this document but I see little sign of the requirements being met by the current Phase 2 application.
- Policy NS/2 3.f: “The town of Northstowe will be developed to integrate Rampton Drift sensitively into the new town to preserve residential amenity.”
- Policy NS/14 Landscaping within Northstowe
- 5. Sensitive integration of Rampton Drift into Northstowe will be achieved through a variety of appropriate landscape treatments which will include additional planting to supplement the existing nearby mature trees.
- D7.22 Rampton Drift is an area that will effectively lie within Northstowe and will therefore be surrounded by urban uses. It will need a specific treatment which allows it to be sensitively integrated into the town whilst ensuring that an adequate buffer is provided in order to maintain its residential amenity.

### Green Separation

- C2 (Mitigating the impact of Northstowe on existing communities).
- Policy NS/4 para 1. “...Where the public has access to land adjoining Longstanton and Oakington, mitigating measures to protect the privacy and amenity of potentially affected properties will be provided.”
- POLICY NS/25 Strategic Landscaping
- Early Delivery of Landscaping:

### Green Separation:

- 2. In those areas of green separation for both Oakington and Longstanton, where mitigation is necessary early in the development, and also at the agreed boundary treatment for Rampton Drift, planting will take place in the first planting season after the grant of outline planning permission for Northstowe
- 

### Rampton Drift itself

- There is a disparity between the highly reassuring statements that pepper the Phase 2 documentation and the NAAP (see my other representation), and the potential reality on the ground. The Application talks about enhancing the RD setting, whereas elsewhere it says RD will be surrounded by buildings of “up to 3” storeys. How are these two statements to be reconciled? I have yet to see detailed proposals for the boundary treatment around RD.
- There are other RD-related issues surrounding the regularisation of their status with Northstowe (getting their grass-cutting and play area maintenance managed by Northstowe Town rather than by their own management company, adoption of their roads, (re-)introduction of street lighting etc.) which I also believe should simply be done as part of the process of integrating RD into Northstowe.
- My own suggestion is that there should be a special meeting of the Northstowe Committee to discuss Rampton Drift issues, but opinion within Rampton Drift seems to be divided on this subject.

- The area of Rampton Drift does not form part of this planning application as it is outside the red-lined area of phase 2. This leaves Rampton Drift in a very difficult position as it would appear that there is no part of the planning process that enables us to achieve our goals for Rampton Drift as part of Northstowe Phase 2. Instead we are left to privately negotiate with the developers and are at the mercy of their goodwill. As Rampton Drift is to be part of Northstowe, there is something fundamentally unsatisfactory about this situation. If HCA can lay claim to the Longstanton conservation area for phase 2, what is the rationale for leaving out Rampton Drift? If Rampton Drift is genuinely considered to be part of Northstowe, we feel it is appropriate that there is a formal mechanism as part of the planning process that reflects this fact and that enables assurances to be put in place regarding Rampton Drift itself. At the moment, we are considered part of Phase 2, in the sense we will be living in it but not in the sense that we can be considered as part of the planning application. The planning authorities need to resolve whether we are part of Northstowe or not.:
- We attended the exhibition at Longstanton Village Hall on Saturday 1 November and were hoping to find out the exact measurements with regards to how much separation space there would be around Rampton Drift. We spoke to a member of the HCA team about this and were very surprised that, not only did they not know the answer, but that it wasn't expected that this might be something that Rampton Drift residents would want to know. We were informed that the information would be sent to us but it has not been forthcoming.
- It is therefore hard to comment but from the plans we have seen there does not appear to be adequate green space and separation around Rampton Drift. The estate will be suffering a very drastic shift from a rural location to a suburban settlement, the least that could be done to minimise the impact is provide sufficient separation around the estate. There are plans for other parks, green spaces, protected conservation areas, etc. across Northstowe; why can't there be something similar at least on one side of the estate rather than being surrounded by houses on all four sides, as well as a school and town centre? Initially there was mention of orchards within Northstowe, one of these on one side of the estate would be much more appropriate and would alleviate some of the negative impacts felt by residents.
- There appears to be a general lack of green space within the plans for phase 2 and we would like to see this remedied. Green space across Northstowe will be important to the feel of the town, the sense of community and the well-being of its inhabitants. To simply squeeze lots of houses into too small a space will be detrimental in the long run. There is an opportunity here to create an exemplar community and a wonderful town that is a blue print for other new towns across the UK and the world.

#### Rampton Drift

- I feel that more needs to be done to aid the transition of Rampton Drift into Northstowe. The developers need to think more about how they are going to work with the park and green spaces that are currently owned by the Residents Company. The Rampton Drift park is going to sadly be located very close to the Northstowe town centre. This will make it popular with local families as somewhere to stop while they are in town. It seems very unfair

that the residents of Rampton Drift should have to pay for the maintenance and upkeep of this area when it is being used by the general public. Therefore the communal areas and roads of Rampton Drift should be adopted by Northstowe.

- As Rampton Drift is to be a part of Northstowe, the homes there should be able to access the same resources as the new residents of Northstowe. Therefore fibre optic broadband and elements that will make their homes more "eco-friendly" should be provided for all Rampton Drift homes.
- The Northstowe area action plan states that: "The town of Northstowe will be developed to integrate Rampton Drift sensitively into the new town to preserve residential amenity."

**8 NEW ROADS, FOOTPATHS, CYCLEWAYS & BUS LINKS INCLUDING THE GUIDED BUSWAY - RESIDENT COMMENTS**

- That a comprehensive public transport system with a significant increase in guided buses and new connection service to the other local villages such as Histon/Cottenham/Bar Hill
- Cycle ways to be priority, together with a range of better public transport connections with Northstowe and connections to other local centres
- Access to the Busway cycle path along the Rampton Road bridle way is currently via a very dangerous crossing. Almost exceptionally along the length of the busway, pedestrians and cyclists are expected to lift their goods and bicycles over the concrete sleepers as they have not been cut through. Given the increased number of people accessing the busway as houses are built in Northstowe, it is essential that residents are given safer access to the busway.
- I agree with the busway going through Northstowe, as a user of the busway I know it is overcrowded during peak hours and many times buses do not stop at Longstanton P & R because they are full. Extra buses going through Northstowe will need stopping locations with full provision of cycle shelters. I anticipate that Longstanton residents will use these stops in preference to the Park & Ride which would be further away. The bus stops therefore need to have good access to the cycleways coming from Longstanton and Rampton Drift.
- I note the sharing of cars and buses on sections of the busway, of course this will mean the buses are not on a guided busway through parts of Northstowe. There could be potential confusion for drivers who are aware of where the busway becomes buses only and may take a wrong turn. This needs careful design and clear signing.
- I have noted that the cross section of the planned roads change as they move through the Town Centre, the sharing of cars, car parking, buses, cycles and pedestrians create many safety issues. It is not clear how the swales and other separations all join up and I see many crossing points in the network and wonder how the safety of these crossings will be implemented. A key concern will be where cycle lanes have to cross the existing guided busway to join up with the main cycle path running alongside. The current crossing point on the bridleway from Rampton Drift towards Rampton is not flat because the bus has to have the guide curbs in place. Lack of a flat crossing is a real safety issue and buses at 56mph would not be able to stop if a bike got stuck or was slow to cross.
- Why is a potentially very busy road being proposed at the back of Rampton Drift? There appears to be very little separation between this road and our gardens. The proposed road is adjacent to the park/childrens playground. Noise and pollution from traffic would be far from environmentally friendly or protecting the amenity of Rampton Drift.
- Due to the closure of Rampton Road we will be forced to take a new route out. I don't have a problem with this but why is a new busy road proposed at the rear of Rampton Drift

