

Appendix 1: Representations and Responses to the Preferred Options Report

North West Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan - Preferred Options Volume 1

Public Participation Report

1. Introduction

1.1

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

1. Introduction

1.1

3892 - English Heritage (East of England Region)

Object

The AAP has an important contribution to make as part of the Cambridge Green Belt, preserving the character and setting of the historic city and providing views into and out of the city. Supporting documents of the AAP recognise this value (e.g. Green Belt Landscape Study), but this is less apparent in the main AAP.

Comment noted. Paragraph 1.1 is factually correct, this is not the place to insert a statement recognising the value of the Cambridge Green Belt.

Preface

Background

3690 - Cambridgeshire County Council

Object

2nd Paragraph - Policy P9/2c has been saved separately from the Regional Spatial Strategy, not within it, as is stated.

Noted.

Amend the text to "... the East of England Plan, and has been saved as of 27 September 2007."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2. Vision, Objectives & Development Principles				
<i>NWI: Vision</i>				
3363 - Girton Parish Council	Object	In the present climate, the vision should explicitly include a zero-carbon, zero-waste development. The thinking over the "revised Green Belt" is incoherent and self-contradictory. The development should be regulated such that it is almost entirely developed in connection with University and college activities and non-university employment provision should be disallowed except for essential infrastructure such as schools.	The Vision requires the development to "embody the best practice in environmental quality" which is confirmed in the policies in the Natural Resources Chapter. The AAP recognises that there will be impact on the Green Belt, and this has been a major consideration in the Site and Setting Chapter; it is important that the principle of the importance of the Green Belt is included in the Vision. The balance of University and non-University employment is a matter for the Employment and University Uses Chapter rather than the Vision.	Pursue preferred option NW1.
3893 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	The Cambridge Green Belt exists because of the historic importance of Cambridge. Its role is both to protect the character of the city, as well as its setting. There should be an explicit reference in the vision and objectives to preservation of the wider historic character of Cambridge as well as to the specific historic interest of the site and its surroundings.	The importance of the Green Belt is accepted and has been a major consideration in the redefining of its boundaries through the Site and Setting Chapter. It is recognised that the Green Belt has a wider significance than the immediate locality and therefore it is appropriate for the Vision to refer to the contribution the new quarter can make to the unique character of Cambridge.	Pursue preferred option NW1. Revise last sentence of Vision to read: "A revised Green Belt and a new landscaped urban edge will preserve the unique character of Cambridge, enhance its setting and maintain the separate identity of Girton village."
3913 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	The housing will extend to the M11 and A14 all round Cambridge and we will lose all our open spaces despite what the environmental impact statement say, and what of improved public transport, congestion charges and general access too!	Concerns noted, however the AAP is not proposing to develop out to the M11 and does include substantial areas of new public open space in place of agricultural land with no or very restricted public access.	Pursue preferred option NW1.
3843 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)	Object	USS agrees with this vision and development aspirations to meet the current and future needs of the University of Cambridge. However, USS encourages the consideration of the potential to permit redevelopment of sites for university-related purposes outside the Area Action Plan boundary, particularly with regards to housing. This would disperse such development and provide opportunities for university related uses in alternative locations to that bounded by the AAP, ensuring that the ability of other landholders within Cambridge to deliver university related uses is not hindered by the vision of the AAP.	Note the support for the vision. The Area Action Plan can however only plan for land within its boundary. The USS should make separate representations concerning land outside the boundary of the AAP in relation to appropriate Development Plan Documents.	Pursue preferred option NW1.
3908	Object	Girton village must keep its identity.	Concern noted, however the vision does include a specific reference to the need to maintain the separate identity of Girton village.	Pursue preferred option NW1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3731	Object	I object to the vision statement. Too much emphasis is given to possible future needs of the University at the expense of existing communities, including current members of the university. The creation of large University quarters is out of keeping with the historic development of the University. Cambridge is not a campus university but has buildings spread throughout the city. The proposed development does not provide sufficient separation between Girton village and the new buildings. The designation of the area in South Cambs adjacent to Huntingdon Road houses as "South Girton" puts that part of Girton in an ambiguous position.	<p>The emphasis in the Vision on the University reflects the fact that the land is only being released from the Green Belt to meet the needs of the University. At the same time however, it also recognises that it should meet the needs of the wider city community and refers to the need to respect the separate identity of Girton village. Historically, the University has been spread throughout the older parts of the City, but increasingly has been on dedicated sites such as west of Queens Road and at West Cambridge. North West Cambridge, although a new University Quarter, will also include non-University developments making it a mixed development rather than a campus. The issue of separation with Girton village is amplified in the Site and Setting Chapter, and further detail in the Vision would not be appropriate.</p> <p>The reference to 'South Girton' in paragraph 3.8 was intended to be helpful as a shorthand way of describing the development to the west of the north-south green gap, but the term was not subsequently used in the document. It can therefore be deleted without any detriment.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW1.</p> <p>Delete the reference to 'Girton South' in paragraph 3.8.</p>
3326	Object	I would like to object to brutal architectural designs such as the flats in Charles Babbage Road.	Concern noted. The vision does include reference to the development being of the highest quality.	Pursue preferred option NW1.
3585	Object	It is not clear how the two stated principles of, firstly, viewing the whole site together as a new University quarter and secondly, preserving the separation of Girton from Cambridge, can be reconciled. The Plan should ensure adequate green separation between the established built-up area of Girton and Cambridge City, in line with longstanding policies against City extension which envelops neighbouring villages. The Plan also fails to acknowledge the risk of exacerbating existing flooding problems in Girton and Oakington.	<p>The plan will achieve these objectives by planning for the site as a whole whilst maintaining an appropriate green separation between Cambridge and the village of Girton. Policy NW2 section 3, is concerned with flooding and flood risk matters.</p> <p>These matters are considered in detail in the relevant Chapters (Site and Setting and Natural Resources).</p>	Pursue preferred option NW1.
3917 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Support	Although I share many of the concerns above re public transport, access and green spaces, Cambridge is going to grow, and this is somewhat more 'infill' than other options - also it is driven by the University and they own the land!	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3367 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>The University supports the creation of a new University quarter with which to meet their long term development needs. The new University quarter will create a sustainable community and will assist adjacent communities with additional services and facilities.</p> <p>The new development will assist the University, Cambridge and the Sub-Region to become a centre of excellence and a world leader within the fields of higher education and research, whilst addressing the University's long-term development needs to 2021 and beyond.</p>	<p>The Vision reflects the principle that the land is only being released from the Green Belt because of the needs of the University. Historically, University buildings have been spread throughout the City, but increasingly University developments have been on dedicated sites such as west of Queens Road and at West Cambridge. The development of a new University Quarter reflects the opportunity provided by the University ownership of this locality which will make it deliverable. Nevertheless, it will include some non-University development which will make it a mixed development rather than a campus. The issue of separation with Girton is dealt with in detail in the Site and Setting Chapter and it is not appropriate to elaborate further in the Vision.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW1.
<i>d.</i>				
3692 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The Footnote reference to the Glossary for sui generis should appear here, where the term first appears, in addition to Policy NW8.</p>	<p>Disagree because to do so would reduce the conciseness of the Area Action Plan.</p>	
<i>f.</i>				
3359 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The University has identified a hotel as one of the mix of uses to be provided at the site, but the Preferred Options Report makes no reference to hotel development. Provision of a hotel at the site will provide accommodation for visitors to the University both at North West Cambridge and other locations. There is an opportunity to provide extended stay suites which could, for example, provide accommodation for visiting academics.</p>	<p>Disagree . The acceptability of a hotel proposal on this site would however need to be demonstrated in terms of its contribution to meeting the long term development needs of Cambridge University. If in future such a need is demonstrated, the objectives of the AAP at d) include reference to creating a satisfactory mix of uses taking into account identified University development needs and paragraph 2.2 at point f) refer to the University aspiration for hotel and conference facilities. These would provide a context for considering the appropriateness of hotel use.</p>	
<i>g.</i>				
3423	Object	<p>There must also be sufficient medical and nursing facilities provided for those living or working on the site</p>	<p>Agreed, but health issues are already addressed by the AAP through objectives b) and m) relating to community facilities, preferred policy option NW20 which requires the provision of high quality services and facilities and by the glossary entry for community facilities which explicitly includes provision for health.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>2.3</i>				
3691 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	This paragraph is unnecessary as the point is already made in Paragraph 2.1	Agree that this point is already made in paragraph 2.1.	Delete paragraph 2.3.
3740	Support	The point cannot be made too forcefully that the University needs to demonstrate beyond all reasonable doubt that the development is needed and not just desirable.	Support noted.	
<i>Objectives of the Area Action Plan</i>				
3894 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	The Cambridge Green Belt exists because of the historic importance of Cambridge. Its role is both to protect the character of the city, as well as its setting. There should be an explicit reference in the vision and objectives to preservation of the wider historic character of Cambridge as well as to the specific historic interest of the site and its surroundings.	Concern noted. It is recognised that the Green Belt has a wider significance than the wider locality, and therefore it is appropriate for the Vision to refer to the contribution that the new quarter can make to the unique character of Cambridge. Furthermore, paragraph 3.2 sets out the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.	Revise last sentence of the Vision to read: "A revised Green Belt and a new landscaped urban edge will preserve the unique character of Cambridge, enhance its setting and maintain the separate identity of Girton village."
3636 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The inclusion of references to exemplars of sustainable development and adaptation to climate change are supported, as are the other objectives, with the exception of Objective i, which should read "To maintain the purposes of the Green Belt in those parts of the plan area not proposed for development".	Support is noted. In respect of Green Belt objectives it is not considered appropriate to restrict the objectives to the land which will remain in the Green Belt as the objective needs to be used in the process of determining which areas should be developed and which should remain Green Belt.	
<i>f)</i>				
3907	Object	Architecture - no 'Russian type' tenement blocks (as seen on Cambridge West Site close to the Vet School). Many adverse comments at Girton presentation. Architecture should be in keeping with surrounding area.	Concern noted, however objective f) is seeking to secure high quality developments of both built form and open space and not promote unsuitable development.	
3696 - Natural England	Support	This should be an essential aim of the development, especially with regard to multi-functional open space for both people and wildlife	Support noted.	
<i>g)</i>				
3744	Object	In the light of the confusion in officers' minds about the relationship with Girton village and the significance of the "Girton gap" this is meaningless persiflage.	Disagree, the objective is simply reflecting good planning practice in saying that the development should link to Cambridge and Girton in a respectful way. This in the context of objective k) which is to maintain appropriate separation between Cambridge and the village of Girton to maintain village character and identity.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>h)</i>				
3365 - Girton Parish Council	Object	This should be replaced by explicit mention to the Government's "Manual for Streets" and its hierarchy of users, putting the needs of the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists above those of motorists. The figure of 40% needs justification and an explanation of how the proposed policies would meet it; plus an indication of the resulting policies if the goal is not achieved.	Concern noted. It would be an inappropriate level of detail to refer to "Manual for Streets" in the objectives, but this and other guidance would be used in developing detailed design. The Councils support user hierarchies which are defined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan 2003, for 3 areas. Transport Corridors, Urban areas and rural areas. In all but transport corridors, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and considered before vehicles. The North West Transport Study contains a justification of the predicted modal split, and sets out the measures needed to achieve it (in particular at paragraphs 7.11 to 7.15). In summary these revolve around measures to increase the number of trips made by public transport, walking and cycling. The study considers that this modal split can be accommodated on the current road network with suitable mitigation measures.	
3737	Object	40% of trips by car is far too many. Research by local traffic surveys shows that at peak times a large fraction of the traffic on the Huntingdon Rd is generated from Girton - a settlement of only 1500 houses. The road is already over capacity and cannot cope with the predicted car traffic generated by the development.	Noted but disagree as Objective (h) with a 40% modal split for cars is considered a realistic target. The North West Transport Study concluded that with a modal split of 40%, developments in the quadrant would not overload the road network, as long as suitable mitigation measures were in place.	
3732 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Cambridge Preservation Society considers that as part of this objective not only commuter transport but also recreational transport needs to be covered. Thus suggested is addition of "equestrian routes" and that all walking/cycling/equestrian routes and public transport better connect "the new urban extension with the urban and rural areas and include connected spinal, radial and orbital routes". ALSO ref Chapter 6. Overall high quality design must be ensured so that all users have usage of safer routes and existing and new greenspaces do not become eroded by merely becoming linear busy/hectic transport corridors with relaxing/ recreational purpose and tranquillity lost.	Concern noted. The general principles proposed concerning connectivity are agreed, but detailed route and pathway design and their relationship to green spaces will be part of the masterplanning process. Objective h) and policies NW11 to NW19 are primarily concerned with maximising the use of sustainable transport modes in order to achieve a modal split of no more than 40% of trips by car. In this context reference to maximising equestrian trips would be inappropriate as an objective of the AAP. Their provision is not prevented by the AAP and the practicability and value of their provision can be considered through the masterplanning process.	
3424	Object	Even 40% trips by car will grossly overload the existing and planned road serving the area. Those with young families will inevitably use the car a great deal for everything from shopping (especially if wet), children's activities, family visits etc.	Noted. Concern is understandable but The North West Transport Study concluded that development in this quadrant could be accommodated on the transport network with appropriate mitigation measures in place.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>i)</i>				
3916 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	Does this affect the green belt?	The AAP is intended to provide for the long term development needs of the Cambridge University and to achieve this there must be the release of land from the Green Belt. Objective i) is stating that even in the final AAP the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt will be maintained. These purposes are to preserve the character of Cambridge, maintain and enhance the quality of its setting and to prevent villages merging with one another and with the City.	
<i>j)</i>				
3697 - Natural England	Support	Natural England supports the principle of this objective	Support noted.	
<i>k)</i>				
3366 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The proposed separation is between the two parts of the development. A clear statement is required as to the status of the north-west segment of the development and the Village of Girton, furthermore we do not consider a road with green banks beside it a green separation. It should be a pedestrian and amenity area.	Disagree because the green gap will prevent the merger of Cambridge with the village of Girton which is consistent with one of the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The green gap running from Huntingdon Road to Madingley Road will provide this separation with its width maintained at the north whilst narrowing in the central section in the middle of the site where community facilities and services will be located. The Huntingdon Road gap will still function effectively whilst including a new road, it does not need to be restricted to pedestrian links.	
3723 - john chaplin	Object	The main village of Girton is the other side of the A14. To try and split this site using Girton as an excuse is quite frankly ludicrous. The site should be developed as one unit and for the two councils to have opposing views is quite damaging	Disagree because the green gap is intended to prevent the merger of Cambridge with Girton which is consistent with one of the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt to prevent the City merging with its necklace villages. In addition the green gap includes a large central open space which will provide a valuable amenity resource for residents of the whole development being shielded from the noise of the M11 by built development.	
3735	Support	I strongly support the principle of separation between Girton and Cambridge City. However I do not think the existing plan makes sufficient separation between the whole of Girton (including the houses on Huntingon Road and the Thornton Road area) and the new development.	Support noted. The existing Green Belt gap on the north side of Huntingdon Road, which effectively maintains separation between Girton and Cambridge is carried across to the south of Huntingdon Road at the same width therefore Thornton Road has as much separation as can be achieved, given the location of existing and committed development. The width of this gap of 200m is considered to be adequate to maintain the perception of separation and separate identity.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>l)</i>				
3324	Object	As a general principle cycle parking in public areas, car parks etc. should be provided free of charge in order to encourage cycle use rather than non-sustainable modes of transport. In circumstances where this cannot be delivered, charges should nevertheless be substantially less than the cost of car parking.	Concern noted, however this level of detail would be more appropriately considered in respect of detailed planning applications rather than in respect of the Area Action Plan.	
3909	Object	Much concern over infrastructure - roads, schools. Three proposed large developments north west and east of Girton.	Concern noted, however it is the intention of this objective and of the AAP that development be accompanied by adequate infrastructure provision.	
<i>p)</i>				
3698 - Natural England	Support	Natural England strongly supports the principle of this objective. It is essential that both the integrity of the SSSI is maintained, but also that any development should take opportunities to enhance the site and wider area for biodiversity.	Support noted.	
<i>NW2: Development Principles</i>				
3825 - Highways Agency	Object	Further detailed transport assessment should be carried out as part of the Masterplan - this should be brought out more clearly in Policies NW2 and NW3. The transport assessments accompanying individual planning applications should then only have to resolve what are essentially matters of detail.	It is accepted that further detailed transport assessments will need to be carried out at the subsequent stages of masterplanning and planning applications. However, this does not require an amendment to the Development Principles of the AAP.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3461 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University has worked extensively with a range of stakeholders on developing its masterplan for this site. The University wishes to continue this relationship in the ongoing development of the proposal. The University actively promotes the proposal for North West Cambridge to be developed as a mixed use development. In accordance with option NW2: Development principles, the University's masterplan provides for a mix of housing tenures, including key worker housing provision, as well as neighbourhood facilities and a school, alongside research and development units and student housing. The University's masterplan will ensure a distinctive balanced, socially inclusive, mixed use development.	Support noted although it must be recognised that the University's current Masterplan has not been approved by the two local planning authorities and will need to be revised to reflect the final form of the AAP.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>a)</i>				
3877 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We strongly welcome the intention that the development will be mixed-use, a key policy instrument that will naturally facilitate lower levels of car usage.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>c)</i> 3775 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Support	The PCT fully supports this principle as it recognises the need for development to be socially inclusive and to create a healthy and safe environment in which to live.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>e)</i> 3741 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	The Cambridge Preservation Society considers that - eg when viewed from Madingley Ridge - it would be beneficial to reduce the visual impact of the M11 (high proportion of tall national freight vehicles). Thus the planting of native hedge/ tree belts would be welcomed to mitigate the visual impact of the M11. Such also could include fully greened noise barriers (using combination climbers and shrubs) and thus also reduce the noise and air pollution of this elevated section of M11 without adversely affecting the setting of Cambridge and enhance the recreational value of the adjacent green corridor along Wash Brook.	Disagree because there is no blanket ban on noise and air quality mitigation measures in policy NW2, the essential policy guidance being that any such measures should not detract from the landscape setting of Cambridge. Land between the M11 and the Madingley ridge does not lie within the AAP area. Hedge and tree planting within this area could be sought but only through negotiations on a planning application for the AAP site, the AAP itself could not require that such provision be made.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>2.</i> 3898 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	The development area will be opposite Girton College, with the junction of the proposed radial route onto Huntingdon Road opposite the college. The scheme must be designed to ensure that there are no adverse impacts in relation either to the grade II* listed building, or to the appreciation of the city at a key gateway into Cambridge. The Landscape Design Associates 'Cambridge Green Belt Study' 2002 provides a helpful analysis of how the historic city is appreciated from routes in - we consider this of critical importance here.	Comment noted. In the interests of concision and to avoid repetition no changes to NW2 are required. Existing planning legislation and guidance (PPG15) include a requirement that authorities considering applications for planning permission for works which affect a listed building have special regard to certain matters, including the desirability of preserving the setting of the building.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>f)</i> 3895 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	Part 2(f) should refer to protection and enhancement of listed buildings and historic landscape features.	Disagree because adequate guidance to protect Listed Buildings exists elsewhere and there is no need to repeat it in the AAP in respect of criteria f). There are no Listed Buildings on-site. Part 3 (m) of policy NW2 provides guidance on the historic landscape. Not all historic landscape features are necessarily worthy of protection and enhancement.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3699 - Natural England	Support	Natural England supports this, and believes it essential that any development proposal fully considers and protects the interest features of the SSSI, and protects and enhances the existing biodiversity on site	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>g)</i>				
3445	Object	Existing trees, bushes and hedges on the site should be preserved and those along the backs of the gardens of houses on Huntingdon Road and All Souls Lane adjacent to the site must not be destroyed, damaged, disturbed or diminished in size.	Comment noted. No blanket requirement to preserve all existing trees, bushes and hedges on the site can be justified. The policy does require the creation of a high quality landscape framework and that the historic environment be incorporated into the development as appropriate. Part s) of the policy seeks to protect trees on the development site.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3700 - Natural England	Support	Natural England supports this aim	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>h)</i>				
3778 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Support	We fully support the need to provide safe and convenient access for all people	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>i)</i>				
3425	Object	Little or no thought seems to have been given, (from responses to my questions at the meeting that I attended) to how crime might be minimised. With access to the M11 and other main roads so close serious thought must be given to this aspect before plans are finalised. This is an area rife with burglaries.	Disagree, because criteria i) is concerned to ensure designs and layouts that minimise opportunities for crime. There will be no significant change to access to the M11 and the A14. In some respects the security of existing dwellings on the fringe of the site may improve because they will often back onto other residential curtilages rather than onto open farmland.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3781 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Support	This principle is also important because of the impact that crime and fear of crime can have on people's health.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>3.</i>				
3896 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	There is no reference to adjacent listed buildings under part 3, despite the proximity of listed buildings including the Grade II* listed Girton College. We are concerned that there is a lack of reference to listed buildings in the document as a whole, despite reference in the previous Issues & Options document.	Concern noted. Listed Buildings are the subject of Government policy guidance in PPG15 with regard to development which may affect their setting. This is already a material consideration to be taken into account in the determination of planning applications. Nevertheless reference to Listed Buildings can be added under section 3, r) of policy NW2.	Pursue preferred option NW2. That point (r) is amended to read "on adjacent conservation areas and listed buildings".