- Main concerns are the volume of traffic trying to get onto the B1050 @ 2 no. T junctions – see phase 1 plans
- I'm a keen walker and do not want to find enjoyable soft surfaced footpaths/bridleways/byways turned into hard tarmacked 'multi use' cycle ways. They are tiring and unpleasant to walk on.
- I will check carefully that footpaths and cycle ways are more than theoretical
- Furthermore the creation of cycle ways and footpaths over an important historical site is not acceptable, I would much rather see the conservation area enhanced with display boards explaining the history of the area and pathways kept to the perimeter to avoid crossing important land features. I question whether the public footpaths are even needed through that area.
- It is imperative that the roundabout connecting the new access road with the B1050 and the A14 does not become a bottleneck
- Regarding Longstanton Road Oakington to Longstanton. If this road is closed to traffic, the residents of Oakington & Longstanton will still need to have access to walk, cycle, wheelchair, buggy, to visit our relatives & friends in either village as we do now & have always done so.
- To avoid traffic rat running it is essential that the road from Longstanton to Oakington (known locally as the airfield road) is closed to vehicular traffic as soon as possible after the start of construction of the new local access road west.
- It would be an excellent amenity if, when the road from Longstanton to Oakington is closed to vehicular traffic, there will still be access for walkers, cyclists, horses etc. from Longstanton to Oakington and back.
- Arrangements need to be in place to ensure that at no time is there traffic (construction and new residents) rat running from Longstanton to Northstowe and back via Rampton Drift.
- I welcome the fact that what is commonly termed 'the airfield road' (running between Longstanton and Oakington) will be closed to the public. I could not find details about how this closure would be enforced, so I would urge that a physical barrier is provided (for example, rising bollards similar to those in central Cambridge). Currently this road is officially closed (except for access) but it is used by a huge number of vehicles each day; for safety reasons this cannot be allowed to increase when Northstowe phase 2 homes are occupied. Physically closing the road to the public will improve road safety in the area and must be done before occupation of any Phase 2 properties.
- Regarding the Southern Access Road (West), I feel that this must be complete (at least in its single carriageway intermediate form) before any Phase 2 homes are occupied. The existing B1050 road is already at capacity and at peak times is over capacity; the addition of Northstowe Phase 1 traffic will make the situation worse. Phase 2 traffic must not be allowed to use this road, and Phase 1 traffic should be re-routed to the new Southern Access Road (West) as soon as possible.

- The key factor from my perspective (and the perspective of others in Rampton who would be likely to commute to Northstowe for work, leisure or education) which I feel needs to be taken into consideration and need amending in the current proposal is the current designation as a Leisure Route of the By-way/bridle way known as Reynolds Drove which connects Cuckoo Lane, Rampton with the guided busway and Rampton Road, Rampton Drift. This short stretch of gravel/mud track is currently far more than a simple leisure route. It is currently s key commuting route for Rampton residents and is woefully inadequate for this task. As the weather and nights draw in, I am no longer able to travel sustainably (i.e. via bicycle) to and from the busway or drop my toddler off at nursery in Westwick. The ground is too unstable/slippy and the complete lack of lighting (be it street light or some form of cats eye) make it very difficult to navigate with a bike with a child in tow. This is such a shame as the busway is a great asset for this area, especially for a village such as Rampton which has only one bus per day, weekdays, into Cambridge.
- Closing Rampton Road to traffic will prevent Long Lane being directly accessed by such traffic from Northstowe. However, it will also be essential to prevent such access from Mills Lane / St Michael's Lane in Longstanton The NAAP requires the whole of this Conservation Area to be respected and that requires, among other things, the prevention of Northstowe vehicles driving down the sleepy roads of Mills Lane, St Michael's and St Michael's Lane, and parking there.
- Long Lane forms a natural boundary between the Phase 2 site and the Longstanton Conservation Area to which it belongs. The NAAP has much to say about Long Lane and it is essential that this part of our Conservation Area is properly handled within the Phase 2 development. Unless all motorised transport is barred then we will inevitably have this lane being used by 4x4s as a dirt track (as has happened on the final section of Rampton Road down to the intersection with the CGB). It should only be used by pedestrians, bicycles and horse riders and it should be left alone to the greatest extent possible – e.g. no tarmac!
- Once the new development of Northstowe is in full swing , there will be substantially more people from Rampton alone that will be using the route as a key commuting route (not one solely for leisure). Access to employment, education and leisure for the existing communities is critical and whilst this is stated in the proposals, Rampton is omitted from the list of communities to which connectivity is listed as a priority. We are however the closest community to the centre, far closer than Cottenham or Willingham. Even if Rampton is classed too small to be taken into consideration, I believe that Reynolds Drove will in fact be the key, safe route for sustainable travel to the centre of Northstowe from Cottenham. This is a large community and one which is stated must have good, sustainable travel options to and from Northstowe. Via cycling down the shared pavement from Cottenham to Rampton and then onto Cuckoo Lane and Reynolds Drove, Cottenham residents will have the opportunity of virtually traffic free cycle access to Northstowe. The only other option is to cycle along Oakington Road which connects Cottenham with Westwick. This is a fast, dark and dangerous road to cycle along. A much safer and appealing option would be to access Northstowe via Rampton and Reynolds Drove.

- I believe that the short stretch of by-way that is Reynolds Drove is in fact a key commuter route and not simply a leisure route. It will provide safe access for residents from Rampton and Cottenham (and potentially those from Willingham that live on the Rampton-side as it were who would access the by-way from the corner of Rampton Road between Willingham and Rampton) on a daily basis and is a critical route to integrate Northstowe with existing communities. I strongly urge you to pass on the feedback that the designation as a leisure route is incorrect. This route needs improving and maintaining as a commuter route. An all weather surface is critical and ideally some form of lighting (cats eyes would be sufficient) would make this a safe and appealing option year-round. Without this, people will have little option but to commute by car, over the much longer distance required to access Northstowe by this road. This is clearly against aims for sustainable access.
- As part of this, improvement of the junction/crossing with the Guided Busway at the end of Reynolds Drove/Rampton Road needs urgent attention. This is currently unsafe. It is very difficult to cross with a bicycle and impossible to cross with a bicycle and a small child. The matter is confounded by the location of this crossing on a bend, at a point in the route where buses are travelling quickly. This must be addressed even if the by-way designation remains as a leisure route. It is neither easy nor safe to cross over the busway at this point to access Northstowe. It is only a matter of time before an accident happens (and with increased usage once Northstowe is built, this is ever more likely).
- I want to thank you for taking the time to read through to this point. I am genuinely interested in becoming involved in the community consultation process and do view Northstowe in a positive light. I want to ensure that safe and sustainable access to the great amenities that Northstowe will offer is correctly planned for, to allow communities to benefit. As my 2 year old son and yet-to-be-born daughter grow up, I want them to truly benefit from this development.
- One of the roads within Rampton Drift is currently unadopted. Will this be adopted by the forthcoming Northstowe Town Council / Cambridgeshire County Council?
- Every effort should be made to integrate the new and existing communities and I welcome the footpath and cycleway links proposed by the outline planning application, The avoidance of a circuitous route could be improved by additional direct pedestrian, cycling and some limited vehicular links between Northstowe and Longstanton in the vicinity of Mills Lane and St Michaels Lane, where ultimately there is the potential for a corridor of further development to link the two communities.
- The transport assessment submitted with the outline planning application indicates a significantly improved frequency of bus services to Longstanton and this is to be welcomed and supported
- That a comprehensive public transport system with a significant increase in guided buses and new connection service to the other local villages such as Histon/Cottenham/Bar Hill