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>k)</p> <p>3498 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA)</p> <p>3295 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA)</p> <p>3297</p> <p>3415</p> <p>3455</p> <p>3327</p> <p>3403</p> <p>3426</p> <p>3440</p> <p>3490</p> <p>3513</p> <p>3524</p> <p>3537</p> <p>3550</p> <p>3582</p> <p>3598</p> <p>3610</p> <p>3622</p> <p>3702 - Lettering Arts</p> <p>3802</p> <p>3869</p>	Object	<p>In order to assure the protection of residential amenity, two members of the 19 Acre Field Residents' Association will be included in all current and future Cambridge City and joint Cambridge-South Cambridgeshire committees planning and evaluating aspects of the development of the site. This should be changed to read .. "Primacy will be given to protecting and enhancing the amenities of the residents of the houses along Huntingdon Road and Storey's Way, and residents of these existing adjoining houses to the site will be directly consulted at every stage of the development process."</p> <p>Almost no attention has been devoted to protecting the amenity of existing adjoining residents, while concern has been lavished on protecting the green belt and maintaining the urban edge. Gardens of existing adjoining houses are important wildlife sanctuaries that should be linked to adjacent garden/sanctuaries on the site.or where it is deemed that the amenity of residents in Huntingdon Road/All Souls Lane have not been protected and there has been insufficient evidence of active consultation and engagement of the 19 Acre field residents association.</p>	<p>Disagree because the Council has an adopted policy towards community participation in the planning process in its Statement of Community Involvement. This states how and when the City Council will involve the community and key stakeholders in preparing, altering and reviewing its plans and guidance for future development, and how and when it will involve the community in planning applications. The SCI is subject to public consultation and public examination by a Government Inspector before being found to be 'sound'. It would not be appropriate to depart from this adopted policy in the AAP. The AAP cannot amend the Council Constitution or democratic practices with regard to membership of its policy and regulatory committees. Most meetings of City Council Committees are open to the public but as members of the public not as elected members of that Committee with voting rights.</p> <p>Criteria k) of policy NW2 properly identifies residential amenity as being an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications. This consideration does not only apply to houses on Huntingdon Road, Storey's Way but also to Lansdowne Road and Conduit head Road and will also apply in respect of newly built houses on site when further developments are proposed.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3563	Support	<p>Very important. But it is hard to see how the proposal could fail to have an adverse impact on residential amenity, so does this bullet have any real purpose?</p>	<p>Support noted. Section 3 of policy NW2 makes it clear that development is not expected to have no impact upon residential amenity, but that any adverse impact should not be unacceptable. Clearly in some respects development could bring improvements to residential amenity in terms of better access to shops, public open space, and community facilities, and improvements to the local transport system including better cycling and walking links and new public transport services.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>n)</i>				
3921 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA)	Object	Nothing should be done to encroach on, overshadow, disturb the peace and tranquility or alter in any way the character of the Ascension Parish Burial Ground. The burial ground is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and it is also of great historical interest. It is the resting place of many Cambridge notables and contains the graves of Ludwig Wittgenstein and members of the Darwin family. Tourists frequently visit the burial ground, and it is a place frequented by local people for quiet reflection or historical interest or for a walk along its winding paths.	Disagree because the site is not an SSSI. The City Council has decided nevertheless that it should be included within an expanded Conservation Area number 7 which will require the impact of developments upon it to be taken into account as material considerations. The policy refers to this aspect at criteria 3 r).	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3701 - Natural England	Support	Natural England welcomes this aim	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>o)</i>				
3368 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Any increase in flood risk would be adverse. There is already a body of evidence that flooding in Girton, Oakington and beyond is becoming a frequent occurrence, suggesting that our water courses are already above capacity.	Disagree because the policy does not say that an increase in flood risk would be acceptable. The developer will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment with their planning application. In line with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25, the site specific assessment will be required to demonstrate how all types of flood risk to the development itself and flood risk to others will be managed now and taking climate change into account.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>q)</i>				
3742	Object	The existing roads are already overloaded. An accident or road works anywhere in the vicinity causes even longer delays, because there are very few alternatives for diverted traffic. The traffic predicted from this site will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the traffic movements.	Concern noted. Detailed work in Transport Assessments at outline planning permission stage will help decide suitable mitigating measures. If these measures or the traffic impact which remains from the development are unacceptable than planning permission would not be granted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3369 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Any increase in traffic is adverse. What criteria inform this proposal? If the impact were proved to be adverse would planning permission be withdrawn, or permission for subsequent stages withheld?	Concern noted. Detailed work in Transport Assessments at outline planning permission stage will help decide suitable mitigating measures. If these measures or the traffic impact which remains from the development are unacceptable than planning permission would not be granted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
3914 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	This will have a big transport impact on the city and surrounding area.	Concern noted. Detailed work in Transport Assessments at outline planning permission stage will help decide suitable mitigating measures. If these measures or the traffic impact which remains from the development are unacceptable than planning permission would not be granted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3427	Object	Madingley and Huntingdon Roads can hardly cope with local traffic movement at present and with no plan to improve these roads - they can't in any case be widened - the 40% extra traffic flow envisaged will place an intolerable strain on these attractive conduits into the city.	Concern noted. Detailed work in Transport Assessments at outline planning permission stage will help decide suitable mitigating measures. If these measures or the traffic impact which remains from the development are unacceptable than planning permission would not be granted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>r)</i>				
3897 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	We suggest that point (r) on page 13 is amended to read "on adjacent conservation areas and listed buildings".	Agree because this would be consistent with the way that Conservation Areas are already treated in the policy.	Pursue preferred option NW2. That point (r) is amended to read "on adjacent conservation areas and listed buildings".
3564	Support	Note that this will be a significant issue when moving to later stages of planning process in respect of the Storey's Way Conservation Area bordering the southern edge of the site	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>s)</i>				
3565 3821	Support	Support. Existing trees must be protected. Also this bullet should extend to recognising existing mixed planting as providing both diversity and forming part of the spatial separation	Support noted. Further protection will be derived from criteria f) concerned with biodiversity and historic landscape features.	Pursue preferred option NW2.
<i>4.</i>				
3823	Object	Light pollution must be avoided, and excessive lighting of footpaths, roads and cycleways should be prevented. Well-designed modern lighting has no need to illuminate the sky, wasting energy and blocking the sight of the stars. So-called "feature lighting" of buildings and artworks should be banned. The site is close to the observatory used for public education in astronomy, which would be seriously affected by such lighting. It also impacts on the amenity of the existing houses.	Agree that light pollution should be minimised. Parts 3 and 4 of the policy are already relevant in this regard with respect of residential amenity, the quality of the urban edge and that new developments should not be exposed to unacceptable levels of light pollution. A lighting strategy will be required as set out in paragraph 2.8. This paragraph text could usefully clarify that the impact of outdoor lighting from the development on the operations of the astronomical observatories should be considered with a view to minimising any negative impacts.	Pursue preferred option policy NW2 but insert revised text after the fourth sentence of paragraph 2.8 to read: "The Lighting Strategy should also consider the impact of outdoor lighting from the development on the operation of the Institute of Astronomy Observatory at Madingley Road, with a view to minimising any negative impacts".

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2.7				
3296 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3298 3416 3453 3328 3404 3428 3441 3491 3514 3526 3538 3551 3581 3599 3611 3623 3703 - Lettering Arts 3804 3870	Object	<p>This should be changed to read..."and wherever possible brings benefits to the area. This should be achieved by directly consulting with residents of the existing adjoining houses on Huntingdon Road, Storey's Way and All Souls Lane and Residents Groups and taking into account their concerns about the heights, forms and purposes of buildings and structures near the edges of the site and in the immediate distance from the site's edges." The development principles...</p> <p>This should be changed to read "... to ensure an integrated scheme that directly consults with residents of existing adjoining houses and takes into account their concerns with the heights, forms, and purposes of buildings near the edges of the site on local amenity, and wherever possible enhances that local amenity."</p> <p>Residents of existing adjoining houses will be consulted at all times. Two members of the 19 Acre Field Residents Association will be included as members of all Cambridge City and Cambridge-South Cambridgeshire committees that develop policy and evaluate proposals for the development of this site.</p>	<p>Disagree because the City Council has an adopted policy towards community participation in the planning process in its Statement of Community Involvement. This states how and when the City Council will involve the community and key stakeholders in preparing, altering and reviewing its plans and guidance for future development, and how and when it will involve the community in planning applications.</p> <p>The SCI was subject to public consultation and public examination by a Government Inspector before being found to be 'sound'.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to depart from this adopted policy in the AAP.</p> <p>The AAP cannot amend the Council Constitution or democratic practices with regard to membership of its policy and regulatory committees. Most meetings of City Council Committees are open to the public but as members of the public not as elected members of that Committee with voting rights.</p>	
2.8				
3900 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	<p>Additional studies and strategies are needed in relation to the historic environment. Archaeological investigations of the area should be carried out before planning permission is granted. A strategy for addressing any archaeological remains should also be provided before permission is granted. This was addressed in Issues & Options document (Option 16.1) but this has disappeared from the current AAP. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be carried out to assess any masterplan and planning proposal before permission is granted. This is important give the need to maintain the historic character and setting of Cambridge.</p> <p>We suggest that a list of supporting documents required with any planning applications should be provided at the end of the AAP, perhaps in Section 10.</p>	<p>Disagree because the AAP is not intended to detail all the supporting evidence and documentation that will be required from developers at planning application stage. Policy references to archaeology and the historic environment and landscape are provided in policy NW2 Development Principles.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>2.10</i>				
3785 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Support	We support the need for a Health Impact Statement on major development proposals but would suggest that the scope and form of the Statement should be first agreed with the local Primary Care Trust. In some circumstances, assesment of the relevant Health Impacts can be incorporated into the Environmental Impact assessment.	Support noted, clearly the PCT will be an important stakeholder in the appraisal process but it would be unreasonable to require that the Health Impact Statement be subject to prior approval before its submission to the Local Planning Authorities.	
<i>2.11</i>				
3429	Object	Every proposal must in addition appreciate the uniqueness of the individual houses along Huntingdon Road and in All Souls' Lane and the houses on the edge of the site in particular must fit in with them.	Disagree with the proposed change because these concerns are already adequately addressed by the wording of paragraph 2.11 and policy NW2.	
3515	Object	Residents affected by the proposals must be consulted through the nominated body, 19 acre field residents association	Comment noted. Public consultations on developments will be as appropriate to the nature and scale of the development proposed and in any event will be in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Consultation is likely to include, but not be limited to, local interest groups.	
<i>NW3: Implementing the Area Action Plan</i>				
3826 - Highways Agency	Object	Further detailed transport assessment should be carried out as part of the Masterplan - this should be brought out more clearly in Policies NW2 and NW3. The transport assessments accompanying individual planning applications should then only have to resolve what are essentially matters of detail.	The Transport Assessment will be a critical part of the planning process subsequent to the adoption of the AAP. An appropriate reference to this will be included in the travel section of the AAP.	Pursue preferred option NW3. Add a new paragraph to the travel section to read: " A Transport Assessment will be required alongside the planning application to allow the travel impact to be properly assessed and adequately mitigated. This will include mitigation against environmental impacts, such as noise, pollution and impact on amenity and health."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3462 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the principle of developing a masterplan to establish development principles. The University wants to work in collaboration with the Councils to establish this masterplan framework and implement Design Guidelines and Design Codes. Design Codes will support all stages of delivery of the masterplan, developed in conjunction with the Councils and in accordance with the recently published Design Codes for Major Development Sites within the Cambridge Area. The codes will also set parameters for the nature of development along the built edge. The design codes will help to ensure that a high quality accessible development is achieved.	The support for the need for a Masterplan is welcomed, although it will need to reflect the final form of the AAP. It is helpful that the University as the major landowner/developer wishes to work in collaboration with the Councils.	Pursue preferred option NW3.
<i>I.</i>				
3502 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3299 3417 3456 3330 3405 3430 3442 3493 3527 3539 3552 3600 3612 3624 3704 - Lettering Arts 3806 3871	Object	Change to 1...and must be part of an outline planning application. "Residents of existing adjoining properties to the site will be directly consulted in the development of the Masterplan, and two members of the 19-Acre Field Residents' Association will be members of all Cambridge or joint Cambridge-South Cambridgeshire committees formulating or evaluating that Masterplan."	Disagree because the Council has an adopted policy towards community participation in the planning process in its Statement of Community Involvement. This states how and when the City Council will involve the community and key stakeholders in preparing, altering and reviewing its plans and guidance for future development, and how and when it will involve the community in planning applications. The SCI was subject to public consultation and public examination by a Government Inspector before being found to be 'sound'. It would not be appropriate to depart from this adopted policy in the AAP. The AAP cannot amend the Council Constitution or democratic practices with regard to membership of its policy and regulatory committees. Most meetings of City Council Committees are open to the public but as members of the public not as elected members of that Committee with voting rights.	Pursue preferred option NW3.

Figure 2.1: Concept Diagram

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 2.1: Concept Diagram</i>				
3319	Object	<p>The northern section of the development will effect a visually sensitive landscape. The existing housing on Huntingdon Road extended the city in this respect in the past, but due to it's age has become a skyline of of trees rather than buildings. The difference in visual terms between building above or below the 20m contour is, to say the least, marginal.</p> <p>The development can be relocated to another part of the site.</p>	<p>Agree that the northern part of the site is visually sensitive as it is prominent in views from the west. However, the David Brown Study indicated that if development were largely limited to above the 20m contour, the slope in front of development would remain which is important as part of the setting of Cambridge. Careful consideration at the Masterplanning stage should ensure appropriate landscaping and the creation of a distinctive "Cambridge" edge to this development which would be sympathetic with the character of the City. Disagree that development could be located elsewhere on site. The land adjoining the existing Park and Ride site on Madingley Road is important to maintain a green corridor running into the City from the west and is located very close to the M11 which is a source of noise pollution.</p>	
3736 - David Wilson Estates & the Consortium of Landowners	Object	<p>Notations B1 and B2 do not reflect current discussions between David Wilson Estates in relation to the development of land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge and Cambridgeshire County Council as the relevant Local Highway Authority.</p>	<p>Disagree because notations B1 and B2 do provide a clear indication of the conceptual locations for access to Huntingdon Road.</p>	
3728 - john chaplin	Object	<p>I think there is far too much green belt land along the M11 road. It would be better for the research buildings etc to be placed along the M11 to provide a barrier for the residential areas. By creating more green belt land along the M11 you are compressing the residential areas and making the density greater which is not good for persons occupying the houses</p>	<p>Disagree because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Green Belt land is important to the setting of the City. 2. Research and Development Buildings would only function as an effective barrier if they were close to the M11 and could effectively form a continuous barrie. 3. Experience at Arbury Camp has shown that it is difficult to deliver such barrier development in phase with residential behind. This has resulted in a need for unsightly acoustic barriers alongside the A14 which need to be avoided alongside the M11. 4. There is no evidence to show that the lower the density of housing development the better it is for the residents. What is true however is that low density housing is an inefficient use of land. 	

Figure 2.1: Concept Diagram

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3899 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	The strip of land fronting Huntingdon Road is extremely significant in terms of providing an important entrance/gateway into Cambridge. This is shown as development in the north-west corner of the site. The land has a low, agricultural character, with some interesting [though undesignated] historic buildings at University Farm. The land provides an important setting to the grade II* listed Girton College opposite. The college, although set back from Huntingdon Road, currently has a green setting to the north and west which is significant. Development along this strip of land should either be of very low density, or kept in agricultural use.	Disagree because the land identified in the AAP at the northern end of Huntingdon Road has already been developed for agricultural and other buildings, all being within the use of the University. Agree that the development of this land should properly take into account its importance to the setting of Girton College and its importance as a gateway Cambridge. Policy NW2 already requires decision makers to consider the quality of the urban edge in their considerations.	
3748	Object	The "Radial Route" is shown as passing through the strategic gap. This will invalidate all the arguments put forward stressing the Gap's importance as a separator.	Disagree because the road would not prevent the north-south green gap providing an effective separation between Cambridge and Girton.	
3362 - University of Cambridge	Object	The Concept Diagram excludes access from Madingley Rise, which has always been part of the University's development proposals. Madingley Rise will provide access to development to the east of the site and will help to distribute traffic evenly to the local road network.	Disagree because the Concept Diagram must be read in conjunction with policy NW13 Vehicular Access. This policy does not specify the number or locations of vehicular access points except to state that there should be no such access from Storey's Way. The intention is to minimise the number of access points consistent with the form of development being proposed. This would not prevent access through the University Observatories if this is justified.	Amend the wording of paragraph 6.5 to read: A limited number of vehicular accesses are proposed in order to limit the impact upon the key radial corridors of Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road. A maximum of two accesses from Huntingdon Road are proposed. One main access from Madingley Road is proposed for general traffic, as indicated on the Concept Diagram and Preferred Highway Option Diagram (Figure 6.1). A secondary vehicular access into the development from Madingley Road may be required to serve the eastern part of the site using the existing route through the University Observatories.

Figure 2.1: Concept Diagram

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3752 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Cambridge Preservation Society objects to the concept diagram 2.1: central green spaces should be wider/bigger to not only create the Girton Gap but importantly to ensure high quality recreational space, which is not blighted by motorway noise and pollution. Therefore it is suggested to further move back the proposed local centre and taking the overall development lower down the ridge NE of Wash Brook. It is considered that such would still retain and enable enhancement (using adequate mitigation planting) of the Setting of the City and create long-term much higher quality living environment for local people and still benefit wildlife.	Disagree because extending the development significantly further towards Washpit Brook would affect the setting of the City and would expose development to the noise and pollution arising from the M11. Agree that open green spaces shielded from M11 noise are important. This is one reason why the north-south strategic gap opens out at the core of the site to provide just such an area which is of a significant size, approximately equivalent to 400 metres by 300 metres.	
3635 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	On balance, the development footprint and the intention to shield the centre and adjoining green space from the M11 is supported.	Support noted.	

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action****3. Site and Setting****NW4: Site and Setting**

3505 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA)	Object	Support for Option 10.1. It is felt that the 68ha site chosen as the preferred option is too small to accommodate Cambridge University's needs and will lead to overly dense development of the site. There is particular concern that taller terraces or apartments with limited or no gardens will be built along the edges of the site, thus harming local amenity especially to those adjoining the site. A larger site will allow for the creation of a less densely built area and the creation of larger green spaces within the site.	<p>The site footprint takes into account a wide range of interests including the degree to which the University's needs can be met and the importance of the Green Belt purposes in this location. Indeed, this area was identified during the preparation of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan as performing important Green Belt functions such that it should not be released for general development. However, in the light of evidence of need presented by the University, a lack of suitable alternative locations, and the importance of the University to Cambridge, the Structure Plan identified that land should be released from the Green Belt between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road specifically to help provide for the University's long term development needs, and only brought forward for development when the need arises. Notwithstanding this, the Councils have looked again at the site footprint and determined that there is some scope to amend it to provide a sensible development area whilst respecting the AAP objectives (which include maintaining Green Belt purposes). This would increase the developable area by around 3.9 hectares whilst maintaining a large central open space within the site of approximately 400 metres by 300 metres.</p> <p>Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development of North West Cambridge, with the aim that development takes account of its surroundings, including existing buildings, open spaces and existing urban and village edges to ensure that development does not harm local amenity and where possible brings benefits to the area. Policy NW5 requires that development is of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing. It will be for the subsequent masterplanning process and planning application stages to take this forward in designing the development to achieve appropriate landscaping on the edge of the development and to safeguard the amenity of existing properties. Masterplanning will also consider how best to protect the character of existing features of interest including the Ascension Parish Burial Ground.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW4 with the developable area increased by 3.9 ha as shown on the revised Proposals Map and Concept Diagram.
3300				
3458				
3457				
3331				
3406				
3431				
3443				
3496				
3516				
3528				
3553				
3583				
3601				
3613				
3625				
3705 - Lettering Arts				
3808				
3872				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3638 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	The area identified on the Concept Diagram for development is insufficient to accommodate the 2,500 homes, student housing, research & development buildings and neighbourhood facilities that is currently proposed by the North West Area Action Plan. The proposed development area must be configured in a way that it can be used efficiently to meet requirements set out elsewhere in the Draft Area Action Plan. At present, this configuration appears awkward and intrinsically uneconomic. It is also important that development area accounts for any constraints, for example ecological constraints, again in ensuring that development requirements can be met.	Disagree in that the NW AAP is not required to accommodate the full extent of the development aspirations of Cambridge University in this location, but to address these aspirations alongside consideration of maintaining Green Belt purposes. In relation to housing the University has indicated an indicative requirement for 2,000 to 2,500 dwellings and the AAP can provide, on the site footprint proposed, for a figure within this range as well as providing for a local centre, schools, open spaces, employment and academic floorspace and accommodation for students. Notwithstanding this, the Councils have looked again at the site footprint and determined that there is some scope to amend it to provide a sensible development area whilst respecting the AAP objectives (- which include maintaining Green Belt purposes). This would increase the developable area by around 3.9 hectares.	Amend the Concept Diagram to accord with the new site footprint.
3463 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The site footprint identified in PPO NW4 and proposals map is insufficient to meet the needs set out in other policies within the AAP or the future needs of the University, and would result in a poor and inefficient development configuration. In particular, the developable area identified is inadequate to make provision for the delivery of 2,500 homes as well as student housing, research & development buildings and neighbourhood facilities.</p> <p>The University's proposed site footprint can accommodate 2,000-2,500 residential units, 100,000m² research and development floorspace, 2,000 student bedspaces and neighbourhood facilities at a density and form appropriate to this location.</p>	Disagree. In relation to housing the University has indicated an indicative requirement for 2,000 to 2,500 dwellings and the AAP can provide, on the site footprint proposed, for a figure within this range as well as providing for a local centre, schools, open spaces, employment and academic floorspace and accommodation for students. No substantive evidence has been submitted to substantiate the assertion that the configuration is awkward and uneconomic. Notwithstanding this, the Councils have looked again at the site footprint and determined that there is some scope to amend it to provide a sensible development area whilst respecting the AAP objectives (- which include maintaining Green Belt purposes). The resulting density and form of development would be appropriate to the location. This would increase the developable area by around 3.9 hectares.	Amend the Proposals Map and Policy NW4 to accord with the new site footprint.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3637 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The concept of the development of the strategic gap and the central open space is supported, although reference should also be made here or, in the Natural Resources Chapter, to the necessary protection of the Travellers Rest pit SSSI forming part of the central open space.	Disagree as the necessary protection of the Travellers Rest pit SSSI is covered in policy NW 2 part f, which states that development proposals should, as appropriate to their nature, location, scale and economic viability protect and enhance the biodiversity of the site and incorporate historic landscape and geological features. Furthermore, paragraph 2.8 specifically states that studies may be required to consider how best to incorporate the Travellers Rest Pit SSSI into the development. However, in order to provide clarity and avoid any misunderstanding any study looking at the SSSI should not just address noise and air pollution concerns that may arise but should cover a full range of potential adverse impacts and there should be separate studies undertaken to address any impact of noise and air pollution arising from the M11 and A14 on the development in general.	Delete reference to 'noise and air pollution concerns' in paragraph 2.8 and replace with a broader reference to 'any adverse impacts'. Amend paragraph 2.9 which covers noise and air pollution to include reference to 'specific studies should be undertaken to address these concerns'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3566	Object	Deeply flawed. Clear from vol 2 that most arguments pointed to 10.1 - fewest objections. In pandering to South Cambs entrenched position the resulting footprint lacks logic (following an artificial boundary rather than paying attention to the balance of the site). Risks cramming large amount of development into small part of site & putting pressure on having higher densities in the "rural" parts of the City portion, simply in order to appease South Cambs. There's also a risk that northern part of the site will be less amenable to worthwhile development, being relatively narrow for much of its length	<p>The site footprint takes into account a wide range of interests including the degree to which the University's needs can be met and the importance of the Green Belt purposes in this location. Indeed, this area was identified during the preparation of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan as performing important Green Belt functions such that it should not be released for general development. However, in the light of evidence of need presented by the University, a lack of suitable alternative locations, and the importance of the University of Cambridge, the Structure Plan identified that land should be released from the Green Belt between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road specifically to help provide for the University's long term development needs, and only brought forward for development when the need arises. Notwithstanding this, the Councils have looked again at the site footprint and determined that there is some scope to amend it to provide a sensible development area whilst respecting the AAP objectives (which include maintaining Green Belt purposes). This would increase the developable area by around 3.9 hectares.</p> <p>Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development of North West Cambridge, with the aim that development takes account of its surroundings, including existing buildings, open spaces and existing urban and villages edges to ensure that development does not harm local amenity and where possible brings benefits to the area. It will be for the subsequent masterplanning process and planning application stages to take this forward in designing the development to achieve appropriate landscaping on the edge of the development and to safeguard the amenity of existing properties. Masterplanning will also consider how best to protect the character of existing features of interest including the Ascension Parish Burial Ground.</p> <p>It should also be noted that this a joint Area Action Plan and the two Councils have agreed this approach.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW4 with the developable area increased by 3.9 ha as shown on the revised Proposals Map and Concept Diagram.
3901 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Support	The supporting documents to the AAP, specifically the Site Footprint Assessment and the Green Belt Landscape Study, acknowledge the harm caused by the development on the historic landscape. We note that the preferred option (Option E) does seek to limit the harm by restricting the development area to the 20 metre contour, retaining open space to the south.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>3.1</p> <p>3504 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA)</p> <p>3418</p> <p>3454</p> <p>3329</p> <p>3407</p> <p>3432</p> <p>3517</p> <p>3529</p> <p>3554</p> <p>3584</p> <p>3602</p> <p>3614</p> <p>3626</p> <p>3710 - Lettering Arts</p> <p>3809</p>	Object	<p>Add...and only brought forward for development when the need arises. "Existing trees, bushes and hedges on the site will be preserved. Trees, bushes, hedges and walls along the backs of the gardens of existing adjoining and adjacent houses on Huntingdon Road and in All Souls Lane and along the boundaries of the Ascension Parish Burial Ground will not be disturbed, damaged, diminished in size or destroyed, even if some of them are found to be technically situated slightly onto the site.</p>	<p>Concern noted. This is an important consideration but it is a matter of detail which will be addressed at the subsequent masterplanning and planning application stages. Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development at North West Cambridge and in accordance with this policy, planning permission would not be granted where the proposed development or associated mitigation measures would have an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity, on the quality of the urban edge and on protected trees and trees of significance. Furthermore, this policy requires development proposals, as appropriate to their nature, location, scale and economic viability, to provide a high quality landscape framework for the development and its immediate setting.</p>	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