- Cycle ways to be priority, together with a range of better public transport connections with Northstowe and connections to other local centres
- Why is a potentially very busy road being proposed at the back of Rampton Drift? There appears to be very little separation between this road and our gardens. The proposed road is adjacent to the park/childrens playground. Noise and pollution from traffic would be far from environmentally friendly or protecting the amenity of Rampton Drift.
- Due to the closure of Rampton Road we will be forced to take a new route out. I don't have a problem with this but why is a new busy road proposed at the rear of Rampton Drift
- I have been a Longstanton resident for 22 years and the traffic on the B1050 going towards the A14 is not coping at all with lengthy queues every morning. The B1050 is a single lane.
- With the proposed route coming out of the Northstowe development and joining the B1050, I have been informed that at this junction there will be a roundabout wide enough for two circulating vehicles (2 lanes). These 2 lanes will continue onto the A14. Eventually, the whole of the Southern Access Road (west) would be dualled, meaning more traffic out of Northstowe.
- The issue I have with this is that the B1050 from Longstanton to this proposed two land roundabout will remain as a single lane. I firmly believe that this will lead to great queues from Longstanton to this proposed two lane roundabout and will not work.
- Traffic coming out of Longstanton will be severely impacted.
- We have already seen and it's been accepted by Tam that the current roundabout just before the A14 is not working. So I have to not have much trust that your proposals will work.
- The B1050 from Longstanton (as shown in blue on the attached map) should also be 2 lanes both ways.
- If this B1050 is not widened and proves to be a bad decision, then I feel the transportation managers should be held responsible for any delays caused to the Longstanton residents in the mornings.
- Main concerns are the volume of traffic trying to get onto the B1050 @ 2 no. T junctions – see phase 1 plans
- Recent flooding on Longstanton Road and increasingly heavy traffic make measures to mitigate these problems essential before further development of Northstowe should be permitted. Longstanton Road must be closed to through traffic before hundreds of new homes are built
- Rampton Drift residents are concerned about their access to Longstanton. Many residents have children in Hatton Park primary school, who will be there for many years. We believe it is essential that Rampton Drift retains access to Longstanton until residents have full access to the Southern Access Road, and also a clear route out of Northstowe to the north to enable access to



Longstanton.

- The existing road transport structure in the area is already overstretched, and the impact of heavy road haulage vehicles serving the construction site will be considerable. I am concerned that it will particularly worsen the existing conflict between pedestrians/cyclists and motor vehicles on local roads including the B1050 particularly between Longstanton Park-and Ride and Bar Hill.
- The plans for the intersection of the planned "southern access road" with the existing "airfield road" (which is meant to be closed to through motor traffic) are vague and provide no reassurance that cyclists and pedestrians will be any less threatened by traffic and unsafe road surfaces there than they are now. Why should their (legitimate) route through towards Girton be compromised or inconvenienced?
- County Council officers agreed with me that parts of the Longstanton Bypass are totally unsuitable for on-road cyclists, particularly at the pinch-point approaches to the roundabouts to/from Swavesey, and at the "golf-course-roundabout", but nothing yet seems to be on offer to improve that. Bear in mind that children from Northstowe will initially be having a link with Swavesey Village College - and in any case, existing children (and adults!) in Longstanton already use Swavesey Village College - and have to travel along these very roads. By bike?
- I have had no reassurance that A) planners, supervisors and construction workers for this so-called ecotown will be required to travel to the site using the Guided Busway provided, nor that B) this route can/will be used to transport materials (e.g. gravel from local sources) onto the site. To me both these should be requirements for planning consent.
- I've got my "walks and rides around Northstowe" map (a similar should be produced again – it could be used in promotional material when trying to encourage new house buyers) and have these comments :
- Can we please check that there is going to be all-users (level) access over (under?) the guided busway towards Rampton as this is the only way "out" to the East? I did see info on the Rampton road but there was no map and what they wanted to do seemed a bit vague.
- A proposed bridleway leads off the road to Rampton towards the byway that leads on to Belsars Hill, can this be guaranteed? It would be nice if the longstanding "problem" of travellers on the Aldreth Causeway could be addresses so that using the route to/from Aldreth would become an enjoyable possibility.
- The best leisure journeys will be towards Swavesey and the RSPB reserve at Fen Drayton. The cycle network (51?) is on the road from Longstanton to Swavesey, which will not be pleasant with the extra vehicles likely. Can anything be planned to make this safe and attractive to cycling families and possibly older children cycling alone to Swavesey Village College?
- I wasn't clear from the LAF meeting, or from the reports, what is intended for the airfield road (other than it would remain a road of sorts). It could be a

useful within-town exercise cycle route or dog-walking/jogging track.

- In Phase 2 the proposed west access road linking to the Bar Hill junction and the Southern link route into the guided busway will effectively cut the Phase 3 land into 3 parts. For security reasons these areas, in particular the Southern part bordering the Oakington green separation, should be fenced off with no public access
- Proper physical closure of the airfield road (through St Michaels) to cars is very welcome. Timescales for the southern access road to Northstowe for phase 2 were not clear, but I feel it MUST be complete before any occupation of phase 2 homes. The B1050 is already at capacity, and the addition of traffic from phase 1 will cause huge disruption. There is absolutely no way phase 2 traffic can be accommodated on this road. I was slightly concerned that recent traffic surveys on the B1050 have coincided with school holidays - the quietest time! The Pedestrian Bridge and linkage to footpath/bridleway network
- From the plans I can see that this bridge is over 5m wide, far wider than Wilsons Road. This is good because the bridge may need to cope with combine harvesters and other large farm vehicles which are prevented from getting access to the Southern fields due to the new SAR. The bridge will be used by dig walkers, horses, cyclists, pedestrians etc. and I would like to verify that the safety aspects are adequate for all types of use. I would also like to see this bridge connected in some way with the pedestrian and bridleway crossing being established as part of the new A14 Barhill junction. It would make a lot of sense for the public footpaths to connect but I do not see any provision for the two schemes to join up.
- In my view this scheme Has one major flaw – the junction with the B1050 is a roundabout which in the peak morning traffic will be almost impossible to enter from the Northstowe direction. There is a continuous stream of traffic on the B1050 from the North and this will have priority on the roundabout as there will be negligible traffic travelling in the other directions. Consequently traffic trying to enter the B1050 from Northstowe will be unable to do so and queues will build up. Some form of peak hour traffic light system or 'merge in turn' system will be needed. Evening rush hour should not be too bad since traffic exiting the roundabout will not create a problem for other directions

#### Southern Access Road (West) (SAR)

- The SAR is the road that the Northstowe Area Action Plan (NAAP) promised us would be in place before any construction work on Northstowe commenced. So it is imperative that work on it begins as soon as possible. The B1050 between Bar Hill and the initial SAR roundabout is to be dualled and it is essential that this roundabout can handle two lanes of traffic in both directions.
- The SAR will initially be single carriageway and will be upgraded to dual carriageway during a subsequent phase.
- The SAR will need to be screened by hedging and trees (see NAAP).
- I gather that the SAR North of the Airfield Road is expected to be single carriageway. This does not sound remotely realistic to me. Please could I be given an expert opinion as to whether a road servicing 10,000 homes should be single or dual carriageway.
- The Homes and Communities Agency have already indicated that work on

the SAR will not commence until the A14 upgrade works are complete. That work needs to start immediately the A14 upgrade is complete.