3.2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3586	Object	The proposed development does not comply with the aims of the Structure Plan which requires that the unique character of Cambridge should be preserved as a compact city.	<p>The preferred site footprint takes into account a wide range of interests including the degree to which the University's needs can be met and the importance of the Green Belt purposes in this location. Indeed, this area was identified during the preparation of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan as performing important Green Belt functions such that it should not be released for general development. However, in the light of evidence of need presented by the University, a lack of suitable alternative locations, and the importance of the University to Cambridge, the Structure Plan identified that land should be released from the Green Belt between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road specifically to help provide for the University's long term development needs, and only brought forward for development when the need arises.</p> <p>The preferred option seeks to minimise the intrusion into the open countryside and Green Belt and is well related to the existing built up area and therefore maintains the compact nature of the City.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Councils have looked again at the site footprint and determined that there is some scope to amend it to provide a sensible development area whilst respecting the AAP objectives (- which include maintaining Green Belt purposes). This would increase the developable area by around 3.9 hectares whilst maintaining a large central open space within the site of approximately 400 metres by 300 metres. Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development of North West Cambridge, with the aim that development takes account of its surroundings, including existing buildings, open spaces and existing urban and villages edges to ensure that development does not harm local amenity and where possible brings benefits to the area. Policy NW5 requires that development is of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing. It will be for the subsequent masterplanning process and planning application stages to take this forward in designing the development to achieve appropriate landscaping on the edge of the development and to safeguard the amenity of existing properties. Masterplanning will also consider how best to protect the character of existing features of interest including the Ascension Parish Burial Ground. It should also be noted that this a joint Area Action Plan and the two Councils have agreed this approach.</p> <p>Action</p>	Pursue preferred option NW4 with the developable area increased by 3.9 ha as shown on the revised Proposals Map and Concept Diagram.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3639 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The overall massing of development will need very careful design and landscape treatment to avoid damage to the setting of this part of the urban area.	Support noted. Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development of North West Cambridge, with the aim that development takes account of its surroundings, including existing buildings, open spaces and existing urban and villages edges to ensure that development does not harm local amenity and where possible brings benefits to the area. It will be for the subsequent masterplanning process and planning application stages to take this forward in designing the development to achieve appropriate landscaping on the edge of the development and to safeguard the amenity of existing properties.	
<i>c.</i>				
3819	Object	There is not enough separation of the proposed development from the existing Girton village. Need more green separation to maintain Girton as a village and not part of Cambridge City.	The existing Green Belt gap on the north side of Huntingdon Road, which effectively maintains separation between Girton and Cambridge is carried across to the south of Huntingdon Road at the same width therefore there is as much separation as can be achieved, given the location of existing and committed development. The width of this gap of 200m is considered to be adequate to maintain the perception of separation and separate identity.	
<i>3.3</i>				
3364 - University of Cambridge	Object	The University has worked with the Councils in identifying appropriate viewpoints of the site. Technical studies undertaken on behalf of the University have verified that neither long nor medium distance views of the site are affected by altering the development edge along the M11. The Councils have maintained that the key views are those of drivers on the M11.	The modelling work that was undertaken demonstrated that the preferred University site option would significantly change the character of this area and that the development would be highly visible from a number of viewpoints. Whilst the Site Footprint paper accepted there would be only minimal difference in impact between footprints in long distance views, there would be a greater impact on medium views from the west on Madingley Road and on short distance views from the M11. It is of strategic importance to maintain the Green Belt setting of Cambridge and the modelling work assisted in understanding the impact which a number of site footprint options would have on the Green Belt and particularly its function to maintain the setting of Cambridge as set out in the David Brown Landscape Study. Furthermore, all the identified views of the site are considered important and it should be noted that a very large number of people pass along the M11 on a daily basis and gain their impression of Cambridge and its setting from this vantage point. These people are not confined to drivers but include passengers in cars and public transport including coaches. The Cambridge Local Plan Inquiry Inspector commented that the M11 should have an open space buffer because at present the M11 runs largely through countryside west of Cambridge.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.4 3464 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The emphasis placed on the 20m contour is misleading as the slope rises very gently. The 20m contour is not clearly distinguishable on site, and does not provide the single-most important context for establishing the new urban edge.</p> <p>The visual impact of the development can be mitigated through landscape treatment and the integration of built form within the landscape- and the visual impact is not altered significantly by moving the site boundary nearer to the M11. The screening suggested for lower lying land is one possible mitigation techniques that could be provided at other points on the M11 edge.</p>	<p>Disagree. The David Brown Landscape Study 2006, states that the land to the south of Huntingdon Road rises eastward significantly from the Washpit Brook near the M11 at less than 10 metres AOD to the 20 metre AOD contour and then continues to rise much more gently to just over 25 metres AOD at the University Farm. Effectively, the land east of the 20metres AOD contour is a very gently modulated plateau with several areas of more marked contouring related to human activity, such as gravel and coprolite digging. This area includes part of the medieval "West Field" of Cambridge and includes several fields with visible ridge and furrow, furlong S-shaped field boundaries and a veteran Oak pollard that marks the boundary between the city and the Parish of Girton. This is therefore an area where the history of Cambridge is written on the land and is still legible and contributes substantially to the setting of the City. Whilst the 20m contour does not follow a defined feature on the ground, the slope is a clear visual feature in this area and studies have identified that retaining the slope of Girton Ridge as a green foreground to Cambridge is a very important part of its setting. A key issue is therefore where best to draw the site footprint on what is, in the central portion of the site, a gently rising and modulated slope. Given the importance of this matter to the plan a further review of the site footprint has been carried out as recorded in the Site Footprint Assessment - Supplementary Paper of March 2008. This has determined that there is some scope to amend the footprint in three locations to provide a sensible development area whilst respecting the AAP objectives (which include maintaining Green Belt purposes). The changes retain a green setting to Cambridge by retaining development up the slope. The site footprint boundary utilises visual breaks in slope on the ground where possible. The overall effect would be to increase the developable area by around 3.9 hectares.</p>	<p>Amend the wording of paragraph 3.4 second sentence by deleting the phrase 'generally follows the 20m contour,' Delete reference to the '20m Contour' in the 3rd Sentence and replace with 'Girton ridge'. Amend the wording of the rest of the 3rd sentence as follows after 'Girton ridge': in the southern part of the area, which is less sensitive in views and so has less impact on the purposes of the Green Belt, and which can be screened on this lower lying land through enhancement of existing hedgerows, is included in the site.'</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.5				
3465 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the creation of a high quality and distinctive built edge, though it objects to the containment of the development at the 20m contour (see representation ID 3464). Fundamental to the success of the proposed masterplan is the opportunity to create a high quality urban edge to Cambridge, facing the M11. The landscape treatment of this space is central to achieving this vision. The University plans to ensure the landscape framework is commenced at the same time as built form development.	Support noted. Agree that the development is not fully contained by the 20m contour	Amend the wording of paragraph 3.5 first sentence by deleting the phrase, 'at the 20m contour' and replacing it with, 'towards the top of the Girton Ridge in the central portion of the site.'
3.6				
3389 - University of Cambridge	Support	Supported in principle, with amendments to detail. The University plans include the retention of a strategic gap, a green landscaped corridor which will ensure that the communities of Girton and Cambridge do not coalesce and assist the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment. This green link will enhance valuable habitats and important species populations within and outside the site. The open space allocation will also be used for amenity and recreation uses which will encourage community interaction, social inclusion and a sustainable community. The central location of community services and facilities will assist this cohesion of community.	Support noted.	
3587	Support	I agree with the importance of the Girton Gap as a green separation between Girton parish and Cambridge City	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3753	Support	There must certainly be a clear separation between Girton village and the city. However, much clearer statements are needed that the land to the north-west of the Gap is part of the village, with detailed indications of how it will relate to the rest of the village. Either that, or the statements about the Gap need bringing into line with reality.	<p>Concern noted. Girton village, south of the A14 is an integral part of the community and the strategic gap is important in order to maintain Green Belt separation between Girton and Cambridge. In passing along Cambridge Road, Girton, the road passes over the A14 without interruption and, as the A14 is in a cutting at this point, its impact is limited and there is no severance of the village community.</p> <p>The strategic gap is particularly important at the northern end of the gap near to Huntingdon Road where it links to the Green Belt outside the Area Action Plan on the north side of Huntingdon Road which separates Cambridge from Girton village. Thus, as one passes along Huntingdon Road, the strategic gap is noticeable on both sides of the road and this is important in maintaining the perception of separation. However, the need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. Beyond this, further to the south, the strategic gap narrows to ensure that the two parts of the development have good physical links to provide for a cohesive and sustainable community and to provide high levels of access to centrally located community services and facilities at a new local centre.</p> <p>The AAP acknowledges the importance of the strategic gap in terms of maintaining separation between Girton and Cambridge as well as providing a large central area of open space at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity. However, it is important that the AAP provides a clear statement in order to avoid any misunderstandings as to the precise nature of the strategic gap.</p>	Amend the first part of paragraph 3.7 to read: 'The need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the south side of Huntingdon Road as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap broadens out within the development to create a large open space at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.7 3588	Object	This paragraph conflicts with paragraph 3.6. It is contradictory to say that 'the strategic gap narrows to ensure that the two parts of the development have good physical links to provide for a cohesive and sustainable community' when 3.6 states the importance of the Girton Gap as a green separation between Girton parish and Cambridge city.	<p>Concern noted. Girton village, south of the A14 is an integral part of the community and the strategic gap is important in order to maintain Green Belt separation between Girton and Cambridge. In passing along Cambridge Road, Girton, the road passes over the A14 without interruption and, as the A14 is in a cutting at this point, its impact is limited and there is no severance of the village community.</p> <p>The strategic gap is particularly important at the northern end of the gap near to Huntingdon Road where it links to the Green Belt outside the Area Action Plan on the north side of Huntingdon Road which separates Cambridge from Girton village. Thus, as one passes along Huntingdon Road, the strategic gap is noticeable on both sides of the road and this is important in maintaining the perception of separation. However, the need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. Beyond this, further to the south, the strategic gap narrows to ensure that the two parts of the development have good physical links to provide for a cohesive and sustainable community and to provide high levels of access to centrally located community services and facilities at a new local centre.</p> <p>The AAP acknowledges the importance of the strategic gap in terms of maintaining separation between Girton and Cambridge as well as providing a large central area of open space at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity. However, it is important that the AAP provides a clear statement in order to avoid any misunderstandings as to the precise nature of the strategic gap.</p>	Amend the first part of paragraph 3.7 to read: 'The need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the south side of Huntingdon Road as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap broadens out within the development to create a large open space at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3370 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The language leaves unclear the relationship between the north-west segment and Girton.	<p>Concern noted. Girton village, south of the A14 is an integral part of the community and the strategic gap is important in order to maintain Green Belt separation between Girton and Cambridge. In passing along Cambridge Road, Girton, the road passes over the A14 without interruption and, as the A14 is in a cutting at this point, its impact is limited and there is no severance of the village community.</p> <p>The strategic gap is particularly important at the northern end of the gap near to Huntingdon Road where it links to the Green Belt outside the Area Action Plan on the north side of Huntingdon Road which separates Cambridge from Girton village. Thus, as one passes along Huntingdon Road, the strategic gap is noticeable on both sides of the road and this is important in maintaining the perception of separation. However, the need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. Beyond this, further to the south, the strategic gap narrows to ensure that the two parts of the development have good physical links to provide for a cohesive and sustainable community and to provide high levels of access to centrally located community services and facilities at a new local centre.</p> <p>The AAP acknowledges the importance of the strategic gap in terms of maintaining separation between Girton and Cambridge as well as providing a large central area of open space at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity. However, it is important that the AAP provides a clear statement in order to avoid any misunderstandings as to the precise nature of the strategic gap.</p>	Amend the first part of paragraph 3.7 to read: 'The need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the south side of Huntingdon Road as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap broadens out within the development to create a large open space at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3747	Object	The proposed gap does not appear to preserve the views towards Madingley from Huntingdon Road which are part of the amenity currently enjoyed by local residents. The open spaces should be oriented to preserve as much of the open and pleasant views as possible.	Concern noted. The strategic gap is particularly important at the northern end of the gap near to Huntingdon Road where it links to the Green Belt outside the Area Action Plan on the north side of Huntingdon Road which separates Cambridge from Girton village. Thus, as one passes along Huntingdon Road, the strategic gap is noticeable on both sides of the road and this is important in maintaining the perception of separation. However, the need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. Beyond this, further to the south, the strategic gap narrows to ensure that the two parts of the development have good physical links to provide for a cohesive and sustainable community and to provide high levels of access to centrally located community services and facilities at a new local centre. A number of key views have been taken into consideration when developing the site footprint and although the view from Huntingdon Road to Madingley Road is considered important, the immediate views from the west are considered to be particularly important. These views provide the most obvious impression of the change in topography on this side of the City and will be viewed on an extremely frequent basis by motorist on the M11.	
3390 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University's masterplan has been developed to respond to the ecological, historic and environmental issues as well as local residents' issues and concerns for the site. The masterplan also allows for a strategic gap which enables connections and good physical links across the gap. This ensures that Girton Village retains a separation from Cambridge, yet also allows for connectivity within the NWC site. The University has also worked closely with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridge District Council to ensure a collaborative and joint working approach with both councils on the development of the masterplan.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.8 3755	Object	This is in direct contradiction with 3.6. The Plan cannot be approved until this contradiction is resolved, and a clear understanding of the site and the Girton Gap is spelled out.	<p>Concern noted. Girton village, south of the A14 is an integral part of the community and the strategic gap is important in order to maintain Green Belt separation between Girton and Cambridge. In passing along Cambridge Road, Girton, the road passes over the A14 without interruption and, as the A14 is in a cutting at this point, its impact is limited and there is no severance of the village community.</p> <p>The strategic gap is particularly important at the northern end of the gap near to Huntingdon Road where it links to the Green Belt outside the Area Action Plan on the north side of Huntingdon Road which separates Cambridge from Girton village. Thus, as one passes along Huntingdon Road, the strategic gap is noticeable on both sides of the road and this is important in maintaining the perception of separation. However, the need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. Beyond this, further to the south, the strategic gap narrows to ensure that the two parts of the development have good physical links to provide for a cohesive and sustainable community and to provide high levels of access to centrally located community services and facilities at a new local centre.</p> <p>The AAP acknowledges the importance of the strategic gap in terms of maintaining separation between Girton and Cambridge as well as providing a large central area of open space at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity. However, it is important that the AAP provides a clear statement in order to avoid any misunderstandings as to the precise nature of the strategic gap.</p>	Amend the first part of paragraph 3.7 to read: 'The need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the south side of Huntingdon Road as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap broadens out within the development to create a large open space at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity'.
3391 - University of Cambridge	Object	The Area Action Plan states that the western portion of the North West Cambridge site is unlikely to have direct links with Girton Parish. It is therefore deemed inappropriate to name this part of the site 'Girton South'. It is felt by the University that any references to this name should be eliminated entirely or replaced with 'NWC-West'.	Whilst this was intended to distinguish between Girton village and the new development, agree that this has not proved helpful. The development needs to be considered as a whole and it is important to emphasise the integration between the two parts of the development rather than any distinction.	Delete the last sentence of paragraph 3.8.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3589	Object	3.8 conflicts with 3.6. It is contradictory to say that the development 'will function as an urban extension to the built-up area of Cambridge, to which it will link' and that 'it should be regarded as a new neighbourhood of Cambridge', when 3.6 states the importance of the Girton Gap as a green separation between Girton Parish and Cambridge City.	<p>Concern noted. Girton village, south of the A14 is an integral part of the community and the strategic gap is important in order to maintain Green Belt separation between Girton and Cambridge. In passing along Cambridge Road, Girton, the road passes over the A14 without interruption and, as the A14 is in a cutting at this point, its impact is limited and there is no severance of the village community.</p> <p>The strategic gap is particularly important at the northern end of the gap near to Huntingdon Road where it links to the Green Belt outside the Area Action Plan on the north side of Huntingdon Road which separates Cambridge from Girton village. Thus, as one passes along Huntingdon Road, the strategic gap is noticeable on both sides of the road and this is important in maintaining the perception of separation. However, the need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. Beyond this, further to the south, the strategic gap narrows to ensure that the two parts of the development have good physical links to provide for a cohesive and sustainable community and to provide high levels of access to centrally located community services and facilities at a new local centre.</p> <p>The AAP acknowledges the importance of the strategic gap in terms of maintaining separation between Girton and Cambridge as well as providing a large central area of open space at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity. However, it is important that the AAP provides a clear statement in order to avoid any misunderstandings as to the precise nature of the strategic gap.</p>	Amend the first part of paragraph 3.7 to read: 'The need to maintain separation diminishes with increasing distance from the south side of Huntingdon Road as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap broadens out within the development to create a large open space at the heart of the new development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity'.
3641	Object	I suggest that the local centre be moved a little closer to the Maddingley Road/ Storey's Way area of the city. This part of Cambridge is very poorly served by local services such as shops and schools. Moving the centre a little nearer to this area of Cambridge would increase the viability of shops and other facilities, by increasing the number of people using them. Keeping the local centre as near to this part of Cambridge as possible would also decrease a possible adverse impact on shops on the Histon Road, and in Thornton Close.	Concern noted. The location of the local centre at the heart of the development will assist in bringing together the two parts of the development either side of the strategic gap and thus encouraging the creation of a cohesive community. The location adjacent to the strategic gap with its recreation and amenity function will enhance its attraction as a community focus. The local centre can also provide for some of the needs of those who live or work in neighbouring communities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3749	Object	It is not clear what the status of the land to the north of the gap is. It is in the current parish of Girton, but is being regarded as "a neighbourhood of Cambridge".	Concern noted. Whilst the new development will abut the existing development in Girton Parish that fronts onto Huntingdon Road, it is unlikely to have any direct links with that part of Girton. Therefore, the new development will function as an urban extension to the built up area of Cambridge, to which it will link across the strategic gap and it is not considered as an extension to Girton. The relationship of the proposed development north of the gap with Girton is restricted to the small number of low density large dwellings along the southern frontage of Huntingdon Road. Appropriate treatment of this interface will be a matter for masterplanning. Huntingdon Road and the grounds of Girton College will continue to provide an effective buffer between the proposed development and Girton village.	
3822	Object	The development can not abut the existing Girton village without having an effect on it. Girton village is in danger of becoming part of a neighbourhood of Cambridge. It needs a green separation to stop this.	The existing Green Belt gap on the north side of Huntingdon Road, which effectively maintains separation between Girton and Cambridge is carried across to the south of Huntingdon Road at the same width therefore, there is as much separation as can be achieved, given the location of existing and committed development. The width of this gap of 200m is considered to be adequate to maintain the perception of separation and separate identity.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4. Housing				
<i>NW5: Housing Supply</i>				
3919 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3325 3615	Object	Higher densities should be achieved away from the edges of the site where there are existing adjoining houses in Huntingdon Road and adjacent houses along All Souls Lane. Building heights and densities should rise gradually as one moves away from the site edges near existing adjoining and adjacent houses. The tallest buildings should be located toward the centre of the overall North West Cambridge site, in the area of the local centre, well away from the edges. I would like to object to houses of more than 2 storeys in the 19 Acre Field immediately behind the existing Huntingdon Road houses.	The policy already provides for higher densities in the central part of the site and for development on existing residential edges to to be developed at an appropriate scale and form. Masterplanning will consider issues of density, height and massing in more detail.	Pursue preferred option NW5.
3902 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	Policy NW5 and supporting text proposes higher density development (on average 50dph). The likely negative impact of such development on Cambridge's historic character and setting is a significant concern. We note that this is acknowledged in the AAP, and that existing development along the western edge of the city is relatively low density.	Concern noted. The land is being released from the Green Belt in this location in recognition of the needs of the University - it would not otherwise have been proposed for release. There will be some harm to the setting of Cambridge but the AAP seeks to minimise this harm to an acceptable degree. The proposed development density would not be constant across the site and if it were to be set at a lower level would increase the pressure for a larger site footprint which would further encroach onto land important to the setting of the City. The AAP also recognises the importance of creating a new urban edge which is sympathetic to the character of Cambridge.	Pursue preferred option NW5.
3466 - University of Cambridge	Object	The University supports establishing development guidelines for 2,000-2,500 dwellings and a range of densities across the site. The provision of approximately 2,000 units of student accommodation is supported by the Universities forecasted need. The development of the site will also fulfil housing targets set for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Whilst the University supports PPO NW5 and considers the implementation of Policy NW5 crucial for meeting its future housing needs, the policy is inconsistent with the Preferred Options proposals map. The site footprint should be amended to reflect this and allow for achievable and appropriate housing densities.	Disagree that the approximate dwelling range and proposed student housing provision should not be capable of being met on-site. The policy recognises through the use of the word 'approximate' that the actual capacity of the site will remain uncertain until further detailed masterplanning has been done. Given that the University has identified a need for around 3,400 dwellings for staff by 2016 which is far more than could be accommodated at NW Cambridge there can be no justification for preferring a slightly larger site footprint which would have a greater impact upon Green Belt purposes. University housing needs could not all be accommodated even if all of the housing on site were to be affordable.	Pursue preferred option NW5.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3834	Object	2000 - 2500 houses AND 2000 units for students is very high density. While this is really good for the local centre and transport, it is very important that such a high density doesn't lead to a feeling of lack of space. Will designs be planned with tree planting and views as part of the design spec?	Concern noted. The development will incorporate extensive areas of new public open space including the north-south strategic gap. However, details of tree planting and views are matters to be addressed and secured through masterplanning.	Pursue preferred option NW5.
3768 - Highways Agency	Support	<p>This policy will provide for 2,000 to 2,500 dwellings 'with a priority on providing for University needs' plus 2,000 units of student accommodation. Having developments will only be permitted if they provide at least 50% affordable housing; this is to meet University needs (Policy NW6).</p> <p>The types of residential accommodation proposed in this location should generate significantly fewer car trips than, say, speculative private housing, but we are concerned that the potential impact of this amount of development is not clear. While the Cambridge North West Transport Study (CNWTS) incorporates a sensitivity test with similar amounts of development on the University land, the Preferred Transport Option which emerges appears to be related to a much lower level of development i.e. 1,150 dwellings (Table 7.1 of the Final Report).</p> <p>We support this objective in principle as it advocates the provision of land for housing development in areas where travelling distances are short. We also note the strategy takes into account the availability of sustainable modes of transport, such as buses, walking and cycling within the development sites.</p>	Support noted. The text at paragraph 7.1 relates only to the approved level of development as planned for in the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan but the Cambridge North West Transport Study (CNWTS) itself looked at development of up to 2,500 homes which was the known potential of the site.	Pursue preferred option NW5.
3642 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	There is a danger that, with this level of housing and the University buildings together, the setting of this part of the edge to Cambridge could be so radically changed that damage will occur. The S106 and planning conditions will need to ensure that considerable care and investment is made in the design of buildings and landscaping to avoid adverse impact.	Support noted. The AAP recognises the importance of creating a new urban edge which is sympathetic to the character of Cambridge.	Pursue preferred option NW5.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3844 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)	Support	<p>The Area Action Plan area is bounded to the north and east by adjoining residential areas consisting of large detached houses developed at very low densities. The Area Action Plan identifies that new residential on these boundaries should be developed in a way through scale and form that will enable it to fit in with the adjoining residential.</p> <p>USS supports this approach to sustainable development in terms of form and massing to ensure the boundaries of the AAP are respected and enhanced and that proposed densities are higher in areas of good accessibility. As stated above, USS would also encourage the potential for those sites suitable for university related purposes to be considered in the future.</p>	Support noted. Masterplanning will consider issues of density, height and massing in more detail.	Pursue preferred option NW5.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>3920 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3506 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3301 3419 3459 3332 3408 3433 3446 3497 3518 3530 3540 3555 3567 3580 3603 3621 3629 3627 3810 3873</p>	<p>Object Two-storey houses should be provided adjacent to the site edges with 30 metre long gardens to provide wildlife sanctuaries. Wildlife from this sanctuary will be able to permeate and seed the site while the trees, bushes and hedges on the site are still too small and undeveloped to provide a suitable habitat for this wildlife. It will also help to preserve the peace and tranquility of the Ascension Parish Burial Ground and prevent overshadowing and overlooking of that scared place. Other buildings (no more than two-storeys) that are parts of these edge clusters should be situated so that they are away from the edges and facing the interior of the site. Cambridge University Estate Management has agreed with us on this design after our extensive participation in their masterplanning process in early 2005. We strongly object to the need for an average net housing density of at least 50 dwellings per hectare, as opposed to the 30-40 dph required by the Structure Plan 2003 (Volume 2, NW5: Housing Supply, Response, page 32). A density of 50 dph will produce a development that is much too dense and not sustainable. Infra-structure needs will increase exponentially.</p> <p>Change to...at public transport stops, "and with lower densities and similar heights and form at the edges of the site where there are existing adjoining houses." The higher densities should be achieved away from the edges of the sites where there are existing adjoining houses. Heights and densities should rise very gradually as one moves away from the edges. House clusters adjacent to the edges should site two-storey houses with 30-meter gardens facing the existing houses on Huntingdon Road and Storey's Way and situate anything else away from this edge. This will also create a continuous wildlife sanctuary with the gardens of existing adjoining houses. A density of 50 dph will produce a development that is much too dense and not sustainable. Infra-structure needs will increase exponentially and there would have to be a vast superstore built (with all its necessary supply traffic) to accommodate the needs of this mini-city, almost the size of Cambourne. There should be lower densities at the edges of the site where there are existing adjacent houses, with development in those areas being similar in height and form to the adjacent houses in order to respect their amenity and the visual impact of the development. The phrase 'appropriate scale and form' is too vague and should rather specify a lower density of housing here, with height and form similar to those of</p>	<p>Disagree that development adjoining boundaries of existing residential should have to be developed at very low densities, with 30 metre gardens and be similar in height and form to existing adjoining houses. Such an inflexible policy is not justified. The policy wording already states that development will be of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing and paragraph 4.5 explains this to mean housing which respects the adjoining housing in terms of its scale and form. The protection of the amenity and character of adjoining housing cannot only be achieved in the ways proposed. It is proper to allow future masterplanners and designers some flexibility in meeting this requirement. Smaller gardens can also function effectively as havens for wildlife and biodiversity. Where new development adjoins or is close to a Listed Building or a Conservation Area account will also have to be taken of the impact of the development on their setting and the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development of North West Cambridge, with the aim that development takes account of its surroundings, including existing buildings, open spaces and existing urban and villages edges to ensure that development does not harm local amenity and where possible brings benefits to the area. It will be for the subsequent masterplanning process and planning application stages to take this forward in designing the development to safeguard the amenity of existing properties. Masterplanning will also consider how best to protect the character of existing features of interest including the Ascension Parish Burial Ground.</p> <p>Assurances given by the University were made as the landowner/developer and the proposed AAP would not prevent them being fulfilled.</p> <p>The AAP is not requiring a large superstore on site but rather local shopping provision which may include a small supermarket. Residents on the site will have access to a number of large superstores including at Bar Hill and at Milton when local developments are completed.</p> <p>The available evidence is that infrastructure needs can be provided for the development. If infrastructure cannot be provided planning permission would not be granted.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW5.</p> <p>Refine the wording of the last sentence of part 1 to clarify that higher densities are appropriate close to public transport stops rather than at them.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>adjoining and adjacent houses. The text:</p> <p>"...development of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing"</p> <p>should be changed to:</p> <p>"...development of an appropriate scale and density where it adjoins existing housing".</p> <p>The site is relatively small and at risk from becoming an overly dense development which will impact on the amenity of the adjoining/adjacent, existing properties and the current tranquility of the Ascension Parish Burial Ground.</p> <p>The areas at the edges of the site must have densities, heights and forms similar to, and sympathetic to, the existing housing.</p> <p>Case made in vol 2 for permitting higher density than required by the Structure Plan is not made, and is peculiarly unsympathetic to local situation and environment (all the more surprising in the light of the argument put forward at NW4).</p> <p>Poor drafting: higher densities should not be "at" public transport stops, but within easiest reach thereof.</p>		
3640 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	The Colleges are the principal providers of student housing and therefore the priority for University needs expressed in Policy NW5 should also refer to Collegiate housing needs.	Disagree because part 1 of the policy is not concerned with student housing provision. Collegiate housing needs are addressed in policy NW6.	Pursue preferred option NW5.
2. 3845 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)	Object	Provision in the Cambridge Local Plan, and more recently, the Core Strategy, indicates that approximately 4,500 new student dwellings are required between 1999 and 2016. It is anticipated that between 4,000-4,500 of these dwellings could be provided within the Northwest Cambridge AAP area. USS considers that the ability to bring forward sites outside the APP boundary for student housing should not be prejudiced by the APP, to ensure that other areas within Cambridge can provide university-related development, offering greater choice and diversity.	Disagree with the sentiment expressed in the objection. The provision for student which may be made in the NW AAP area does not mean that provision cannot continue to be made elsewhere within Cambridge as has been the pattern for centuries.	Pursue preferred option NW5.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3756	Object	This is not a matter for the University but for the individual Colleges. There should be a clear statement from the Colleges (perhaps through the Bursars' Committee) of agreement to these goals before the Plan can be approved. There also need to be clear guidelines about how the Colleges would work to allocate such accommodation.	Disagree because the University has identified a need for additional student units in Cambridge in addition to those to be brought forward by the Colleges. The NW AAP provides an opportunity to meet this need which could not be met elsewhere in Cambridge.	Pursue preferred option NW5.
<hr/>				
<i>4.1</i>				
3715 - Lettering Arts	Object	Change to read...at public transportation stops, " and with lower densities and similar heights and form at the edges of the site where there are existing adjoining houses.	Disagree because the policy already requires development to be of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing.	
<hr/>				
<i>4.3</i>				
3835	Object	"Higher densities and smaller gardens place added value on the need for quality landscaping and open space". Open space cannot always compensate for smaller gardens. Gardens provide valuable amenity for people in the surrounding area, even where they are private gardens, in that they provide spaces for trees, wildlife and add to the biodiversity of an area, as well as being good for families with children. Could it be asked that there is a mix of garden sizes in the development, as well as a mix of house sizes? A lot of new developments I have seen recently have large houses squeezed into tiny plots.	Disagree because there will be a variety of house types and sizes developed on the site together with a variety of mixed uses including those associated with the University. Agree that gardens can provide for degree of common shared amenity even when private and can be good for wildlife and biodiversity and valuable for families with young children. However smaller gardens can also provide many of these benefits and which also allow land to be used more efficiently.	
<hr/>				
<i>4.4</i>				
3643	Support	VERY IMPORTANT	Support noted.	
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.5 3507 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3302 3460 3333 3409 3434 3447 3519 3531 3556 3604 3616 3628 3721 - Lettering Arts 3811	Object	Change to...at very low densities. "New residential development on these boundaries will be at lower densities and will be similar in height and form to existing adjoining houses. Houses along these boundaries will have 30-metre gardens abutting the gardens of existing adjoining and adjacent properties, thus protecting and augmenting the wildlife sanctuaries (birds, small mammals) in these gardens and the Burial Ground. These wildlife sanctuaries will maintain and create habitats for wildlife that will permeate the site, but which will not be fully resident on the site until local trees, bushes and hedges mature."	Disagree that development adjoining boundaries of existing residential should have to be developed at very low densities, with 30 metre gardens and be similar in height and form to existing adjoining houses. Such an inflexible policy is not justified. The policy wording already states that development will be of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing and paragraph 4.5 explains this to mean housing which respects the adjoining housing in terms of its scale and form. The protection of the amenity and character of adjoining housing cannot only be achieved in the ways proposed. It is proper to allow future masterplanners and designers some flexibility in meeting this requirement. Smaller gardens can also function effectively as havens for wildlife and biodiversity. Where new development adjoins or is close to a Listed Building or a Conservation Area account will also have to be taken of the impact of the development on their setting and the character of the Conservation Area.	
<hr/>				
<i>NW6: Affordable Housing</i>				
3725 - Home Builders Federation	Object	Preferred Policy Option NW6 The policy relating to affordable housing provision states that housing developments will only be permitted if they provide at least 50% affordable housing. It is then stated that financial viability will be taken into account. Whilst the HBF welcomes the fact that the importance of viability is recognised, it fails to see how all developments will be able to deliver more than a minimum of 50% affordable housing provision. Therefore, the policy wording is too inflexible and unsound. The policy should aim for a figure of affordable housing provision, rather than specifying a minimum. Furthermore, this needs to be backed up by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment produced by key stakeholders including the development industry.	Disagree that the policy wording is inflexible. The policy is consistent with the great need of the University for key worker housing, the University's own evidence on viability and the conclusions of the Cambridge Local Plan Inspector's Report. Reference to a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is misplaced as mainstream affordable housing is not being proposed on this site which is to provide only for the affordable housing needs of University and College staff as evidenced by studies of housing need submitted by the University to support its case of the 2005 Cambridge Local Plan Inquiry.	Pursue preferred option NW6.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3468	Object	Whilst not objecting per se, but wish to comment that the mix should be sympathetic to existing developments at the site's boundaries - this mix shouldn't just be something to be regarded as an inward-looking objective	Concern noted.	Pursue preferred option NW6.
3467 - University of Cambridge 3645 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	<p>By including the words "at least", preferred policy option NW6 is unsound, as it does not have proper regard for adopted planning policy for the site, and is not reasonably flexible to deal with changing circumstances.</p> <p>Affordable housing policy for the site was tested through the review of the Cambridge Local Plan. The Inspector concluded that 50% was an appropriate target (and that higher targets would not represent a viable option for the University), and that flexibility was required.</p> <p>Policy should allow for flexibility in meeting the 50% target by deleting the words "at least".</p> <p>We object to the proposed mix between key worker and market housing. The Adopted Cambridge Local Plan requires the provision of 40% or more. The North West Area Action Plan proposes 50% or more. In order for delivery of the North West Cambridge proposals, sufficient levels of market housing will need to be brought forward to underpin the viability of the development. We are concerned that Policy NW6, as presently drafted with regard to provision of at least 50% affordable housing could seriously prejudice this delivery.</p>	<p>Agree because the Cambridge Local Plan Inspector did agree that a 50% target was appropriate for this site having considered viability evidence and did not choose to include any qualifying words such as 'at least' and 'or more'. The Local Plan Inspector's Report states at paragraph 9.22.26 that a target of 50% is justifiable and goes on to state that it is possible that the University may wish to provide a higher proportion of key worker housing bearing in mind the importance of the provision of adequate housing to the achievement of the University's aspirations. Given that the overall identified housing need found by the University in its own evidence (3,400 dwellings by 2016) is much higher than the total provision possible at NW Cambridge (approximately 2,000 to 2,500 dwellings) it is logical that extra provision could be made in this location if this is viable and deliverable. The policy qualifies its reference to 50% affordable housing being provided by stating that account will be taken of costs and viability, it cannot therefore be termed inflexible.</p> <p>The equivalent policy in the Cambridge Local Plan, policy 9/7 refers to a 50% target and not to a 40% target as the objection from the Bursars Committee states.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW6.</p> <p>Delete the words 'at least' from the first sentence of the policy.</p> <p>Delete the words 'should be secured' from the penultimate line of paragraph 4.6 and replace with 'could be provided'. This better reflects the Cambridge Local Plan Inspectors Report conclusion that if the University wanted in future to provide more than 50% affordable housing the policy should not prevent them doing so.</p>
3644 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Support	We are in support of the Council's proposal that all of the "affordable" housing on the site should be for University and College key workers. The Council will be aware from the BBPSC's representations to the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document that many housing pressures are such that of the University's and College's workforce are forced to live outside of the City and further a field. The proposals for North West Cambridge will assist the improvement of this situation.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW6.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3769 - Highways Agency	Support	<p>This policy will provide for 2,000 to 2,500 dwellings 'with a priority on providing for University needs' plus 2,000 units of student accommodation. Having developments will only be permitted if they provide at least 50% affordable housing; this is to meet University needs (Policy NW6).</p> <p>The types of residential accommodation proposed in this location should generate significantly fewer car trips than, say, speculative private housing, but we are concerned that the potential impact of this amount of development is not clear. While the Cambridge North West Transport Study (CNWTS) incorporates a sensitivity test with similar amounts of development on the University land, the Preferred Transport Option which emerges appears to be related to a much lower level of development i.e. 1,150 dwellings (Table 7.1 of the Final Report).</p> <p>We support this objective in principle as it advocates the provision of land for housing development in areas where travelling distances are short. We also note the strategy takes into account the availability of sustainable modes of transport, such as buses, walking and cycling within the development sites.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW6.
3646 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The principles applied to provision of affordable homes are supported.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW6.
4.6				
3468 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that a higher proportion than 50% of affordable housing could be secured.</p> <p>This was tested through the Cambridge Local Plan Inquiry. The University demonstrated that 50% affordable key worker housing provision for 2000 dwellings would result in a negative residual land value, and 50% provision on 2500 dwellings resulted only in a small positive land value. The Inspector concluded that future fluctuations in market conditions and viability appraisal assumptions are unlikely to lead to a significant improvement in viability. The 50% target is already challenging. To treat it as a minimum requirement is unsound.</p>	Disagree because the wording does not require that more than 50% affordable (key worker) housing should be provided but only if viability evidence at the time demonstrates that this is deliverable. The Local Plan Inspector's Report states at paragraph 9.22.26 that a target of 50% is justifiable and goes on to state that it is possible that the University may wish to provide a higher proportion of key worker housing bearing in mind the importance of the provision of adequate housing to the achievement of the University's aspirations. Given that the overall identified housing need found by the University in its own evidence (3,400 dwellings by 2016) is much higher than the total provision possible at NW Cambridge (approximately 2,000 to 2,500 dwellings) it is logical that extra provision should be made in this location if this is viable and deliverable.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW7: Balanced and Sustainable Communities</i>				
3469 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The University objects to the proposals to distribute affordable housing in "small" groups or clusters, and to locate student housing in a separate and distinct University quarter.</p> <p>The size of a small group or cluster of affordable housing is not defined in the Preferred Options report. We are concerned that distribution in small groups would provide unacceptable constraints in relation to the procurement of housing and housing management. The word "small" should be deleted in order to retain flexibility.</p> <p>The preferred policy option to distribute affordable housing in "small" clusters is therefore overly prescriptive and unnecessary.</p>	<p>Disagree because this intermingling of market and affordable housing is standard practice in the Cambridge area and is supported both by Government Policy set out in PPS3 and elsewhere, in existing adopted Development Plans for the Cambridge area and in the Cambridge Affordable Housing SPD which states that affordable housing can be provided through peppercorn or in groups which should normally be between 6 and 25 dwellings. This provides flexibility for both management, site and other reasons. Deletion of the word small could result in proposals for very large concentrations of tenures across the site which would not be inclusive or sustainable. However, a new paragraph could be added to the AAP to explain what is meant by the words, 'small groups and clusters'.</p> <p>Agree that allowing student housing to be provided in each phase of the development would help to ensure its availability when needed, and also that there is little recent history of residential amenity being affected by proximity to College student housing. As over half of the student housing would probably be for post-graduates who can have cars the case for a student accommodation quarter is less convincing.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW7 subject to the following amendment.</p> <p>Add new paragraph to the supporting text as follows: Delete existing paragraph 4.9 and replace with: 'The layout of the development should integrate affordable housing with the open market housing in ways that minimise social exclusion. The creation of tenure monocultures should be avoided. The development of the affordable housing in multiple small groups and clusters of between 6 and 25 dwellings will satisfy the policy requirement to achieve mixed and balanced communities'.</p> <p>Amend the wording of the second section of part 1 of the policy to read: 'Affordable housing will be intermingled with the market housing in small groups or clusters, whilst the student housing can be provided in a number of groups distributed across each phase of development'.</p>
3410	Object	<p>University Quarter. Height, form and densities of houses in clusters at the boundaries near existing adjoining houses will be similar to those of the existing adjoining houses. Two storey houses with peaked roofs will be sited on the boundaries with 30 metre gardens facing the gardens of existing adjoining houses on Huntingdon Road and All Souls Lane. Terraces and properties without gardens in these clusters will be sited facing the centre of the site. Building heights and densities will rise slowly moving away from the boundaries.</p>	<p>Disagree because these objections concern matters addressed in policy NW5 concerning Housing Supply. This clearly states that a range of densities will be provided, with higher densities in and around the local centre (located in the centre of the development) and with development of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing. Paragraph 4.5 acknowledges that new housing development on existing residential boundaries should be developed at a scale and form that will enable it to respect the adjoining residential. Disagree that development adjoining boundaries of existing residential should have to be developed at very low densities, with 30 metre gardens and be similar in height and form to existing adjoining houses. Such an inflexible policy is not justified.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW7.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3770 - Highways Agency	Support	<p>This policy will provide for 2,000 to 2,500 dwellings 'with a priority on providing for University needs' plus 2,000 units of student accommodation. Having developments will only be permitted if they provide at least 50% affordable housing; this is to meet University needs (Policy NW6).</p> <p>The types of residential accommodation proposed in this location should generate significantly fewer car trips than, say, speculative private housing, but we are concerned that the potential impact of this amount of development is not clear. While the Cambridge North West Transport Study (CNWTS) incorporates a sensitivity test with similar amounts of development on the University land, the Preferred Transport Option which emerges appears to be related to a much lower level of development i.e. 1,150 dwellings (Table 7.1 of the Final Report).</p> <p>We support this objective in principle as it advocates the provision of land for housing development in areas where travelling distances are short. We also note the strategy takes into account the availability of sustainable modes of transport, such as buses, walking and cycling within the development sites.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW7.
3648 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The principles applied to provision of lifetime homes are supported.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW7.
1. 3650 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	We are also concerned that Policy NW7 is overly prescriptive in terms of its requirement to distribute affordable housing in small clusters, with student housing provided as a separate quarter. We consider that a more permissive approach should be taken to the distribution of tenures – student, key worker and open market, to reflect the vitality of Cambridge and its mixed, inclusive character, so as to permit integrated as well as segregated communities of collegiate housing.	Disagree because such intermingling is important in the creation of mixed, balanced and sustainable communities. Paragraph 4.9 already provides for some flexibility with regard to the student housing. Proposals for exceptions to be made with respect to Collegiate housing could be considered where justified in respect of individual planning applications.	Pursue preferred option NW7.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3508 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3303 3334 3435 3448 3499 3520 3532 3541 3557 3605 3617 3630 3724 - Lettering Arts 3812 3874	Object	Change to...distinct University quarter. "Height, form and densities of houses in the clusters at the boundaries near existing adjoining and adjacent houses will be similar to those of the existing adjoining houses. Two-storey houses with pitched roofs will be sited on the boundaries with 30-metre gardens abutting the gardens of existing adjoining houses on Huntingdon Road and in All Souls Lane and the site of the Ascension Parish Burial Ground. Terraces and properties without gardens in these clusters will be sited facing the center of the site. Building heights and densities will rise slowly moving away from the boundaries."	Disagree because these objections concern matters addressed in policy NW5 concerning Housing Supply. This clearly states that a range of densities will be provided, with higher densities in and around the local centre (located in the centre of the development) and with development of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing. Paragraph 4.5 acknowledges that new housing development on existing residential boundaries should be developed at a scale and form that will enable it to respect the adjoining residential. Disagree that development adjoining boundaries of existing residential should have to be developed at very low densities, with 30 metre gardens and be similar in height and form to existing adjoining houses. Such an inflexible policy is not justified.	Pursue preferred option NW7.
2.				
3651 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	There is a requirement to bring forward a mix of housing types to meet the housing needs of all and in this regard NW7 is welcomed. However, we consider that Policy NW7 could be further reinforced to explicitly acknowledge that this requirement relates to both affordable housing and market housing. Arguably, it is more important to ensure that the specific housing needs of key workers are met than the needs of those who are able to access the housing market, owing to affordability issues.	Comment noted. Agree that a mix of affordable housing should be provided that meets the current and future anticipated housing needs of qualifying key workers. This is the intention of the policy. Paragraph 4.8 makes it clear that account will be taken of the available evidence in determining the nature of the housing to be provided.	Pursue preferred option NW7.
4.9				
3762	Object	"Furthermore, Cambridge University student housing is essentially car free" is an over-optimistic assessment, particularly since the majority of this accommodation is likely to be for mature students and research students *and their families*.	Concern noted. Almost half of the forecast accommodation will be for undergraduates and of that for postgraduates the great majority on past evidence would be for single people rather than families and couples. The AAP will include parking standards (see paragraph 3.3 of appendix 1) which set out the restricted car parking provision being proposed for student housing.	
3647	Support	Could the local centre be located on the southern edge of the University Quarter, to keep it close to existing populations, which would increase its viability? This would also make putting student housing above shops relatively easy.	Support noted. The location of the local centre is intended to provide good accessibility from all parts of the development and to be accessible from existing populations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5. Employment & University Uses				
<i>NW8: Employment Uses</i>				
3792 - East of England Development Agency (EEDA)	Support	We would refer you to our previous response dated 6 November 2006 to your Council's Issues and Options consultation, in which EEDA supported Option 12.2, in respect of the Employment Chapter. EEDA therefore welcomes this as the Preferred Option for the employment policy NW8 (p.23).	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW8.
3470 - University of Cambridge	Support	The development strategy for the Cambridge Sub Region includes employment development. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan identifies an indicative take up of 252ha of employment land in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire between 2002 - 2016. It is essential that the AAP enables the provision of employment development at North West Cambridge.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW8.
<i>b)</i> 3569	Object	Inclusion of commercial use contradicts the responses to option 12 in vol 2. Option 12.1 would not increase housing demand to same extent. It should not be a matter of planning policy to engineer better working relationships between the University and the commercial sector. Such social engineering is an abuse of the planning process.	Disagree, Planning Policy Guidance Note 4 states that development plans must take account the needs of industry and commerce while at the same time wider objectives in the public interest. These needs include links with other businesses. One of the reasons for the successful local economy in Cambridge is the close relationships between business and the University. Allowing commercial research to operate alongside the University, providing they firms can demonstrate a special need for this location, will help the economy of Cambridge. Draft Planning Policy Statement 4, which will replace Planning Policy Guidance Note 4 in due course also refers to the need to "Recognise, and positively plan for, the benefits that can accrue when certain types of businesses locate within proximity of each other or with other compatible land uses such as universities and hospitals".	Pursue preferred option NW8.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2. 3570	Object	10-year limit is inadequate. Longer-term guarantee is required.	<p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 4 paragraph 29 states that occupancy conditions should be imposed only in special circumstances and only for "a short period (no more than 10 years)". Circular 11/95 also has 10 years as being a suitable maximum period for an occupancy condition. This is to ensure that fair competition is not unduly hindered by the planning process and industry is able to respond to economic demand.</p> <p>This period of time is accepted practice in the Cambridge area for applying occupancy conditions on employment developments, and to extend it only on this site would not be justified.</p> <p>The 10 year limit on occupancy conditions is reasonable and adequate.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW8.
5.2 3649	Object	I am worried about too much employment land in what will be a high density residential area. It would need to be very carefully planned and sited.	<p>Concern noted.</p> <p>The uses that will be developed on the site have already been identified in previous policy documents. The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 indicated that this site should be reserved for predominantly University related uses. The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 expanded on this and identified higher education uses, including collegiate provision, academic faculties and commercial research.</p> <p>The siting of uses on the site will be undertaken at the masterplanning stage when a planning application is submitted. There will be further consultation with the public when a planning application is submitted to the Councils.</p> <p>The Masterplan and planning application will have to be in conformity with the North West Area Action Plan, policy NW2 will ensure uses are carefully planned and sited.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW10: Mix of Uses</i> 3771 - Highways Agency	Object	<p>The Issues and Options consultation offered two options. The first was to limit employment to teaching and research requirements of the University; the second to allow a mix of uses which includes commercial research. The Highways Agency's preference was for the former, but the latter option is now proposed as the preferred option; albeit that the commercial element must be able to demonstrate a special need to be located close to the University.</p> <p>Along with 70,000m² of University related employment, there could be up to 30,000m² of commercial floorspace. It is not clear what assumptions have been made in the Cambridge North West Transport Study but Table 7.1 of the Final Report suggests that it may be below what is now proposed.</p>	<p>The Cambridge North West Transport Strategy tests a "worst case scenario" where there is a 50:50 split between academic and commercial uses. Commercial uses will generate a higher amount of traffic than academic uses.</p> <p>The Preferred Options Report identified a 70:30 split (with up to 30% commercial) and it is being recommended that the next iteration of the Area Action Plan contains a 60:40 split (with up to 40% commercial). This split of uses will generate less traffic than the scenario tested in the Transport Study.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW10.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3927 - University of Cambridge 3928 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	Any split between academic and research land is notional and cannot be applied rigidly; flexibility is required in order to take advantage of future opportunities when they arise.	<p>The Objectors concerns are noted but in order to plan positively for the future of the area more detail is needed on the likely mix of uses. The policy approach will also help to ensure that employment development is focussed on meeting the University's needs, particularly in the light of the Employment Land Review initial findings of plentiful supply of land for research and development in the Cambridge area. The mix will in turn will influence other factors such as parking and levels of traffic generation. This information has not been forthcoming from the objector and as a consequence the Councils have had to decide how they was going to address the issue in the absence of more detailed masterplanning.</p> <p>Policy 9/2c of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan indicates that the site should be reserved for predominantly University-related uses.</p> <p>The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 added greater detail to this split, within the City boundary by apportioning land takes to higher education uses and student accommodation (14 ha) and research uses based on the University requirements at the time (6 ha). It was this ratio that was used to generate the 70:30 split for the 100,000 sq m sought by the University between academic uses and research uses in the North West Area Action Plan Preferred Option report.</p> <p>However the 14 ha figure includes land for student housing. This makes the assumptions behind 70:30 split included in the Preferred Options report unreliable.</p> <p>To recalculate the split of employment uses one must first estimate what land take the student housing would use.</p> <p>To estimate the land take of the student housing some assumptions need to be made regarding the density of student development. The University of Cambridge assumes a density of 200-250 dph for undergraduate housing and 150-200 dph for postgraduate housing. (Source: Cambridge Local Plan Inquiry, Evidence on behalf of the Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge, Proof of Evidence No 2: Staff & Student Housing Needs, page 10, bullet point 6) Also, their net requirement of identified need for additional student accommodation to 2025 identifies the need for 931 undergraduate places and 1,303 postgraduate units. (Source: Cambridge Local Plan Inquiry, Evidence on behalf of the Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of</p>	Pursue preferred option NW10 subject to the following amendment: "Up to 60,000 m2 or higher education uses...Up to 40,000 m2 of University related sui generis research institutes and commercial uses..."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Cambridge, Proof of Evidence No 2: Staff & Student Housing Needs, page 12, table 5) This equates to 42% undergraduates and 58% postgraduates.</p> <p>Applying these figures to North West Cambridge, this gives 840 undergraduate units developed at 200-250 dph and 1160 postgraduate units at 150-200 dph. I.e. 9.16 ha - 11.93 ha.</p> <p>Taking a mid-point between the two areas calculated gives 10.55 ha, then halving this figure gives 5.27 ha.</p> <p>Assuming that about half of the student housing would be in each District, it follows that the land take for higher education uses included in policy 9.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 minus the land assumed for student housing is: 14 - 5.27 = 8.73 ha.</p> <p>This gives a division of 8.73 ha to 6 ha equating roughly to a 60:40 split.</p> <p>In the absence of any more detailed evidence from the University this split will be used. It has been based upon figures which have gone through the inquiry process for the Cambridge Local Plan, which is an advantage. It also maintains predominantly University-related uses in the employment uses on the site whilst increasing flexibility in future provision.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review commissioned by the Councils is indicating that there is a very generous supply of B1(b) land in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire in relation to demand to 2021 and beyond. As such there is not a great need for large new allocations of B1(b) land in the Cambridge area.</p>	
3471 - University of Cambridge 3652 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	<p>This policy confuses two land use designations: University-related academic and/or research & development facilities and collegiate provision. The AAP should be clarified to reflect that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collegiate provision = student housing. This should not be referenced in PPO NW10, as it is covered in PPO NW5. 2. University-related academic and/or research & development uses. These should be identified under PPO NW10. 	Agree, the preferred option as currently worded is unclear and confusing.	Pursue preferred option NW10 subject to the following amendment to clause a): "... of higher education uses, including academic faculty development and a University Conference Centre, within Use Class D1; and ..."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3794 - East of England Development Agency (EEDA)	Support	EEDA broadly supports policy NW10 but would wish to ensure that commercial research is supported within the Cambridge Area over the plan period.	Support noted. The Councils' Employment Land Review (ELR) has been carried out in the light of guidance prepared by DCLG and guidance prepared for EEDA by Roger Tym and Partners. The ELR indicates that there is a plentiful supply of B1(b) land in the Cambridge area over the time period of the Area Action Plan.	Pursue preferred option NW10.
<i>a.</i>				
3371 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The plans give no indication of the location or nature of the Colleges, which would be very different in character from the rest of the development.	<p>Concern noted.</p> <p>The term "collegiate provision" has been removed from NW10.</p> <p>The uses that will be developed on the site have already been identified in previous policy documents. The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 indicated that this site should be reserved for predominantly University related uses. The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 expanded on this and identified higher education uses, including collegiate provision, academic faculties and commercial research.</p> <p>The siting of uses on the site will be undertaken at the masterplanning stage when a planning application is submitted. There will be further consultation with the public when a planning application is submitted to the Councils.</p> <p>The Masterplan and planning application will have to be in conformity with the North West Area Action Plan, policy NW2 will ensure uses are carefully planned and sited.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW10.
<i>5.5</i>				
3655 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Whilst supporting the intentions and contents of the employment policies, there is some confusion in the way they are described. There are some discrepancies between Policy NW10, which makes provision for academic, University-related research and commercial research, and the supporting text which refers to "academic and non-University research".	Agree that there is a lack of consistency between paragraph 5.5 and policy NW10. Paragraph 5.5 also indicates a land take for employment development which is more appropriately considered at the masterplanning stage.	Amend paragraph 5.5 to read: "The University has submitted evidence to the Council at the Inquiry into the Local Plan 2006 that indicates that they have a need for 100,000m2 of D1 higher education uses, University related research institutes and commercial research uses at North West Cambridge. "