- A condition should be imposed that no Phase 2 houses should be occupied until the SAR is fully commissioned.

#### Airfield Road

- The Airfield Road (AR) is closed to vehicular traffic, but widely used. It would be far less used if the A14 and B1050 were not so overloaded. As it is, anyone coming from Willingham and heading down Huntingdon Road saves a very great deal of time using this road at busy times. The Airfield Road will be severed when the SAR is laid straight across it. Since by then the A14 upgrade will be complete, the impact of closing the Airfield Road will be less severe.
- I have had detailed communications with Highways Officers and the HCA and the picture I have obtained is:
  - Airfield Road to become a complete cul-de-sac for motorised traffic from the Longstanton side;
  - Airfield Road to have access into Northstowe from the Oakington side only for buses and emergency vehicles. Access into the Northstowe site will be policed by rising bollards or number-recognition cameras.
  - Airfield Road pedestrian/bicycle/equestrian traffic to cross the SAR and new haul road via a signalised pedestrian crossing.
  - These arrangements are probably satisfactory for the current phase, but will become very difficult when the SAR is dualled. Emergency access vehicles and buses would then need a fly-over to join the SAR and it is unrealistic to expect pedestrian/bicycle/equestrian traffic to use a signalised crossing to cross a dual carriageway.
  - I take it as read that it will not be possible to join the SAR heading South from the Airfield Road, nor to join the Airfield Road from the SAR heading North.
- As residents of Rampton Road, Rampton Drift were are extremely concerned that the plans appear to indicate that the main route in and out of Rampton Drift will be via a residential street in the new development and a new junction opening up on to the existing Rampton Road. Rampton Road is very narrow, especially at the point marked on the plans for the new junction; we have concerns about all of Rampton Drift traffic having to enter and exit via this route as the road is not suitable for regular two way traffic, the road is also currently unsafe due to insufficient street lighting. It also seems unfair that everyone in Rampton Drift will have to navigate the residential streets of the new town in order to reach a main road, we're sure that the new residents of Northstowe won't be best pleased either with all of Rampton Drift traffic having to go past.
- We fully appreciate the reasons for closing Rampton Road off to Longstanton but it seems ridiculous that Rampton Drift residents can't have a direct route onto the main road , especially since a new road will be built parallel to Rampton Road, the road that's already in place! We would prefer Rampton Road to have a junction onto the new main road rather than have access through the residential streets of the new town. This would allow Rampton Drift residents immediate access to their homes from the southern access road, it would provide a quicker and safer route into Rampton Drift for emergency vehicles and new residents of Northstowe would be less likely to drive (and park) into Rampton Drift if it remained a cul de sac.
- Rampton Road should also not be closed to Longstanton until Rampton Drift

residents have the ability to exit the site to the South- i.e. we should not be expected to have to negotiate rush hour traffic from Willingham and from Phase 1 just to be able to get onto the A14.

- It's also imperative that suitable pedestrian crossing facilities are installed on the new road close to its junction (hopefully we will be able to have a junction here) with Rampton Road to ensure the safety of those who wish to walk or cycle to Longstanton or vice-versa.
- We are concerned that the SAR will be very busy during the construction phase and we would request that the developers restrict use of the road by construction traffic during peak periods to minimise congestion. In addition some thought has to be given to how noise from the SAR might impact upon residents of Rampton Drift.

**9 RESIDENTS COMMENTS 9 PLANNED IMPROVED DRAINAGE - RESIDENTS COMMENTS**

- A comprehensive drainages system to protect Oakington village from flooding
- This is really important to Oakington. We will need convincing that the planned system can cope/protect Oakington
- We hope you believe the figures given to you – that the overflow will go out to the Rampton drain
- Had better be. You cannot fake this
- The proposals to mitigate the surface water flooding at Longstanton and Oakington by up-stream balancing lakes are to be welcomed and when constructed these drainage bodies should be managed and maintained in the long term by an appropriate body with statutory powers e.g. Anglian Water
- I am pleased to see that proper provision for foul drainage is proposed by an improvement to the Uttons Drove sewage treatment works and that this will improve the present inadequate foul drainage facilities in the village, which often results in surcharging in the Station Road and High St area. A condition should be imposed to require the foul drainage system to be improved before any occupation of dwellings
- There must be complete assurance from Cambridge Water that they will have capacity to provide for Northstowe as well as the many other new residential developments in Cambridgeshire
- Are you sure that the drainage is sufficient for a site that is so near the sea level?
- Section 4.3 Historical records of flooding lists rainfall that caused floods in 1978 and 2001. The flood risk assessment should now consider the rainfall that caused the flooding this year (8/8/2014)
- Section 2.1 mentions additional flood storage which is proposed upstream of Oakington. This should be implemented sooner rather than later as part of Phase 2 works not in Phase
- The developers have said to the local newspaper that building the many houses of Northstowe would not increase the flooding. You cannot expect people to believe this unless most surface water is drained locally and by that I do mean half a mile through pipes to the ponds
- I have already suggested that the first row of houses near the busway are built to send all roof and hard standing rain to the ditch, even though it has been cut short at the bus stop. This requires one or more pipes under the cycle track which should be laid before the surface. These houses will benefit from £38 pa lower sewerage charge. If this and oil traps are in the plans, why not say so?

- The drainage aspect is another major concern should this road and new buildings be built in such close proximity to the rear of Rampton Drift.
- Recent flooding at Bar Hill and Longstanton will only get worse despite mans interventions to prevent this from happening again by use of attenuation ponds and drains. So called 'growth' and 'development' intended under the Northstowe Phase 2 proposal will not be good for the health of people or the countryside because it will lead to queues and congestion, cyclists either hitting one another or pedestrians, greater pollution, less wildlife and a denuded way of life.
- I am not a drainage engineer and cannot comment on the drainage issues. I would suggest, however, that the piecemeal approach to the planning for Northstowe is hardly likely to lead to an exemplar town with respect to drainage, let alone improvements to drainage in the surrounding villages. And I do have concerns about the long-term management of water features and waterside habitats, given the poor record for maintenance of ditches in the area.
- Rampton Drift's sewers currently drain up into Longstanton using an unreliable compressed air system. We expect concrete assurances that Rampton Drift sewers will be connected to Northstowe's sewer network at an early stage in phase 2.