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6. Travel				
<i>NW11: Sustainable Travel</i>				
3911 - cottenham parish council	Object	<p>In response to your invitation Cottenham Parish Council offers the following comments - regarding traffic and surface water drainage - on the NWCDAAP.</p> <p>This draft of the area action plan was, no doubt, underway prior to, or at least conterminous with: (i) the Cambridge North West Transport Strategy (CNWTS) and (ii) the planning application for houses, a school, and retail units etc on land twixt Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge (DWHPA).</p> <p>Unfortunately, the nature of, and general lack of some detail in the draft AAP leaves this Council with the same concerns as were expressed in response to both the CNWTS and DWHPA. As a consequence, therefore, this Council encloses a copy of each of the three responses already made and asks that they be read as directly applicable to the draft AAP. We appreciate that this may not be the norm but by making such a submission we remain consistent in our treatment of this area of Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The congestion on the network has been modelled using a strategic transport model (SATURN), which covers a wide area of the network between Huntingdon in the North West to Sawston in the South East. This model has been used by the DfT and the Highways Agency in the decision making process for the A14 improvements. It has been validated and approved during this process. More detailed Transport Assessments will be made at outline planning permission stage which will inform strategy for mitigation measures.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW11.
3915 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	<p>More footpaths and cycleways good but no mention of transport plans for younger children and less-able elderly.</p>	<p>Noted but in fact residential travel plans are aimed at helping all members of a community, including those with disabilities, to travel sustainably; any school on the site will be required to submit a school travel plan.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW11.
3472 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>It is not clear whether the 40% target is achievable.</p> <p>In addition, it is not clear whether the target % modal split applies to trips from the site, and/or to the site, and/or to through traffic, or how this would be monitored. Normal practice, established by the Travel for Work Partnership, is to monitor journeys to work.</p> <p>Further clarification will be required as to whether the 40% target applies solely to single occupant vehicles. Without that clarification, the policy is ambiguous and could penalise effective travel planning measures such as car sharing and car clubs.</p>	<p>Concern Noted. The modal split figures are for travel to work journeys. Car sharing and the use of car club are currently included in the 40% target.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW11.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3773 - Highways Agency	Object	The Council should consider whether it is wise to incorporate a modal split target within the policy statement. It is not adequately defined; for example does it relate to trips external to the site or all trips? Is it referring to car driver or all trips by car? It is not clear how the policy will be applied in relation to individual planning applications, also it may be that the target is insufficiently challenging and that it may be possible to do much better in practice.	Agree that the modal split target should be clarified. It relates to journey to work and is a target for the whole development area, i.e. it may vary for individual elements of development. The target is sufficiently challenging, as the aim would be to get a more benign modal split wherever possible.	Pursue preferred option NW11.
3372 - Girton Parish Council	Object	This should include explicit mention to the Government's 'Manual for Streets' and its hierarchy of users, putting the needs of the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists above those of motorists. The figure of 40% needs justification and an explanation of how the proposed policies would meet it; plus an indication of the resulting policies if the goal is not achieved.	Disagree because it would be an inappropriate level of detail to refer to "Manual for Streets" in the objectives, but this and other guidance would be used in developing detailed design. The Councils support user hierarchies which are defined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan 2003, for 3 areas. Transport Corridors, Urban Areas and Rural Areas. The priority needs of pedestrians and cyclists and considered before vehicles except in Transport Corridors. The North West Transport Study contains an explanation of how the predicted modal split can be reached and how this can be accommodated on the current road network with suitable mitigation measures. The Study is a supporting document for the AAP.	Pursue preferred option NW11.
3761 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Cambridge Preservation Society objects as equestrian routes are not covered i.e. the Chapter on Travel should not just cover commuter routes but also recreational routes - radial and orbital linking urban areas with the rural fringe [see Green Infrastructure Strategy 2006]. Overall the Society would not like to see that green spaces/green corridors are transferred into linear transport routes, thus reducing the recreational value of green space with their main purpose being for relaxation and enjoyment of tranquillity, landscape etc. High quality design standards and design codes need to be established early on to create quality and distinctive environments for all.	Disagree because recreational routes to nearby villages and open countryside are included in policies NW17 and NW18 and would include provision for horse riders where appropriate. It is considered that this is the more appropriate part of the AAP to consider recreational routes.	Pursue preferred option NW11.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3839 - Sport England	Support	<p>Sport England supports this policy to encourage sustainable travel within this development, particularly the commitment to encouraging more walking and cycling. This policy will help to meet wider government objectives to increase participation in sport and physical activity and reduce related health problems such as obesity and heart disease.</p> <p>Sport England has published specific guidance aimed at promoting opportunities for sport and physical activity within the master planning process for major new developments: 'Active Design' was published in March 2007 and can be downloaded from the Sport England website at www.sportengland.org/active_design_complete.pdf</p> <p>We would therefore recommend that the supporting text to this policy could include a reference to the above document, as a useful reference point for developers to ensure that the master plans for this development include the Active Design principles in relation to encouraging sustainable modes of transport.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW11.
3876 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We strongly welcome the policy statement that the plans should achieve a modal split of no more than 40% of trips by car. This will require robust policies to promote walking and cycling, and a high-quality standard of infrastructure to continental levels.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW11.
3827 - Highways Agency	Support	We also support the council in encouraging sustainable travel modes, associated with this development. We would reiterate that the document should make reference to thresholds for when developments would be required to produce a Transport Assessment and the level of coverage that is required. The policy should take account of the recently published Guidance for Transport Assessment (DfT) and Circular 02/2007 in relation to any potential impact of development on the Trunk Road Network.	Support noted. Comprehensive transport assessments will be required at the outline planning permission stage	Pursue preferred option NW11.
3787 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Support	We fully support the overall approach to Travel as it will directly improve people's health, reduce road traffic accidents and reduce environmental impacts including air pollution.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW11.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>a.</i>				
3763	Object	The Councils' record on providing cycling facilities has to date been lamentable. In order to be acceptable this goal needs a great deal more detail added to ensure that those doing the planning are aware of the conflicting needs of commuting cyclists, other cyclists and pedestrians, who cannot all be accommodated in a single traffic stream or set of facilities.	Noted. This matter is addressed more fully under Preferred Policy Option NW17. Detailed road and cycleway layouts will be designed during the masterplanning and outline planning permission processes and will aim to meet the conflicting needs of cyclists, pedestrians and other forms of transport.	
<i>6.3</i>				
3847 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Whilst these aims are desirable they depend, for success, upon co-operation of the public. The draft policy does not mention the possibility of other measures to suppress trips by private car, e.g. road pricing as suggested in the Cambridge-Huntingdon Multi Modal Study.	Noted. Disagree because road pricing is not a policy option that is currently available within the North West Area Action Plan, although it is being studied by the County Council. The A14 Multi-modal Study referred to the need for demand management but not necessarily road pricing.	
<i>c.</i>				
3373 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The routes should also be "high quality". Figure 7.1 of the accompanying Transport Study shows a single-lane, two-way cycle path in the middle of the Orbital Road. This is the very opposite of 'quality' for cyclists' needs. Nor is it either safe or convenient nor does it meet Government guidelines as in the Manual for Streets.	Noted. It is accepted that high quality routes are important. However Figure 7.1 of the NW Transport Study is intended to be illustrative of the principle, rather than design specific. Detailed road and cycle way layouts will be designed during the masterplanning and outline planning permission processes.	
<i>d.</i>				
3374 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Our experience in the Wellbrook development makes perfectly clear that inadequate provision of car parking has no impact on car ownership; it results merely in inappropriate and dangerous parking.	Agree that limited parking spaces with no on-street controls can be a problem, and so controls on-street parking would be introduced in line with the principles set out in paragraph 6.22 of the Draft AAP.	
3783	Object	Experience of recent developments in Girton and elsewhere has shown that providing limited parking does not reduce the number of cars people own, but simply encourages selfish and unsafe parking which obstructs roadways for pedestrians and cyclists. It also makes it difficult for visitors to the site including workmen and delivery drivers.	Agree that limited parking spaces with no on-street controls can be a problem, and so controls on-street parking would be introduced in line with the principles set out in paragraph 6.22 of the Draft AAP.	
<i>f.</i>				
3661 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The policies for sustainable travel are supported and the inclusion of residential travel planning is welcome. However, a further consideration might be for a comprehensive travel strategy for the whole area.	Noted. The Councils should ensure that travel plans for both developments in NW Cambridge are consistent and supportive of each other.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW12: Highway Infrastructure</i>				
3777 - Highways Agency	Object	Development will be subject to 'sufficient highway capacity being available to serve all stages of development' (NW12). NW15 says that highway provision will be funded by development 'as appropriate'. The supporting text identifies that this will be based on transport assessments. While this appears to protect our interest, Circular 02/2007 indicates that if the Action Plan is adopted it will not be possible for us to object to the principle or scale of development, merely to deal with detailed matters of access. Thus, sufficient transport assessment is required at this stage in the process to give comfort that there is a feasible strategy which will manage demand and/or be able to deliver the necessary highway infrastructure. CNTWS may be able to provide this but at present there appear to be difficulties in drawing out the full implications in so far as they could affect trunk road operation.	Concern noted. The modelling work for the NW Transport Study fully considers the impact on the Trunk Road Network, using a strategic transport model (SATURN), which covers a wide area of the network between Huntingdon in the North West to Sawston in the South East. This model has been used by the DfT and the Highways Agency in the decision making process for the A14 improvements, and has been validated and approved during this process. The Highways Agency was involved in preparing the Brief for the NW study and raised no concerns at that time.	Pursue preferred option NW12.
3848 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	This and subsequent policies are informed by the Cambridge North West Transport Study. The Council perceive that this document is flawed in that it fails to properly quantify the current and predicted levels of congestion, noise and air pollution in the A14/Histon Rd, Cambridge/B1049 corridors. Furthermore, it acknowledges policy conflict between the Highways Agency and Cambridgeshire County Council with regards to congestion, but Policy NW12 gives no indication as to how 'mitigation' might be achieved. Mitigation measures need to be properly defined and conditioned within the policy statement, in the context of baseline conditions and modelled predictions, with reference to current traffic counts, noise barrier at Arbury Park and South Cambs. Declaration of Air Quality Management in the A14 Corridor, which includes the B1049 intersection. South Cambs DC now regard the AQMA as a material consideration of planning purposes. This should not be ignored in the Area Action Plan.	Noted. However paragraph 6.14 of the NW Transport study, shows that assessment of noise and air quality issues was not within the study's scope, but some environmental impacts are to be expected. Mitigation measures to address such problems will be part of the masterplanning process after more detailed Transport Assessments are available.	Pursue preferred option NW12.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3658 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Policy NW12 is too narrow in that it only refers to development being subject to highway capacity. The following needs to be incorporated, "Development will be subject to sufficient highway capacity along with the additional supporting sustainable transport measures being able to serve all stages of development". In addition, the policy is not clear whether it means that development cannot be started until there is sufficient highway capacity to serve all stages of development. The County Council would like clarification on this matter.	Noted. The provision of sustainable transport measures is an essential pre-requisite of development, and has been set out in paragraph 6.4 of the Draft AAP. Policy NW12 indicates that each stage of development will need to demonstrate adequate highway capacity, but does not imply that the highway capacity needed for all stages of development needs to be available from the outset.	Pursue preferred option NW12.
3868	Object	The housing development can only be accommodated in the present proposed locations if the capacity of the present road system is substantially increased. Otherwise it needs to be relocated outside the area currently serviced by Cambridge. The proposed increase in buses and the guided bus system will not provide the required increase in system capacity. All residents and their visitors need to travel to Cambridge for shopping and leisure activities. All residents also need to use car transport to reach their work, family and friends in other parts of the country.	Concern Noted. The development of NW Cambridge is required as part of the strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region in the Structure Plan. The North West Transport Study concluded that development in this quadrant could be accommodated on the transport network with appropriate mitigation measures in place. Transport Assessments will assess these impacts more fully and suggest suitable mitigating measures.	Pursue preferred option NW12.
3571	Support	Whilst supporting this, I wonder how "sufficient" will be determined, and suspect this policy is largely meaningless.	Support noted. The availability of "sufficient" highway capacity will be determined through transport assessments as part of master planning and outline planning permission processes.	Pursue preferred option NW12.
3473 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University wishes to continue to work in conjunction with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Highways Agency on the ongoing development of the masterplan and associated highway infrastructure requirements. The University aims to establish whether sufficient highway capacity is available at all stages of development, and what measures are required to mitigate adverse traffic impacts on the surrounding highway network. The University will provide detailed development proposals for the site which will be supported by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plans that will also help mitigate impact on the highway network.	Support noted. Transport assessments and travel plans will need to be provided	Pursue preferred option NW12.
3867 - Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council	Support	The Council is keen to see that any development does not impact on the already congested surrounding infrastructure.	Support noted. Transport Assessments will assess these impacts more fully and suggest suitable mitigating measures.	Pursue preferred option NW12.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW13: Vehicular Access</i>				
3375 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The Huntingdon Road is already inadequate for current demand. No indication is given of how traffic from the site will interface with that of other developments (NIAB, Northstowe). That Storey's Way residents should continue to be protected from the effects of necessary traffic flows is unacceptable.	Disagree. The NW Transport Study looked at traffic from both NIAB and NW Cambridge sites and took account of the overall scale of development in the Cambridge area and the proposed strategic infrastructure needed to support it. In Figure 3.4 of the Study Storey's Way is not shown as a transport corridor as it is considered that it should continue to be protected from the effects of through traffic in order to protect amenity.	Pursue preferred option NW13.
3922 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA)	Object	Regular vehicle access should not be permitted to the site from Huntingdon Road via the University Farm Road	Concern noted. However, the location of access points will be determined as a result of subsequent master planning, and not set as part of the AAP.	Pursue preferred option NW13.
3828 - Highways Agency	Object	This policy should ensure that all residents of new developments have good access to sustainable travel modes, and convenient connections to employment, education, retail, leisure, and healthcare services. Developers should be required to provide adequate cycle and footway connections into existing networks as well as providing off-site improvements where there are any gaps in the existing network to these facilities. The policy should also ensure that all new development is well served by bus and where possible/appropriate, rail.	Concern noted but consider that the AAP already addresses this matter. Agree that priority should be given to sustainable travel modes - this is promoted by the draft AAP in Preferred Policy Options NW16 (public transport), NW17 (cycling) and NW18 (walking)	Pursue preferred option NW13.
3392 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University proposes to minimise vehicular access points to the site. This will reduce the amount of congestion and traffic flow around the development. The University currently proposes to provide vehicular access points onto both Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road in order to disperse traffic into the highway network .	Agree with limiting vehicle access points. University comments are consistent with preferred highway options by the Councils shown in figure 6.1	Pursue preferred option NW13.
<i>NW14: Madingley Road to Huntingdon Road Link</i>				
3590	Object	Although not yet finalised, it appears that the Huntingdon Road/Madingley Road link will be through the Girton Gap green space. In view of this it is not clear how the aims of NW15, 6.6 'Any new road will need to be designed to not impact on the purposes and amenity of the strategic gap within the development area' will be achieved.	Agree that this is an important issue. Para 6.6 makes it clear that a road will only be possible if its impacts on amenity are acceptable. These impacts would include minimising the impact upon green spaces through design, route location and landscaping. This would be achieved as part of the master planning of the area.	Pursue preferred option NW14.
3903 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	There is a potential negative impact resulting from the new link roads through the development area on historic environment. We have already expressed concern in relation to the proposed junction of the radial route opposite Girton College [see comments under policy NW2]	Agree that this is an important issue. However, Para 6.6 makes it clear that a road will only be possible if its impacts on amenity are acceptable. These impacts would include minimising the impact upon historic environment, including Girton College. Design, route location and landscaping to achieve this would be carried out as part of the master planning of the area.	Pursue preferred option NW14.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3923 - CRONC	Object	I am writing on behalf of CRONC in connection with the above. As local residents, we will be directly affected by the development and have serious reservations about the traffic implications, especially in view of the naive, optimistic and impossible proposals of the developers. As a result of the additional burden of traffic, we believe that there should be a proper through-road between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road to absorb some of the traffic caused by the development as well as the traffic resulting from other developments (such as Longstowe). It is hardly fair that existing residents on Huntingdon Road should be required to bear this additional burden alone. Such a road would also relieve the existing and proposed additional burdens on Storey's Way and Castle Street.	Concern Noted. There will be a link road between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road, although this will be primarily for access to the site and public transport, cyclists and pedestrians will be given priority.	Pursue preferred option NW14.
3904 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	Policy NW14 refers to link road between Huntingdon and Madingley Roads along the "strategic gap" within the development. This gap is intended to act as Green Belt to prevent Girton and Cambridge from merging together and to provide an open space for landscape reasons (amongst others). There is potential for the link road to harm the gap and the very reasons for having it.	Concern noted. Para 6.6 makes it clear that a road will only be possible if its impacts on amenity are acceptable. These impacts would include minimising the impact upon green spaces. Design to achieve this would be carried out as part of the master planning of the area.	Pursue preferred option NW14.
3881 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	Whilst an orbital route restricted to cyclists and public transport (Option 13.4) received the most support during public consultation, the preferred option is for an all-purpose route with slower speeds and safe crossings where "priority is give to walking, cycling and public transport and to a design based on low vehicle speeds". No detail is given here, but vulnerable road users should have priority over side roads, and low vehicle speed on this route should mean 20mph. Option 13.2 was chosen because 13.4 discriminated against people who have to use a car. But, of course, 13.2 will cater for those who choose to drive too. If, as we agree, it is important that this road "should not release suppressed demand for car travel and hence create adverse traffic impacts" (section 6.6), then the road heirarchy on this orbital route and throughout the development must put the private car last.	Concern noted. The design of the new road, together with other polices in the AAP, should give priority to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians.	Pursue preferred option NW14.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3572	Object	Deeply flawed. Option 13.4 clearly performs best across all objectives and had most support. To choose any other option flies in the face of logic and the democratic process and is a nonsense. What's proposed will simply encourage more journeys within the City and on its immediate edge, which is unsustainable (and contrary to policy, therefore)	Agree it is important not to encourage trips that could be undertaken by sustainable modes. However taking the responses to the Issues and Options into account, together with the findings of the North West Cambridge Transport Study, the Councils' proposed approach is to take forward Option 13.2 (Issues and Options Report) with a new all-purpose route, but designed so as to not impact on the purposes and amenity of the Strategic Gap and to provide access for the proposed development, whilst designed in a way which discourages through traffic. It would also reduce rat-running through Storey's Way and offer an alternative access to the strategic road network.	Pursue preferred option NW14.
3829 - Highways Agency	Object	This policy should ensure that provision of a new road has taken into account the development sites. In so far as recognising the implementation of measures to monitor the modal split, and encourage the use of walking and cycling as a priority within the development sites.	Concern noted. The Preferred Option is informed by the NW Cambridge Transport Study which did take into account the developments. The design of the new road should give priority to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians.	Pursue preferred option NW14.
3765	Object	Any road cutting into the Strategic Gap is unacceptable, not just because it contradicts the aims of NW 15.6.6 but also because it destroys the purposes of the Gap as a separator.	Agree that this is an important issue. Para 6.6 makes it clear that a road will only be possible if its impacts on amenity are acceptable. These impacts would include minimising the effects upon green spaces through design, route location and landscaping. This would be achieved as part of the master planning of the area.	Pursue preferred option NW14.
3789 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Object	Loss of ridge & furrow grassland requiring compensation measures. Concern regarding unsustainability of chosen option in that it will allow rat-running & discourage use of sustainable forms of transport.	Concern noted. The design of the new road should give priority to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians.	Pursue preferred option NW14.
3393 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the development of a new route linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road and beyond. The route will ensure sustainable forms of transport are prioritised and encouraged, and safe crossings for pedestrians and cyclists are provided. The route will be based on low vehicle speeds and the University feels that safe direct access would be preferable from the surrounding areas.	Support noted. This is consistent with the Councils' preferred highway option shown in figure 6.1 of the draft AAP	Pursue preferred option NW14.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW15: Highway Provision</i>				
3779 - Highways Agency	Object	Development will be subject to 'sufficient highway capacity being available to serve all stages of development' (NW12). NW15 says that highway provision will be funded by development 'as appropriate'. The supporting text identifies that this will be based on transport assessments. While this appears to protect our interest, Circular 02/2007 indicates that if the Action Plan is adopted it will not be possible for us to object to the principle or scale of development, merely to deal with detailed matters of access. Thus, sufficient transport assessment is required at this stage in the process to give comfort that there is a feasible strategy which will manage demand and/or be able to deliver the necessary highway infrastructure. CNTWS may be able to provide this but at present there appear to be difficulties in drawing out the full implications in so far as they could affect trunk road operation.	Concern noted. The modelling work for the NW Transport Study has considered the impact on the Trunk Road Network, using a strategic transport model (SATURN), which has been used by the DfT and the Highways Agency in the decision making process for the A14 improvements, and has been validated and approved during this process. This is considered sufficient transport assessment to inform the AAP. More detailed Transport Assessments will be made as part of the preparation of master plans and planning applications and will be subject to consultation with relevant authorities, including the Highways Agency.	Pursue preferred option NW15.
3542	Object	The following should be added: "New road construction will protect the amenity of existing adjoining houses. No roads, paths or walkways will be constructed along the boundaries of the site in the immediate proximity to existing houses or the Burial Ground as this would degrade the amenity and facilitate criminal access to the rear gardens." This will protect the amenity of the existing residents.	Noted. The North West Transport Study considers the permeability of the site crucial to encouraging high levels of walking and cycling. Foot and cycle path locations will be developed at the master planning stage and, will take into account the need to preserve the amenity of existing homes and features.	Pursue preferred option NW15.
3474 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University accepts that infrastructure requirements that can be attributed to the development proposals will be funded as part of the scheme proposals. The high levels of non car mode split predicted from the site are not expected to create a requirement for any major offsite infrastructure improvements. The University supports the funding of highway provision by the development where appropriate, however the site footprint identified in AAP NW4 is too small to fund all the highway infrastructure required, particularly infrastructure proposed in the County Council's TIF proposals and orbital & radial routes identified in the AAP.	Support noted. The level of infrastructure funding required will be determined by the outcome of a transport assessment.	Pursue preferred option NW15.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6.4				
3849 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	This paragraph implies and confirms the statement in the Transport Study that development should result in "nil detriment" in terms of free flow of traffic on the trunk road (A14). The inevitable increase in traffic levels resulting from the A14 upgrade and development in North West Cambridge transfers this "detriment" in terms of noise, pollution and congestion to the local road network. The Highways Agency in their response to the Draft Regional Plan (RSS14) and to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan also confirm the intention to use powers to restrict access from local roads should this become necessary. HA predict that congestion (and the environmental consequences) on the Cambridge Northern radial routes (B1049, A10) will continue even after completion of the upgrade works. The current traffic counts for the B1049 north of the intersection show this B class route running at over 1 1/2 times capacity and is defined in the study as an "over capacity link". Additional slip roads and A14 lane capacity plus lay byes between Girton and Impington, now confirmed by HA route announcement, are not properly considered. NW transport policies that do not take these important factors into consideration are therefore by any definition unsustainable. The Councils continue to object strongly to policies that fail to address these fundamental questions.	Concern Noted. The NW Transport Study was not intended to look at noise and air pollution issues. Detailed mitigation measures will need to be addressed as part of the masterplanning process, which is when more detailed Transport Assessments will be carried out.	
6.5				
3739 - David Wilson Estates & the Consortium of Landowners	Object	The text at Para 6.5 should reflect the Concept Diagram at Fig 2.1 and the comments lodged by David Wilson Estates in relation to the Diagram.	Concern noted. Figures 2.1 and 6.1 are indicative only and are not detailed proposals maps.	
3766	Object	Figure 6.1 is useless even as a rough indicative guide. The relationship between the accesses to Huntingdon Road from this site and the NIAB site needs clarification, as does the impact of the TIF proposals upon the whole of the AAP.	Disagree Figure 6.1 is indicative only- and is at an appropriate level of principle for an AAP. However, more detailed studies of the junction arrangements are being considered by Cambridgeshire County Council and will be taken into account in later more detailed planning stages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6.6				
3659 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The definition of a new link road in Paragraph 6.6 as being primarily to provide access to the new development is acceptable in the context of the AAP, but in terms of the current Long Term Transport Strategy/Transport Innovation Funding proposals the route will be expected to serve a wider purpose so this should be acknowledged both within the policy and supporting text. The route shown in Figure 6.1 will also need to take account of the proximity to the strategic gap, the green 'core' and the Travellers Rest SSSI, and consequent design and routing issues to avoid adverse impact.	Concern noted; However as stated in 6.6, the prime function of the road is to provide access to the development, with the proviso that this does not have adverse traffic impacts or effects upon amenity. The location and design of the route will take into account a number of factors such as the proximity to the strategic gap, the green 'core' and the SSSI. No part of the NW Cambridge development is predicated on the introduction of the measures included in the current TIF proposals, to which there is as yet no commitment.	
3509 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3420 3545 3335 3411 3436 3449 3500 3521 3533 3558 3596 3606 3618 3631 3733 - Lettering Arts 3813	Object	That any new roads or paths should protect the amenity of existing houses and not be constructed next to their site boundary.	Noted. However an appropriate boundary treatment for properties will be part of the masterplanning process and one aspect that it will take into account is the amenity and security of existing properties which can be achieved by appropriate layout, boundary treatment and landscaping. At the same time however, site permeability is crucial to encouraging high levels of walking and cycling. Foot and cycle path locations will be developed at the master planning stage but wherever possible will preserve the amenity of existing homes.	
3882 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We welcome this only if it includes fast, legible, priority on and off-road routes.	Support noted.	
6.7				
3738 - David Wilson Estates & the Consortium of Landowners	Object	The reference to the Guided Bus Route as being "to the north" is misleading implying that the Guided Bus will be routed through the NIAB site, between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road. This is not the case, with the Guided Bus being routed down Histon Road. The paragraph should be reworded by deleting "route to the north".	Agree that this could be misleading. There is the potential for buses to leave the guided bus route and travel onwards through the NIAB development, but not on a guideway. Change: delete 'to the North' from paragraph 6.7.	Change: delete 'to the North' from paragraph 6.7.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3857 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We are pleased to see that there is a requirement to consider how any route between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road would relate to the wider road network and the development proposed north east of Huntingdon Road (the NIAB site).	Noted.	
<i>NW16: Public Transport Provision</i>				
3910	Object	Public transport - needs to be more reliable and more frequent service through village of Girton to encourage growing frail and aged population. OAPS cannot stand for 40 mins or more in cold and rain when scheduled bus fails to arrive.	This is not a matter for the AAP, as Girton lies outside of its boundary and is beyond the scope of the AAP.	Pursue preferred option NW16.
3858 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We support the need for high quality public transport. However, bench-marks for "high quality" need to be defined i.e. frequent services between 6am and midnight 7 days a week, every day of the year. We are also concerned that buses are already full when they pass stops nearer to the city centre.	Concern noted. The Glossary to the draft AAP includes a definition of high quality public transport (from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003) which covers the objector's points.	Pursue preferred option NW16.
3475 - University of Cambridge	Object	The term "including enhanced bus services along Huntingdon Road and the proposed Madingley Road to Huntingdon Road link route" is imprecise and could imply that the University is to make direct provision of public transport. The University is not a public transport operator. Policy should require development to facilitate the enhancement of bus services, through infrastructure provision, but not to provide direct capital support. High quality public transport links within the area will be included as part of the more detailed design work and as such it is premature to say that all PT links should be segregated.	Agree that the wording should be clarified.	Pursue preferred option NW16 subject to the following amendment: NW16 d) amend to "Support for residential travel plans and employee travel plans including measures to encourage bus usage, funded by the development".
3376 - Girton Parish Council	Object	This and the following sections make no reference to the effect the TIF bid will have on PT generally, or how these plans will integrate with it. No consideration is given in any part of the Plan to the adverse impact on cycling of increased bus provision, though buses are the most intimidating problem faced by cyclists.	Noted-; however transport modelling work is underway on a variety of projects in the region including TIF but no part of the NW Cambridge development is predicated on the introduction of the measures included in the current TIF proposals, to which there is as yet no commitment.	Pursue preferred option NW16.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3830 - Highways Agency	Support	<p>The policy considers that a 'high quality public transport provision will be provided to support this development'. The Highways Agency supports this policy as it takes account of the PPG13 standard with the majority of development within 400 metres of a bus stop and proposed improvements to bus services and facilities (real time information, bus priority measures and urban traffic management).</p> <p>This policy should encourage in partnership with the highways authorities a strategy for monitoring and enforcing Residential Travel Plans and employee Travel Plans after implementation.</p>	Support noted. Agree the importance of PPG13 guidance.	Pursue preferred option NW16.
<i>a)</i>				
3764 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	<p>Comment - The Cambridge Preservation Society does not wish to see the usage of green spaces/ green corridors for major transport routes. It is considered that it is essential that master planning maximises the recreational, amenity and biodiversity qualities required for green spaces etc and any major routes (e.g. bus and cycle routes) are not routed within green spaces but more adjacent to green spaces or preferably within built up areas.</p>	Noted; however para 6.6 makes it clear that a road will only be possible if its impacts on amenity are acceptable. These impacts would include minimising the impact upon green spaces. Design and location of the route to achieve this would be carried out as part of the master planning process.	Pursue preferred option NW16.
3573	Support	<p>Whilst supporting this, it's worth noting that the adoption of option 13.4 at NW14 would mean there is no need for such designation and no significant conflict between bus and other traffic (which would be minimal)</p>	Support noted. Preferred Policy Option NW14 makes it clear that the proposed road will be designed to give priority to sustainable modes, including buses.	Pursue preferred option NW16.
<i>b)</i>				
3574	Support	<p>Whilst I'm unclear how you force operators to provide services, any enhancement of Huntingdon Rd services should include a wider variety of city centre destinations (choices have been more or less eliminated in recent years, most recently by the County Council withdrawing the Sunday service to the Railway Station)</p>	Support noted. Bus priority ensures that routes are more attractive to bus operators because of fewer delays from other vehicular traffic, and hence more reliable travel times. Bus routes into the city centre provide interchange facilities to link with other destinations.	Pursue preferred option NW16.
<i>b.</i>				
3377 - Girton Parish Council	Object	<p>The entire structure of bus routes will need revision in the event of a successful TIF bid.</p>	Noted. However, TIF is still the subject of consultation and there is no commitment to the introduction of its proposals. Furthermore this is not an appropriate matter for the AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3859 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We are concerned that the diversion of "some existing bus services" on "Huntingdon Road" into the site will reduce the frequency of buses down Huntingdon Road into the City Centre for local residents living in Huntingdon Road and the roads on its north-east side. It should be stipulated that this negative effect will not be allowed.	Noted. Although the aim will be to give a net improvement in bus services, the level of service will ultimately be decided by the operators and the AAP cannot stipulate what is allowed in operational terms.	
<i>Figure 6.1: Preferred Highways Option</i>				
3850 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The northern junction of the link road No.3 shown in Fig 6.1 should, if pursued, be limited to access by public transport, cycling and pedestrian only. An "all mode" junction with Cambridge Road, Impington at this location would exacerbate predicted congestion and air pollution within the Air Quality Management Area already mentioned in the previous comments.	Concern noted. However, although the design of the new road should give priority to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians, the NW Transport Study indicated that an all mode road was its preferred option as the route was needed to access the proposed development.	
3734 - David Wilson Estates & the Consortium of Landowners	Object	Discussions have concluded that a staggered crossroads arrangement is acceptable. Fig 6.1 should be amended to reflect this stagger.	Disagree. This is a level of detail which is not appropriate for the AAP: Figure 6.1 is indicative only. However, more detailed studies of the junction arrangements are being considered by Cambridgeshire County Council, which will inform master planning and the preparation of planning applications.	
3666 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Additionally, a map illustrating potential links for soft users into the countryside and to neighbouring communities, relating to the walking and cycling policies would be useful, or information added to Map 6.1. This could also show, diagrammatically, links to countryside access improvements already being made around the proposed site of Northstowe, and to the proposed 'Cambridge Necklace' route for which a bid has been made for GAF3 funding.	Disagree, the Councils consider that this is adequately covered in policies NW17 c) and NW18 c).	
3824	Object	To minimise traffic impact on surrounding area there should be only one access for car traffic to Huntingdon road at the end nearest the A14. This would stop car journeys to cut through the development	Disagree because this is inconsistent with the recommendations of the North West Transport Study which indicates that two accesses onto Huntingdon Road would be necessary to serve the development effectively and to provide the opportunity for an orbital route for public transport and cycling.	
3660 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	In respect of the route shown in Figure 6.1, there will also need to be an awareness of the proximity to the strategic gap, the green 'core' and the Travellers Rest SSSI, and consequent design and routeing issues to avoid adverse impact.	Support noted. Para 6.6 makes it clear that a road will only be possible if its impacts on amenity are acceptable. These impacts would include minimising the impact upon green spaces. Design to achieve this would be carried out as part of the master planning of the area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>6.13</i>				
3851 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Extension of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway from Kings Hedges Road through the NIAB site to join the Huntingdon Road as a preferred ultimate route to the City Centre, would relieve potential bus congestion along Histon Road and provide a faster more reliable service with potential increase in patronage. The transport study inexplicably fails to assess the excellent 10 min frequency of the existing Citi 7 service. At this frequency, (if proven viable after the 2 year "start up grant" subsidy expires), congestion delays on the B1049 and along Histon Road, Cambridge, can be mitigated. Guided buses, travelling over longer routes need to be more reliable. Attention is drawn to the decision to reduce the number of Guided Buses using Histon Road and to abandon the queue relocation/bus priority scheme authorised by the respective Area Joint Committees on 15th September and 20th October 2003. The consequences of these decisions to increase guided bus services on Milton Road and to reduce them in North West Cambridge have not been properly assessed.	Concern noted. This is a level of detail which is not appropriate for the AAP. Decisions on the wider operation of the Guided Bus system will be made by the County and District Councils, in conjunction with the operators. This will take account of the AAP and any master planning and planning applications in the area.	
3860 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We do not understand how there will be a connection with Cambridge Guided Busway at Histon Road since no bus stop is provided there (see Guided Busway Update November 2007 where bus stop is shown in Arbury Park not on Histon Road).	Concern noted. There is the potential for guided buses to come off the guideway and run through the NIAB site or stop at existing bus stops on Histon Road.	
<i>NW17: Cycling Provision</i>				
3653 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Support	The BBPSC support the provision of new and improved cycle links through the local area.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW17.
3840 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the policy to encourage cycling as part of this new development, as this will help to meet wider government objectives to encourage more participation in sport and physical activity in order to reduce associated health problems such as obesity and heart disease. Also applicable to this policy are our previous comments on Policy NW11 in relation to 'Active Design'.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW17.
3831 - Highways Agency	Support	We support this policy as it advocates the promotion of sustainable travel modes, encouraging the reduction of travel by car and will reinforce efforts to minimise traffic generation within the development.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW17.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3862 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Support	Support. More convenient cycle routes are essential to key destinations, including the proposed new rail station at Chesterton.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW17.
3476 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>The University supports the provision of new and improved cycle routes which will provide safe, permeable and connected routes through the development to key destinations including bus stops, the local centre and the various employment, residential and neighbourhood facilities.</p> <p>The new cycle routes will encourage sustainable transport forms, providing good quality links between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road and to open space, the adjacent communities and the city centre. Cycle parking provision will be provided across the development.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW17.
<i>a)</i>				
3378 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Without indication of how conflict with buses can be avoided, and how proper south-bound cycle facilities can have priority, this can only be one of two things: insubstantial spin or a promise of grossly inferior cycling provision.	Agree that it is important to provide high quality routes for cycling. However, details of road and cycle routes design layouts will be part of the masterplanning process and would not be an appropriate level of detail for the AAP.	Pursue preferred option NW17.
3662 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Reference within the policy for cycling should specifically acknowledge integrated links with the adjoining development across Huntingdon Road, which may be the location for some of the community facilities that will serve the AAP area.	Agree that specific mention of cross connections should be included.	Pursue preferred option NW17 subject to the following amendment: NW17b) amend to "Giving priority to cycling within the development, including connections to key destinations, including the local centre, bus stops, the primary school, employment, the NIAB development; and...."
3575	Object	It's clearly reasonable to expect an increase in cycle traffic to/from the city centre - yet, beyond the site itself, the designated route from the Huntingdon Rd side is dangerous, poorly surfaced and shows no sign of being cared for or upgraded. To what extent can permission of this development be made dependent on improvements to existing cycle routes beyond its boundaries if promotion of cycling is being touted as one of the solutions to the transport problem the development poses?	Agree this is an important matter to achieve modal split. Support for off site measures will be negotiated through the masterplanning and S106 process.	Pursue preferred option NW17.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
c) 3852 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The policy should specifically mention the proposed cycle bridge at the A14/B1049 intersection for which S106 provision has already been made as a result of development at Arbury. An additional/alternative route connecting NW Cambridge with NCN51 at Histon has also been identified in discussions concerning the NIAB site.	Noted. However, this a matter of detail not appropriate in an AAP. Detailed pedestrian and cycle links will be considered as part of masterplanning and subsequent S106 negotiations.	Pursue preferred option NW17.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6.14 3878 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	<p>Section 6.14: Need for on-road provision for cyclists as provision of first resort: additional bullet point needed. This issue is our most pressing concern and we feel it is absolutely crucial to correct. The suggested policy direction for cycle provision is misguided and will lead to considerable problems for both cyclists and walkers.</p> <p>Section 6.14 of the Volume 1 document goes against clear national policy (such as the Manual for Streets and recent DfT guidance) that on-road provision should be the provision of first resort. We strongly object to the notion that a network of "segregated cycle paths" should be the primary form of infrastructure as implied by the text. Furthermore, there is no mention of the need to cater primarily for convenient and safe on-road cycling.</p> <p>A new first bullet point must be inserted which makes clear the need for a cycle-friendly general road environment, facilitated by slower speeds and adequate space for cycling. Shared-use/segrgated paths adjacent to the roads should not feature whatsoever in the development and must be considered provision of absolute last resort - they are totally unsuitable for commuter (and other) cyclists and are strongly disliked by pedestrians. Draft AAP Policy NW17 also agrees with our view that "All cycle routes should be designated cycle paths (not shared-use)."</p> <p>We suggest the following wording: "6.14 a) A cycle-friendly road environment within all streets and roads in the development, providing both commuter cyclists and less confident cyclists with permeable routes through all streets, facilitated by slower speeds and avoidance of pinch-points and other cycle-hostile measures, all of which are in line with the recommendations of the government's Manual for Streets."</p> <p>Our new Position Paper "Cycling in New Developments" makes clear that the way that cycling should be planned in new developments and we formally request that real attention be paid to the points made in this paper.</p> <p>We ask that, if possible, information be included on vehicle speeds and Homes Zones.</p>	<p>Agree that both on and off road cycle facilities should be provided. However, detailed road designs will be part of the master planning process.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.14a) to "High quality cycle provision within the development ..."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3879 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	We are concerned that the report makes too much of the idea that only "short distance trips" can be made by cycling. It incorrectly encourages the mindset that cycling is just for short journeys. Indeed, it has been suggested that 5km should be considered the design limit for cycling by the consultants. Yet in and around Cambridge, a large number of people regularly cycle even greater distances. As such, the modelling must be adjusted to correct this incorrect modelling constraint.	Agree that the phrase "short distance" can be misleading.	Amend the first sentence of paragraph 6.14 to "...to encourage trips to be made by cycling....."
3510 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3304 3421 3546 3336 3412 3437 3450 3522 3534 3559 3607 3619 3632 3746 - Lettering Arts 3816	Object	Cycle access to the site from Huntingdon Road should be limited and should not include All Souls Lane.	Disagree because this is not consistent with the North West transport study, which indicates maximum permeability is necessary to encourage cycling to destinations within the development and connections to existing cycling networks. However it is intended also to make best use of existing accesses wherever possible.	
<i>d.</i>				
3379 - Girton Parish Council	Object	"consideration" of vague plans is not enough. Providing a voucher (redeemable at a local cycle shop) for a free, high-quality cycle would be a far preferable option.	Agree that this would be a valid incentive but it is not an appropriate level of detail in an AAP. Cycle promotion schemes could form part of a Residential Travel Plan.	
<i>6.15</i>				
3664 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	References to cycling for health as well as recreation purposes should be included in the supporting text to the Cycling Policy. We would also like to see more explicit consideration for equestrians and of the provision of both a hard surface for utility cycling and a softer surface for equestrian users so as to minimise potential conflict between users. For recreational links into the countryside, a softer surface with a harder substrate is generally acceptable.	Agree that these are important considerations but are a level of detail not appropriate to the AAP. More detailed road/cycle way design will be part of the masterplanning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3444	Support	Please please please could you improve the cycle connection into the city centre along Huntingdon Road. All cycling support is hopeless if it is abandoned at the junction with Histon Road (where the old Texaco garage used to be). You MUST GET BIKES SAFELY ALL THE WAY INTO TOWN (AND A DIRECT WAY) or else families will just use their cars. Half a cycle route is worse than no cycle route. It is a sham	Support noted. Radial routes through the site may provide an alternative to cycling down Huntingdon Road. Support for off site measures will be sought through the masterplanning process and S106 negotiations.	
<i>6.16</i>				
3861 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We support provision of radial routes for cyclists. However, improvement of existing cycle routes along Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road "must be improved", not "may be improved".	Disagree as such a level of specific detail is not appropriate in an AAP. However, off site measures will be sought through more detailed studies and strategies through the masterplanning process.	
<i>6.17</i>				
3880 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	We believe there are two crucial omissions in 3.36 of the Cambridge North West Transport Study. These are: a) NIAB Site: The accommodation bridge over the A14 to the north of the site, which would provide a good route for cyclists in from Northstowe; and b) Accommodation underpass beneath the M11, which would provide an alternative route to the villages to the north and west of the site.	Disagree as such a level of specific detail is not appropriate for an AAP. However, off site measures will be sought through more detailed studies and strategies through the masterplanning process.	
3863 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Support	Support. More convenient cycle routes are essential to key destinations, including the proposed new rail station at Chesterton.	Support noted.	
<i>NW18: Walking Provision</i>				
3883 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	Segregation of pedestrians and cyclists is not overly emphasised and should be, in relation to footpaths.	Concern noted. This is a matter of detailed design not appropriate in an AAP. Detailed footpath/cycleway design will be part of the masterplanning process.	Pursue preferred option NW18.
3380 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Plans should include "(d) Development of Home Zones where cars are discouraged and a maximum vehicle speed of 20mph (or less) is enforced" Some of the data about walking distances in the Transport Study appears to be seriously misleading.	Concern noted. Agree that Home Zones should be considered, but this should be as part of the more detailed master planning processes rather than in the AAP	Pursue preferred option NW18.
3832 - Highways Agency	Support	The Highways Agency supports this policy as it advocates the promotion of sustainable travel modes, encouraging the reduction of travel by car and will reinforce efforts to minimise traffic generation within the development.	Support noted	Pursue preferred option NW18.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3841 - Sport England	Support	<p>Sport England supports the policy to encourage walking as part of this development, as this will help to meet wider government objectives to raise participation in sport and physical activity, to help address growing health problems such as obesity and heart disease.</p> <p>Our comments made on Policy NW11 in relation to 'Active Design' are also applicable in this instance.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW18.
3477 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>The University supports the provision of pedestrian routes which will provide permeable, safe and connected routes through the development to the various employment, residential and neighbourhood facilities. The development will be designed to maximise legibility and permeability of walking trips, encourage short distance trips, and reduce car dependency.</p> <p>The University encourages sustainable transport forms, providing good quality links to open space and the adjacent communities and city centre. Priority will be given to walking routes that connect to key destinations.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW18.
<i>a)</i>				
3663 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Reference within the policy for walking should specifically acknowledge integrated links with the adjoining development across Huntingdon Road, which may be the location for some of the community facilities that will serve the AAP area.	Agree that walking links should refer to the NIAB development.	Pursue preferred option NW18 subject to the following amendment: NW18a) amend to "Giving priority to walking routes between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road, to adjacent development and to the City Centre"
<i>c)</i>				