#### Planned improved drainage

- We think it is important that Rampton Drift is connected to the new wastage / sewerage system planned for Northstowe at the earliest possible point.
- We would like assurances that Rampton Drift will not be put at a greater risk of flooding due to the loss of green belt land, the addition of housing, and the height of the surrounding developments. As Rampton Drift is planned to be the lowest point of Northstowe how will we be protected.
- Rampton Drift's sewers currently drain up into Longstanton using an unreliable compressed air system. We expect concrete assurances that Rampton Drift sewers will be connected to Northstowe's sewer network at an early stage in phase 2.
- Pictures received from Katy Andrew, (no comments)
- There is a ditch within my eastern boundary (Rampton Road) which in addition to drainage of my land takes the run off from Rampton Road. The hedge on the outside of the ditch does not belong to my property and will be part of the Sub Phase B mid 2-17 development (Appendix B) Ideally the hedging will remain for screening and security purposes or an appropriate alternative provided
- I currently have a water extraction Licence through the Environmental Agency for water abstraction for my crops. The planning document clearly states the "lowering of the groundwater levels within the site the impacts to the surrounding area should not be significant" Although this could be of slight benefit during the winter months it will not be the case during the summer months as this would have a major impact on the water level of my well which

historically has never run short of my authorised extraction amount. If the water level is lowered the well will run dry.

- The vegetables and fruit I produce are for human consumption. It is acknowledged fact that there are pockets of groundwater contamination on the site of this application (Appendix D), with a large majority to be found to the south of my property (i.e. barrack buildings and MOD site). Once these areas are disturbed my concerns are that the groundwater contamination could flow in the direction of my land as documented on the ground water flow directions (Appendix C) and this will affect the purity of my abstracted water which in turn will affect my crops.

I write to object to the above application on the following grounds:

- 1. The original application for development of the town of Northstowe relied to demonstrate that its impact on flood risk to Swavesey was mitigated on modelling undertaken on the Uttons Drove Drain/Swavesey main drain by various consultants over a number of years. That model has now been reviewed by Peter Brett (formerly Hannah Reed). The Peter Brett review demonstrates that the modelling is flawed, as the predicted outcomes do not reflect real world data recorded by the Environment Agency at Webbs Hole Sluice. Recorded flood events are significantly higher and occur more frequently than those predicted by the model. I believe that SCDC will hold a copy of the Peter Brett review but if you do not please contact me and I will provide it to you.
- Given that the modelling upon which the application for Northstowe relied has been demonstrated to be flawed, no planning consent should be granted until such time as the modelling has been fully audited and updated so that it accurately predicts water levels in the Swavesey Main Drain/Uttons Drove Drain, in order that it can be demonstrated that the required 1:10 standard of protection has been delivered.
- 2.,. The development of Northstowe relies on the implementation of the Land Drainage Solution (LDS) to mitigate against increased discharges from Uttons Drove Sewage Treatment Works.

Delivery of the LDS was split into two phases:

- Phase one involved channel works that were required to improve conveyance. Allow for future maintenance so conveyance could be maintained, strengthen and raise existing banks and increase storage.
- Phase two involves the installation of a pumping station at Webbs Hole Sluice with a pumping capacity of 1 cumec, so that additional discharges into the Swavesey Main Drain/Uttons Drove Drain can be discharged into the river when Webbs Hole is "tide locked".
- Phase one of the LDS should have been delivered through the mechanism of a Funding Agreement between MCA Developments, Anglian Water, SCDC and the Environment Agency and dated October 2011. This funding agreement included an outline design, which included the creation of a 4m wide maintenance berm in Mare Fen, combined with the raising of bank levels and the strengthening of the bank. This work should have been completed by the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012. These works have not been delivered and neither SCDC nor the EA appear to have a plan or funding in place which would enable the completion of Phase 1 of the LDS.

- As a result of the non-delivery by EA and SCDC of Phase One of the LDS, local communities and businesses are being put at increased risk of flooding by proposed development at Northstowe because:

i The banks in Mare Fen are below their design height and as such storage capacity in a flood event in Mare Fen that should be available to protect the village of Swavesey from flooding will be taken up instead by increased discharges from Uttons Drove when the bank is overtopped in a flood event.

ii A survey of the banks in Mare Fen undertaken on behalf of the Environment Agency and dated 17<sup>th</sup> July 2013 shows that the banks are in a poor condition, which means there is a risk that the bank could be breached in a flood event should they be overtopped. I can provide a copy of this report to SCDC if you have not received a copy from the EA.

iii Without the provision of a maintenance berm, maintenance cannot be economically delivered to the Mare Fen reach, which means that future conveyance is unlikely to be maintained.

**No planning consent should be granted until such a time as a methodology to deliver Phase One of the LDS has been identified, together with sufficient funding to ensure its delivery.**

3. The Western section of the Southern Access Road falls within a tributary of the Swavesey Drain. Proposals to mitigate against increased run off into the Swavesey Drain catchment are inadequate.

**No planning consent should be granted until it has been demonstrated that runoff from the access road will have no impact on the swavesey Drain/Uttons Drove Drain catchment and an appropriate maintenance scheme is in place.**



**10 OTHER ISSUES - RESIDENTS COMMENTS**

- Hopefully 1-7 will be managed and checked etc. by you – the Planning Department in conjunction with any vested interests – such as the people who are going to manage the various facilities etc.
- There is no category for this, Please organise all construction activities in ways that fully minimise disruption to existing residents
- I have yet to see detailed proposals for the boundary treatment around RD.
- The major problem with Garden cities is that they were built for high car ownership. Northstowe needs homes and jobs concentrated near bus stops on the two routes through the area. Scientists in family and single accommodation need to be near the guided bus stop – leaving the car to the spouse. Teenagers also need the guideway for sixth form college and a social centre,
- I recently attended the public exhibition in Longstanton on Sat 27<sup>th</sup> September and was dismayed to learn that there were no representatives from the Homes and Communities Agency present to answer questions. Given the huge impact Northstowe will have on existing local communities I find this surprising and disappointing, especially given the difficulties in locating specific pieces of information in the huge volume of documentation on the South Cambridgeshire planning website
- It is clear that a lot of thought and careful planning has gone into the Northstowe phase 2 proposal but I feel there are some points that need further consideration. From the documents, it is unclear to me what steps have been taken to ensure community development and cohesion, so that new arrivals integrate effectively into a growing community.
- Recent flooding on Longstanton Road and increasingly heavy traffic make measures to mitigate these problems essential before further development of Northstowe should be permitted. Longstanton Road must be closed to through traffic before hundreds of new homes are built
- It also worried me that at the Longstanton consultation last week.... no one had been to Rampton Drift? And on the Northstowe planning application phase 2 leaflet given out Rampton Drift houses had no gardens on the plan, how can that be? All answers I received from the consultations have been completely conflicting, no one knows what to say especially I have found to a Rampton Drift resident. If no answers are known why have consultations? I was told I could air my views online easier said than done, HOW?? Are you making people unable to leave feedback for a reason, because unless you have the planning application numbers and dates you have no way of leaving feedback! And finally the A14 when is this upgrade going to be completed, mixed answers again today, not convinced by the professionals at the consultations! Not happy constantly 'fobbed off' as if we don't matter!! (we are living here now)
- Why not have a competition for some of the designs, with teams from the Cambridge Universities Arts faculties to judge?

- Otherwise the plans seem good, though it's a pity to build on greenfield sites (apart from the old airfield). I see the pill boxes from the guided buses, so I'm glad you're thinking of keeping these!
- I am concerned about the construction traffic noise and then the new residents' traffic noise from the new local access road west and the impact on Longstanton. On other major construction projects I have been involved in, a planning condition has been the need for infrastructure planting very early/before the start of construction to ensure adequate screening of and noise reductions from the new road. Will South Cambs add this and the need for earth banks as a planning condition.
- I could not find details about the provision of a Health centre and in particular provision of a GP Surgery. Longstanton residents already have trouble accessing GPs/nurses/midwives due to limited provision, so I feel strongly that a GP surgery should be provided and should be open when the Phase 2 homes are occupied to avoid overwhelming the existing overstretched local surgeries.
- I consider that it is the best interests of the village to adopt a constructive and positive attitude towards Northstowe and for existing local residents to be involved in shaping and influencing the development of the new town. Every opportunity should be taken for Longstanton to share in the financial investments for Northstowe and to obtain economic, environmental and community benefits for the existing village. I consider that a community fund should be created to provide financial assistance for schemes of enhancement and environmental improvements in Longstanton. This should be included in the S106 agreement.
- A condition should be imposed on the planning permission that all routes for construction traffic should be the subject of a scheme to be submitted for approval by the council and that no construction traffic should be routed through the village
- A condition should be imposed to require, for approval by the Council, the submission of details of location, mitigation for noise levels and dust and hours of working for all construction plant and machinery which is to be placed on the site. This is in order to protect the residential amenity of dwellings in Longstanton which are located in close proximity to the site.
- 2018 is too late for the school to open
- Why is there no graveyard when the one at Longstanton is almost full?
- I see that a church is proposed but no space for a burial area, there is no space in Longstanton for extra graves to cope with Northstowe and I am not sure that Phase1 was allocated with any new burial grounds either. There needs to be some space provided for this within Northstowe phase2 rather than in some remote area outside of the town for phase 3
- Why keep the pillboxes?
- The application is already showing signs of the conflict between the desire to conform to "exemplar" standards and the requirement to fit 3500 homes in too

a small space

- The current proposal to provide 1.5 car spaces per property is widely seen as entirely inadequate. Orchard Park is a good demonstration of the parking chaos that results from such a policy. The minimum figure that might be acceptable is 2 per household.
- The site will need ordnance and dangerous containments (e.g. heavy metals, aircraft fuel, mustard gas and perhaps worse) removing. More information is needed on how these activities are to be carried out.
- We need clarification about whether 16 medium-scale or 5 large-scale wind turbines could end up being located “in the immediate vicinity” of Northstowe.
- Local parishes already have a serious shortage of burial space. Phase 1 contains no burial site and we were told that this deficiency would be fixed in Phase 2. I gather that the story now is that Phase 2 will contain no burial site and this need to wait till Phase 2. This simply is not good enough. I gather that the total Northstowe burial site budget is 4Ha. That means Phase 2 needs to find 2Ha. We cannot wait until after 2030 for burial site.
- The HCA neither owns nor controls areas of the site for initial house building. Please slow down
- What safeguards will be in place to ensure that the area on the Longstanton side of Long Lane, in particular Mills Lane and St Michaels does not become overflow car parking for Northstowe residents, whilst still allowing visitors to houses in Mills lane and St Michaels to park freely.
- I feel it would be useful if the secondary school included a pool for the use of the community outside school hours, along the lines of Impington Village College, which is the nearest pool otherwise.
- There should be a series of indexes to all the documents, to make it easier for people with a particular interest to look things up (not just now but over the next decade
- Comparative data on other new towns and how existing communities were accommodated and how the new arrivals felt, both when the towns were completed and in the decades afterwards, needs to be made available.
- What problems did the inhabitants of the existing new towns feel they had? What steps were taken to address these issues?
- What lessons from other developments have been learnt and incorporated into the Northstowe plans?
- What lessons have been learnt from exemplary new developments in Frieberg Germany, Malmö Sweden and Almere in the Netherlands?
- At what stage will SCDC apply for granting of a royal charter for a market, both indoor and outdoor?
- It is unclear what role small independent builders will play. My view is that

this should be substantial, as they will build to a higher building code and quicker than their national, volume builder counterparts. Small builders wield less political influence, e.g. demanding the proportion of social housing is reduced., or ducking out of section 106 agreements

- Having a CHP (Combined Heat & Power), community heating system) built early on, with an EU grant, would assist developers to reach eco standards much quicker and more cheaply than without such a development.
- I have been to several Northstowe consultation meetings (although not the final one on Saturday 1 November) and have been frankly disappointed by the lack of definitive information available, and sometimes the offhand attitude of staff present. I can appreciate that the whole planning process for Northstowe poses a great headache for SCDC and associated organisations, but given the impact of the new community on existing residents I feel that we are getting short-changed on mitigation of major disruption during the building phase.
- I tried to look at the plans on the website, and then the paper copies lodged at Willingham Library. In both cases it was hard to find my way through the material. No index was available with the paper documents. I was totally overwhelmed by the amount of information. And I do not have the time nor the technology skills/expertise to absorb the material and make meaningful comments.
- Therefore - in the hope that you will make known each of my suggestions, below, in the appropriate quarters - I can only reiterate what I have said at previous meetings
- I have had no reassurance that A) planners, supervisors and construction workers for this so-called eco town will be required to travel to the site using the Guided Busway provided, nor that B) this route can/will be used to transport materials (e.g. gravel from local sources) onto the site. To me both these should be requirements for planning consent.
- Finally, I do hope that there will be adequate and timely consultation with Longstanton residents at each stage of review of the detailed planning consultations. We have had disruption, and the threat of disruption, hanging over the village for well over a decade. Initiatives to discuss and disseminate information seem to start cheerfully then fizzle out completely. It is hardly surprising that after the series of delays, changes of plan, and reapplications, the silent majority of villagers is completely confused and worn out.
- As I am sure you are aware, Rampton is situated very close to the centre of the proposed phase 2 developments. In fact, other than the obvious Oakington/Westwick and Longstanton/Rampton Drift, Rampton is actually the closest existing community to the centre of this new phase. It was therefore really disappointing to find the level of consideration given to Rampton and its residents. Rampton may be a small community but it is an existing community none-the-less and one with which Northstowe must integrate successfully if it is to truly become an accepted part of the locality.
- There was only one exhibition in Rampton and this was at a time that those in the village who are working/commuting to larger centres for further education

etc. would not be able to attend. I am therefore worried that the views of this demographic (in which my husband and I fall) will not be fully represented. We therefore went along to an exhibition at Longstanton. I was left concerned and offended by the attitude of one of the council employees whom I spoke to. I expressed an interest in the connectivity of our village to Northstowe. Good connectivity is vital, especially given the few amenities in Rampton. Her response to my concerns was simply words to the effect of 'well why did you move to Rampton?! I was shocked and very concerned that this attitude is a reflection of the council and planners as a whole. Is Rampton going to be overlooked because it has a small population, despite being the closest to this development? I sincerely hope not.

- I would like to reiterate at this point that I am not against the development. In fact, I researched a lot into it prior to purchasing our house in 2011. I view it as a great asset to the area, especially for smaller communities such as Rampton. I think that the employment, educational and leisure amenities will be of great benefit, provided that enough thought and attention is given to how to integrate existing communities with this. I would like to be considered for one of the community consultation groups. I did fill in the details when at Longstanton but as a resident of Rampton, I am not sure if there is a different group that I may have to be a part of. I feel that my views would be shared by many of those most likely to view Northstowe as a positive asset and most likely to use the amenities which are being proposed. I am genuinely concerned that views from my demographic will not be represented and the attitude of the council employee that I spoke to added to my concerns
- I want to thank you for taking the time to read through to this point. I am genuinely interested in becoming involved in the community consultation process and do view Northstowe in a positive light. I want to ensure that safe and sustainable access to the great amenities that Northstowe will offer is correctly planned for, to allow all communities to benefit. As my 2 year old son and yet-to-be born daughter grow up, I want them to truly benefit from this development.
- D7.25 Open spaces such as playing fields, play areas, burial grounds and allotments will need to be designed and landscaped to a high standard and link to and integrate with other landscaped and amenity areas so that they contribute to the overall quality of the setting for the urban fabric of Northstowe.

#### **General observations**

- The SCDC website lists around 100 documents associated with this application. It is simply not possible to generate representations as a result of reading these documents on-line.
- There are some vague words about the Phase 2 site level being raised by up to 500mm. We need to know precisely where that is proposed.

#### **Barracks structures to be retained**

- Virtually everything has been bulldozed. The Officers' Mess (which I believe dates from the '50s) is scheduled to become a primary school. I see no point in making that statement unless the County Council has inspected it and agreed on this usage (which seems unlikely). The guardroom would make a characterful setting for a pub. The water towers, in my view, are an eyesore

which will be a constant temptation for dangerous activities and which will become steadily more rickety with the passage of time.

- We are concerned that ground levels of the new town might be raised we need assurances that this will not cause flooding of Rampton Drift and in addition that the sewers of Rampton Drift are connected to the new site in the early stages of the building.
- We couldn't see a site in the plans for a Police/Ambulance/Fire station, given the size of the new development we think that all emergency services should be represented.
- There doesn't appear to be any post 16 education provision. Since all children are now required to stay in education until 18, it's critical that a sixth form college should be planned for Northstowe. This will save students from having to make long (and expensive) treks into other villages/Cambridge just to be able to get to a 6th form.
- Parking is an enormous concern for residents, especially given that it is already a problem in Rampton Drift. Parking is likely to be exacerbated by Rampton Drift's close proximity to the town centre and by the fact that there is inadequate provision for parking throughout the phase 2 proposal, whether that be for residential (only 1.5 spaces per house), town centre or education.
- There is mention in the planning application of the site level of Northstowe being raised. What are the implications of this for Rampton Drift? Residents have expressed concern that flood water will gather in Rampton Drift as it will become the lowest point in Northstowe.
- Rampton Drift faces being surrounded by house building for over a decade. It is essential that the phasing of building works gives due consideration to existing housing, ideally by building out from Rampton Drift, rather than in towards it.
- Rampton Drift roads and footpaths need to be adopted by the council for full maintenance and repair responsibility.
- Northstowe Phase 2 will be built to high specifications in terms of communications infrastructure and general carbon standards. As a minimum, we would expect that Rampton Drift is fitted with fibre-optic cable at the same time as it is laid for Phase 2. We believe Northstowe overall would benefit from Rampton Drift properties being retrofitted to bring them closer to overall Northstowe environmental standards.
- Further support is provided by D6.6, on the next page:  
D6.6 There is a need for emergency vehicles to gain access into Northstowe from the Cottenham Fire Station. There are a number of ways this could be provided. Access could be from Station Road, Oakington or Cottenham Road, Westwick or Longstanton road, Oakington. For the first two of these options, it may well be able to make use of the maintenance track of the guided busway, linking into the town via the dedicated busway within the town. The route of this access will be determined through Master planning. If it makes use of Longstanton Road, Oakington, design and traffic management measures, will facilitate movement by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and ensure that no motorised vehicular traffic, other than

that for essential access, can use this route. Any solution will pay particular regard to the need to ensure that the green separation between Oakington and Northstowe is not fragmented or otherwise adversely affected.

- Phase 2 requires a fire station, police station and an extensive medical centre.
- We would like to know what the anticipated disruption will be to daily life for residents at Rampton Drift whilst building is taking place. Some people on the estate have young families, whilst some work from home and will be disrupted by years of building. What will you be doing to minimise noise, traffic, etc. as building starts to surround the estate? What hours and days do you anticipate works will take place?
- We would like assurances that Rampton Drift will be fitted with fibre-optic cable / broadband at the same time as it is laid for Phase 2.
- In summation, we welcome the town and the new opportunities it will bring but are wary that current plans do not provide enough answers and currently look like they will be detrimental for residents of Rampton Drift. We would like to see amendments made which will rectify this.
- We also think that it is important that more discussions take place between the HCA and Rampton Drift residents to work together on some of the issues listed above, including management of the estate and integration into Northstowe.

#### Build Order

- The application proposed sub-phasing (p146 onwards on design and access statement) suggests a build order generally moving clockwise around RD. The problem with this approach is that all but two of the sub-phase areas border onto RD. According to figure 8.2 on p 147 this could mean, potentially, building works from 2017 (start of sub-phase B) through to 2028 (end of sub-phase F) or even, given our proximity to the town centre, through to the end of 2031. While, of course, the outline application does not indicate that work will actually continue right next to RD for this entire time, it also does not rule it out, and at present would seem to leave that to the discretion of the developers.
- Building work around RD should occupy as brief a time as can reasonably be arranged, as far as possible in one block of time, and as soon in the development plans as possible. Ideally there would be early building work directly around RD which can then act as a buffer between RD and the building works.
- Leaving RD out of this outline proposal unfortunately leaves us somewhat in limbo. We will be part of Northstowe, and it makes sense for RD to be integrated rather than have the appearance of being separate from the town. It would seem to be beneficial to all sides for RD to be included in formal proposals in order to clarify all aspects of how RD will be incorporated within Northstowe, rather than just dealing with the boundary to RD. Issues include:
- In section 6.7 of the design and access statement it is suggested that 1.5 parking spaces should be the average per dwelling. While we understand and agree with the need to encourage use of public transport rather than car use, we do not think that restricted car parking has much impact on decisions

on how many cars (if any) a household will have, rather it is determined by need. The only way to reduce car ownership is to make public transport or cycling the convincing best option.

- This is of particular concern due to the significant lack of parking in much of RD, generally due to the age of the estate. Given the proximity of RD to the town centre, there is also a concern to ensure that there is sufficient town centre parking provision.
- As a resident of Rampton Drift with a property at the edge of the estate towards the back I am particularly concerned about the apparent lack of separation that I have seen on plans at local exhibitions with what looks like what will be a well used road running directly behind my garden – I am concerned about noise, lighting and safety affecting my property (safety particularly for children and family pets). Whilst I welcome Northstowe and the amenities and facilities it will bring I would like some balance - Rampton Drift is a very quiet residential area with no through traffic and quite a unique community feel – it is a very safe area for children allowing them a lot of freedom which is not possible in more built up areas – being so close to a new town centre will change their whole way of life.
- Parking is an enormous concern for residents, especially given that it is already a problem in Rampton Drift. Parking is likely to be exacerbated by Rampton Drift's close proximity to the town centre and by the fact that there is inadequate provision for parking throughout the phase 2 proposal, whether that be for residential (only 1.5 spaces per house), town centre or education.
- Ironically, I noted that all the presentation staff present at Longstanton on 1 November arrived by car. It was a case of we need our cars but you won't need yours.
- Rampton Drift faces being surrounded by house building for over a decade. It is essential that the phasing of building works gives due consideration to existing housing, ideally by building out from Rampton Drift, rather than in towards it.
- There is a market garden on Rampton Road which this proposal would effectively land lock. This land lies in the last sub-phase of Phase 2 so there is no immediate urgency to solve this problem, but it does need to be resolved.
- The Estate is currently maintained by its residents who contribute to the upkeep of all the gardens and play area. Nowhere did I see for definite that this would be adopted by the Northstowe council and what the time scale was for the adoption of these areas. Especially when it would not be possible to stop residents of elsewhere in Northstowe coming to use the play equipment.
- Screening with trees hedges seems to be the only way to keep any sort of separation and shield the estate from a decade of building work. This planting needs to start way before any building work as it could take years for these to establish enough to provide a decent level of screening from the sight and noises of massive building site.



- Being a teacher and having school aged children living in the area I have been very disappointed to hear the news that already funds for the education being cut and moved elsewhere. The future of our children should not be a thing that is done on the smallest shoe string. 3 class entry primary schools are unmanageable and far too big for children starting out in education. They need the home feel and support that a smaller school brings. How are they going to complete a whole school assembly with 600 pupils in the school?

#### Primary Schools

- I was disappointed to hear that many of the new primary schools are going to be three form entry. From experience I have found this sized school (630 pupils) too big for a primary school. When a four year old enters school for the first time, it is often their first big stint of time away from their own home environment. This is why primary school should have an intimate and family atmosphere. The head and deputy head teachers should know each child by name, the children should be able to recognise and name each class teacher and the children should recognise familiar faces around the school. The bigger the school, the harder this becomes. With a school with 90 children per year group, even the most basic of tasks become difficult. Can you fit all 630 pupils in the hall for an assembly where they can still see/hear and engage with the person taking it? Can you get all of the pupils through the canteen in an hour, or will lunchtimes need to be staggered? Every time you split the school so the children hardly ever have any time when they are all together, then you destroy that feeling of family and community that a school needs. Northstowe could make their schools the best for miles around. You have an opportunity here to build amazing, state of the art schools with excellent facilities and teachers that people would love to send their children too. If you create fantastic schools, you will sell your houses, as parents will often move house to be in the catchment of a good school, however I can foresee many parents being put off by living in the catchment of a 630 pupil school. Please reconsider this decision and stick with two form entry schools.
- Rampton Drift expect to be fully integrated into Northstowes infrastructure, including things like broadband/fibre-optic cable, sewage etc. At present in the planning process we exist with a red line around us, which leaves us cut out of many of the planning discussions, but obviously we need to be included from the start to ensure a positive transition into Northstowe.
- We object to the planning application in principle on the grounds that it will lead to further loss and damage to the countryside and long term harm to the environment and human health.
- In any event, housing of this nature will mainly be occupied by foreigners, so why should England's countryside pay such a high price for this invasion? The road systems needed to support such a town obviously harms the countryside and will lead to further noise and pollution (not to mention the vast destruction of the countryside when the A14 upgrade occurs!)
- Loss of countryside and habitat leads to a reduced wildlife population and human overcrowding

- Cambridge City is now manic when it used to be a lovely university town. I am sure that you are 'over egging the pudding' such that it will no longer be such an attractive place to work in, live or study!
- Currently it seems as if Cambridge is ring fenced by earth-movers and bulldozers. I think it's about time that Planners thought more about preserving the environment and not chasing dubious growth statistics. I believe that there is degree of planning irresponsibility in that the overall infrastructure will not cope with the increased population explosion caused by the massive house building programme now taking place.
- We therefore object to 'further development' for the reasons stated above.
- The planning application states that dust will be managed and monitored. This will be a necessity for my business due to the close proximity of the Phase 2 earth works and building.
- Consideration will need to be given to proximity of lighting on the west and eastern boundaries of my property (Rampton Road) due to the seasonal crops being grown. Too little/too much light has an effect of delaying or advancing flowering which in turn would affect my crops/livelihood.
- The first is in relation to the Northstowe Phase 2 Exhibition at which the HCA were present, given at Longstanton on 1 November 2014. I noted and commented that within all the plans, diagrams, pictorial examples and polished commentary on the proposals and finished product, there was no mention of the 'car', which in my view was a little deceptive and mischievous. Yes, your illustrations and pictorial examples of phase 2 were idyllic but regrettably NOT realistic.
- I have looked at the Northstowe website although no way could I spend time opening all the files.
- The first of the two (a submission form) we were directed to open was a joke as none of the boxes about what they were going to build were filled in, there was only the comment "see submission" or a similar word. I couldn't see the information in the second document and presume it was hidden within the numerous others sub-documents.
- I found the maps I saw in the main report very confusing as they failed to name the existing villages and roads and I think one of the plans hadn't even got the new roundabout and road between Longstanton and Swavesey. Why couldn't they use an OS map as a base for their maps?
- There was no map I could see that fitted the development into the wider landscape, perhaps it was one of the other extra documents but you can't tell what is in them from the names. I remember what we were shown at the LAF meeting and I wasn't convinced that a lot of time/though has recently gone into ensuring that the occupants will be able to easily get out into the wider region. Is this in fact being discouraged in order to "preserve" the quiet of the existing villages? How many of the people that have drawn up the town plan know the site they are dealing with. It looks to me more like they have cut-and-pasted from a computer design "book". I feel that it has been "plonked down" without any real thought of how people will spend their leisure time or

how they will “get out” to go to work and school. Regarding the latter I expect many of the secondary school pupils will be placed at schools outside the settlement (I suspect the town’s secondary school won’t be built and functioning in time for the first phase occupants anyway).

This page is left blank intentionally.



Description		Scale									
	May only occur in exceptional circumstances, highly unlikely	1									
	Is unlikely to occur in normal circumstances, but could occur at some time	2									
	Likely to occur in some circumstances or at some time	3									
	Is likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances	4									
	Is highly likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances	5									
<b>Risk Impact Ratings:</b>											
Description	Scale					Colour Codes	Probability/likelihood				
							1	2	3	4	5
Insignificant disruption to internal business or corporate objectives Little or no loss of front line service No environmental impact No reputational impact Low financial Loss	1										
Minor disruption to internal business or corporate objectives Minor disruption to front line service Minor environmental impact Minor reputational impact Moderate financial loss	2				5	M	M	M	H	H	
Noticeable disruption to internal business and corporate objectives Moderate direct effect on front line services Moderate damage to environment Extensive reputational impact due to press coverage Regulatory criticism High financial impact	3				4	L	M	M	H	H	
Major disruption to corporate objectives or front line services High reputational impact – national press and TV coverage Major detriment to environment Minor regulatory enforcement Major financial impact	4			Impact	3		M	M	M	M	
Critical long term disruption to corporate objectives and front line services Critical reputational impact Regulatory intervention by Central Govt. Significant damage to environment Huge financial impact	5				2	L	L	M	M	M	
					1	L	L	L	L	M	