3680 - Cambridge Ramblers' Association	Object	We agree with the emphasis on priority for cycle and pedestrian travel within the sites and back into the City, but would like to see specific reference to new recreational footpath links from both the University and NIAB's sites out to Coton, Girton and Histon. These would ideally be by new footbridges over the M11 and A14.	Disagree as such as level of specific detail is not appropriate in an AAP. However, off site measures will be sort through more detailed studies and strategies through the masterplanning process.	Pursue preferred option NW18.
3706 - Natural England	Support	We support the principles established here, particularly under (c) "...including links to an improved rights of way network and to nearby villages and open countryside."	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW18.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>6.18</i>				
3665 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Although Paragraph 6.18 refers to "key external destinations" it does not mention open countryside destinations such as the Coton Reserve. To that end the development should also include provision of a footpath link along Madingley Road to join with Public Bridleway No 30 running south towards the Coton footpath.	Concern noted. This matter is generally covered by Preferred Policy Option NW18 (c). Detailed off-site provision will be negotiated as part of the masterplanning process.	
<i>6.19</i>				
3511 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3305 3422 3547 3337 3413 3438 3451 3501 3523 3535 3560 3608 3620 3633 3750 - Lettering Arts 3818	Object	Walking access points from Huntingdon Road should be limited and not include All Souls Lane.	Disagree because this is not consistent with the North West transport study, which indicates maximum permeability is necessary to encourage walking to destinations within the development and connections to existing walking networks. However it is intended to make best use of existing accesses wherever possible.	
3875	Object	In provision of walking routes, there should be a specification to avoid placing these along the boundaries of the site, and so alongside rear fences of existing houses. This could, regrettably, promote littering there, and unwanted access, if a narrow walking route also lies between the existing boundary and a new fence belonging to the development.	Noted. However the AAP is a high level policy document whilst appropriate boundary treatment for properties will be part of the master planning process and one aspect that it will be taken into account is the amenity and security of existing properties. At the same time however, site permeability is crucial to encouraging high levels of walking and cycling. Foot and cycle path locations will be developed at the master planning stage but wherever possible will preserve the amenity of existing homes.	
3884 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	Segregation of pedestrians and cyclists is not overly emphasised and should be, in relation to footpaths.	Disagree. This is a matter of detailed design not appropriate in an AAP. Detailed footpath/cycleway design will be part of the master planning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW19: Parking Standards</i>				
3846 - Highways Agency	Object	The Council should ensure that the parking policy should take into account recent guidance such as: - PPG13: Transport - PPS3: Housing	Concern noted. Car parking maximum standards, as set out in Appendix 1 of the AAP, are in line with PPG 13 and PPS 3 and are considered appropriate to achieve the aims of the AAP to reduce excessive car dependency and create a high quality urban environment.	Pursue preferred option NW19.
3381 - Girton Parish Council	Object	No indication is given as to how visitor access is to be controlled to ensure the number of visitor cars does not exceed the parking provision.	Noted. It is the limited number of car parking spaces which will effectively reduce the opportunity for excessive demand for visitor spaces in accordance with the car parking standards. Enforcement will be through the normal parking regulations.	Pursue preferred option NW19.
3478 - University of Cambridge	Object	The University does not object to the parking standards listed in Appendices 1 and 2, but it would be helpful for standards to be provided for the commercial research and research institute uses proposed for the site. In accordance with the aforementioned standards the University will aim to minimise the amount of car parking, where practical, and maximise the amount of cycle parking in order to discourage unnecessary car use and to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport. The provision of student residential parking will be low.	Agree that car use should be discouraged wherever possible. The car parking standards do this by being maxima, as emphasised in para 6.20 of the draft AAP, and clarified in para 1.1 of Appendix 1, but this could be further clarified in the tables of standards.	Pursue preferred option NW19 subject to the following amendment: Amend the headings of the second column of tables 1-6 of Appendix 1 to "Maximum Standard"
3790	Object	While aiming to reduce car USE as much as possible, adequate car parking should be provided to allow for visitors and for the increase in home deliveries (which is part of a sustainable transport system by cutting down private car trips to shops). Ideally car parking should be off road to reduce visible impact and obstruction of routes for cyclists.	Agree this is very important. Visitor parking will be provided in accordance with the maximum car parking standards detailed in paragraph 3.1.	Pursue preferred option NW19.
3885 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	Car parking should be in bays to minimise dangers for cyclists, especially on the internal bus and main traffic routes.	Agree that car parking should be in marked bays, but such detailed design is more appropriate in later stages of the planning process including master planning.	Pursue preferred option NW19.
6.20				
3886 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	Car parking should be in bays to minimise dangers for cyclists, especially on the internal bus and main traffic routes.	Agree that car parking should be in marked bays, but such detailed design is more appropriate in later stages of the planning process including master planning.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7. Community Services and Facilities				
<i>NW20: Provision of Community Services and Facilities, Arts and Culture</i>				
3842 - Sport England	Object	<p>Sport England support the principle of providing high quality community services and facilities which will help to develop a sustainable community, and can potentially be used for small scale sports use.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the policy should clarify whether sports facilities are included within this policy, as the policy refers to provision by 'sporting clubs', whereas the glossary defines community facilities as falling within Use Class D1 and parts of Class C2. This definition would therefore exclude sports facilities such as swimming pools, sports halls etc which fall within Class D2 of the Use Classes Order 2006.</p>	<p>Concern noted. It is important to recognise that not all services and facilities will be provided by the public or commercial sectors and some facilities may be best provided through direct involvement of community groups e.g. facilities for faith or social and sport clubs and in appropriate instances land may be required for such provision. The reference to sporting clubs in part 2 of policy NW 20 relates to any such facilities provided over and above that required by the Open Space and Recreation standards and this distinction should therefore be clarified in the supporting text to the policy.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred policy NW20.</p> <p>Insert a new supporting paragraph to policy NW20 to read: 'Not all services and facilities will be provided by the public or commercial sectors. Some facilities at North West Cambridge will be best provided through the direct involvement of community groups, e.g. facilities for faith and public worship and associations including social and sporting clubs. In appropriate instances the development may be required to provide land for their provision. These would be any sporting club that provides facilities over and above that required by the Open Space and Recreation Standards'.</p>
<i>1.</i>				
3591	Object	<p>There is no mention of on-site healthcare provision for the proposed 2,000 university students and residents of the 2,000-2,500 open market and affordable dwellings</p>	<p>Agree that there should be reference in the AAP to the provision of healthcare although such provision could be provided outside the development, for example in a local centre in the new neighbourhood being established north of Huntingdon Road. However, it will be important to ensure that the local centre in the AAP area is a robust and viable centre with a good range of facilities.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW 20.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.9 to include reference to provision of healthcare.</p>
3576	Support	<p>Very important that this is agreed prior to planning permission being granted. Many possibilities have been mentioned at meetings, in presentations, and the like - in some cases without those who would be responsible for providing same even being aware they were being "suggested"</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW20.</p>
3394 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>High quality neighbourhood facilities will be provided on site directly associated to the needs of the new community. The University intends to engage with key stakeholders prior to submission of a planning application.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW20.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7.3				
3796 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Support	We support the need for Community development workers but feel that the need to build social cohesion with the existing communities surrounding this development is equally important. Other measures for building and monitoring social capital also need to be considered. The local Improving Health Partnership is working with the Voluntary sector on developing such measures and would be keen that the outcomes of this work feed into the ongoing planning of this development.	Support noted.	
3673 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	We notice (p35, 7.3) that Professional Community Development Workers will help establish the community. We'd like to suggest that part of their role should be to encourage behaviours consistent with the high-level of sustainability of their new homes i.e. by providing information and advice about the importance of energy efficient behaviours and encourage pride/identity associated with the sustainability aspects of this new community.	Support noted, however, this is not a matter for the Area Action Plan.	
<i>NW21: A Local Centre</i>				
3864 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We are pleased to see that community provision for the University's North West Cambridge site is being considered along with the provision for neighbouring communities. North East of Huntingdon Road. This should specify provision for both existing and new communities.	Concern noted. Paragraph 7.8 in the AAP states that the local centre can also provide for some of the needs of those who live or work in neighbouring communities, particularly the sector of North West Cambridge which will be developed to the north of Huntingdon Road and the University's West Cambridge Site, south of Madingley Road. However, in accordance with Circular 5/2005, any provision must be directly related to the proposed development and planning obligations should not be used solely to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision .	Pursue preferred option NW21.
3833	Support	There is a real lack of local facilities in the Madingley Road area, no shops, school, hall etc, although we do have sports facilities. It would be great if the new development could improve this aspect for local people. I am not sure what routes are planned, but I feel it would be very helpful to make the new centre very accessible for people from this part of Cambridge. Having a centre as near as possible to Madingley Road/Storeys Way would improve the viability and vitality of the new centre, as it would increase footfall. Building them this side would also avoid conflict with local centres already present in Thornton Road and Histon Road. I am sure that it is important that the new centre doesn't threaten those shops.	Support noted. The local centre will act as the focus for the new community and will be linked to the network of pedestrian and cycle routes as well as public transport routes. Furthermore, the location of the local centre at the heart of the development will assist in bringing together the two parts of the development either side of the strategic gap and thus encouraging the creation of a cohesive community. The location adjacent to the strategic gap with its recreation and amenity function will enhance its attraction as a community focus. The local centre can also provide for some of the needs of those who live or work in neighbouring communities.	Pursue preferred option NW21.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3479 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>The University supports the provision of services and facilities at the centre of the development as this will promote and encourage a sustainable community. The co-location of facilities and services enables a more efficient use of land and buildings in line with PPS3. The University's masterplan identifies a local centre which includes a primary school.</p> <p>The facilities will be within walking distance and well served by public transport and a pedestrian and cycle path network in line with sustainable development principles, in order to encourage sustainable living.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW21.
3667 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The development of a local centre with the range of facilities specified is supported.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW21.
<i>7.5</i>				
3339 - Lidl UK	Support	Since our arrival in the UK in 1994, Lidl has had a strong desire to gain representation within Cambridge. It is our intention to provide neighbourhood communities with a choice, which would include our specific brand of food retail. By anchoring a local centre, we believe we would encourage quality at the lowest possible prices whilst sourcing a workforce specifically from within the local community.	Support noted.	
<i>7.7</i>				
3786	Object	The focus on a single centre (with a supermarket already jockeying for a site, see the comments at 7.5) makes it inevitable that the "strategic Gap" will fail in its intended purpose, and will be unlikely to withstand the demands of future development.	Concern noted, however, the need to maintain separation between Girton and Cambridge diminishes with increasing distance from Huntingdon Road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. The local centre will act as the focus for the new community and the location at the heart of the development will assist in bringing together the two parts of the development either side of the strategic gap and thus encouraging the creation of a cohesive community.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3592	Object	Conflicts with paragraph 3.6 which states the importance of the Girton Gap to act as a green separation between Girton parish and Cambridge City	Concern noted, however, the need to maintain separation between Girton and Cambridge diminishes with increasing distance from Huntingdon Road, as the relationship with Girton village becomes less obvious. The strategic gap then broadens out at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscape and biodiversity. The local centre will act as the focus for the new community and the location at the heart of the development will assist in bringing together the two parts of the development either side of the strategic gap and thus encouraging the creation of a cohesive community.	
3670 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Paragraph 7.7 refers to the opportunity for playing fields associated with the primary school to be located within the green area of the gap, and this is supported.	Support noted.	
7.8				
3865 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We are pleased to see that community provision for the University's North West Cambridge site is being considered along with the provision for neighbouring communities. North East of Huntingdon Road. This should specify provision for both existing and new communities.	Concern noted. Paragraph 7.8 in the AAP states that the local centre can also provide for some of the needs of those who live or work in neighbouring communities, particularly the sector of North West Cambridge which will be developed to the north of Huntingdon Road and the University's West Cambridge Site, south of Madingley Road. However, in accordance with Circular 5/2005, any provision must be directly related to the proposed development and planning obligations should not be used solely to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision .	
7.9				
3800 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Object	There is no reference to health facilities in this list. On the basis of the approach proposed in 7.10 , i.e a health facility may be provided outside of this development in the new neighbourhood north of Huntingdon road, it should be included in this list even if that approach is taken. We do wish to explore the possibility of a specialised Student Health Care facility that would be particularly appropriate for this development, but we are at the early stages of discussion.	Agree that there should be reference in the AAP to the provision of healthcare although such provision could be provided outside the development, for example in a local centre in the new neighbourhood being established north of Huntingdon Road. However, it will be important to ensure that the local centre in the AAP area is a robust and viable centre with a good range of facilities.	Amend paragraph 7.9 to include reference to provision of healthcare
3320	Object	There needs to be some mention of commercial leisure facilities such as pubs and clubs. In the absence of such facilities locally, residents will have to travel further afield, increasing the numbers of trips made by all transport modes.	Concern noted. Policy NW20 requires that development will provide an appropriate level and type of high quality services and facilities in suitable locations to serve all phases of development. The provision of commercial leisure facilities are therefore not ruled out, however, such provision will be a commercial decision. Paragraph 7.9 should be amended to reflect that the local centre will include a range of services and facilities and refer to the provision of other services.	Amend the first sentence of paragraph 7.9 to include reference to 'a range of services and facilities' and amend part b to include reference to 'other services'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3791	Object	<p>There are a number of important omissions here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A secondary school. At present both this and the NIAB development are each assuming that the other will provide. *Both* need to be forced to include it in preliminary plans until the final decision is made. 2. Health care. 3. A pub. <p>Furthermore, all of these facilities will bring people into the site from outside: this fact should inform the transport considerations -- but does not at present.</p>	<p>Concern noted. 1) Paragraph 7.11 in the AAP acknowledges the need for secondary school provision and reflects the current County Council position which is for a secondary school to be provide on land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road. The development at North West Cambridge will therefore need to make an appropriate financial contribution to such provision.</p> <p>2) Agree that there should be reference in the AAP to the provision of healthcare although such provision could be provided outside the development, for example in a local centre in the new neighbourhood being established north of Huntingdon Road. However, it will be important to ensure that the local centre in the AAP area is a robust and viable centre with a good range of facilities.</p> <p>3) Policy NW20 requires that development will provide an appropriate level and type of high quality services and facilities in suitable locations to serve all phases of development. The provision of commercial facilities are therefore not ruled out, however, such provision will be a commercial decision.</p>	Amend paragraph 7.9 to include reference to provision of healthcare and to refer to the provision of other services.
3743 - David Wilson Estates & the Consortium of Landowners	Object	<p>It is noted that there is no reference to the provision of a secondary school. The land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road is capable of accommodating a secondary school which would meet the criteria identified by Cambridgeshire County Council through the work which has been undertaken during 2007.</p>	<p>Concern noted, however, paragraph 7.11 in the AAP acknowledges the need for secondary school provision and reflects the current County Council position which is for a secondary school to be provided on land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road. The development at North West Cambridge will therefore need to make an appropriate financial contribution to such provision.</p>	
3807 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	<p>Cambridge Preservation Society considers that wider range of community facilities are established e.g. hard paved/landscaped market square as flexible space catering for commercial activities such as farmers markets as well as community events (flea markets, fairs etc), religious centres/spaces and commercial food/drink outlets supporting activities of nearby greenspaces. Centrally located should also be sheltered housing/old people homes to fully integrate with the community and ensure easy walking/wheelchair distance to green spaces, shops etc. Where community facilities cannot be afforded during any development phases then land must be safeguarded for the local community and Councils to provide facilities at a later stage.</p>	<p>Concern noted, however, policy NW20 requires the development to provide an appropriate level and type of high quality services and facilities in suitable locations to serve all phases of development and in order to identify the appropriate level, detailed assessments and strategies will be required to be prepared with key stakeholders prior to granting planning permission.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>b.</i>				
3340 - Lidl UK	Support	At Lidl, we believe that our business promotes social inclusion by bringing the benefits of an appropriate range of supermarket shopping to areas where such facilities may not be readily accessible; in terms of the value offered on the deeply discounted prices of goods on sale.	Support noted.	
<i>c.</i>				
3668 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The principle of the provision of the library within the local centre is supported (especially as there will be other facilities i.e. Primary School nearby). It will be necessary, ultimately, to identify the best location for a library, taking into account the needs of the north west quadrant as a whole.	Support noted.	
<i>g.</i>				
3674 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Existing Waste Local Plan (saved Policy WLP18) proposes all new major development areas in the CSR are potential sites for waste management facilities to ensure improvements to waste recycling. Reference should be added to the supporting text to Policy NW21, plus the position of the new Minerals and Waste LDF, which is looking for a major waste facility and recycling centre to serve the northern sector of the Cambridge area. Although the NIAB land is currently a potential location officers are still considering site specific options, including North West Cambridge. A decision is likely in the Spring.	Disagree. It is not the role of the AAP to include policies for waste or to repeat policies which are in other parts of the development plan, or attempt to interpret them. Waste policies are contained in the Waste Local Plan 2003 and the County Council is preparing a Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework, which is progressing. Paragraph 1.3 in the AAP makes it clear that the AAP will form part of the development plan for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District and the documents which make up the development plan are listed in each Council's Local Development Scheme. Furthermore paragraph 1.4 states that in using the AAP it is essential that its policies are read as a whole rather than in isolation and should also be read together with policies and proposals elsewhere in the development plan.	
<i>7.10</i>				
3866 - Windsor Road Residents (WIRE)	Object	We are concerned about the relative timing of provision of facilities on the University's site and the new neighbourhood North East of Huntingdon Road. It is likely that the NIAB site will be developed in advance of the University site. Specify that if this happens, there will not be a corresponding delay in the provision of new facilities for the two areas, especially in view of the existing shortfall in the existing area between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road.	Concern noted. Joint working with key stakeholders to develop both parts of the North West quadrant will assist in co-ordinating provision and timing of appropriate facilities to serve the new developments.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7.11				
3918 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	I note that the development is planned in conjunction with the NIAB site to the north of Huntingdon Road where a secondary school is planned. If this plan is not stuck to, i.e. no secondary school, it will put pressure on other schools in the area.	Concern noted, however, this is not a matter for the Area Action Plan.	
3745 - David Wilson Estates & the Consortium of Landowners	Object	It is noted that there is no reference to the provision of a secondary school. The land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road is capable of accommodating a secondary school which would meet the criteria identified by Cambridgeshire County Council through the work which has been undertaken during 2007.	Concern noted, however, paragraph 7.11 in the AAP acknowledges the need for secondary school provision and reflects the current County Council position which is for a secondary school to be provide on land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road. The development at North West Cambridge will therefore need to make an appropriate financial contribution to such provision.	
3671 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In Paragraph 7.11, whilst supporting the principles of the location for, and financial contribution to secondary schooling, it would be more appropriate for the first sentence to say, "The development will contribute to the need for a secondary school."	Agree that this sentence should be clarified.	Delete reference to "provision" at the end of the first sentence and replace with "places".
3672 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Paragraph 7.11 last sentence. The County Council supports the statement that development of North West Cambridge will make an appropriate financial contribution to secondary provision.	Support noted.	
NW22: Public Art				
3654 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	We appreciate that the Adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2006 requires the provision of public art at a cost of 1% of the construction costs for a proposal. Whilst we do not object to the provision of public art as part of new development, we are concerned that the required provision could have considerable implications for the viability of the development.	Concern noted. Paragraph 10.15 of the AAP states that the overall viability of the development will be taken into consideration in the decision on the level of planning obligations to be incorporated into the S106 Agreement at the planning application stage.	Pursue preferred option NW22.
3480 - University of Cambridge	Object	The University made objections to the inclusion of policy for public art provision in the preparation of previous development plans. We recognise, however, that the Cambridge Local Plan Inquiry Inspector concluded that public art provision should be sought by planning policy. However, the City Council's "Supplementary Planning Guidance: Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes", adopted in 2003, seeks provision at a cost equal to 1% of the construction cost of the development. The 1% cost should be a target, not a minimum requirement. Provision of more than 1% could have a significant impact on development viability.	Support for the provision of public art is noted and agree that policy NW22 should be consistent with other planning policy guidance and seek a cost equal to 1% of the construction cost of the development.	Pursue preferred policy NW22 subject to the following amendment: delete 'at least 1%' and replace with 'at a cost equal to 1%'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3726 - Home Builders Federation	Object	Policies must make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances.	Concern noted. Paragraph 10.15 of the AAP states that the overall viability of the development will be taken into consideration in the decision on the level of planning obligations to be incorporated into the S106 Agreement at the planning application stage.	Pursue preferred option NW22.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8. Recreation				
<i>NW23: Open Space and Recreation Provision</i>				
3905 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	Reference to green infrastructure should be made in policy NW23 and supporting text, including a suggestion that cultural heritage features will be accommodated within this.	Green infrastructure has a wider remit than open space and recreation provision alone. Accordingly, it would be more suitable to clarify the need to consider green infrastructure. Cultural heritage features such as the historic landscape, archaeological features and conservation areas are already dealt with in the Development Principles section and for avoidance of repetition within the document should not be reiterated.	Pursue preferred option NW23 subject to the following amendment to Objective O (after paragraph 2.4 in chapter 2) 'to read to secure the infrastructure needs of the development, including green infrastructure; and'
3890 - Cambridge Leisure & Ice Centre	Support	<p>The Preferred Policy acknowledges the suitability of the Plan Area for sports facilities. Paragraph 8.6 also recognises that the Plan Area may provide the opportunity to host a facility which may serve a wider area and the University community as a whole, such as an ice rink. Paragraph 8.6 is itself coherent and consistent with the Major Sports Facility strategy for the Sub Region. This proposes that an Ice Rink is a Sub Regional Priority on the basis that there is demand and a unique catchment area for a potential ice rink development.</p> <p>The Opportunity highlighted in Paragraph 8.6 within the North West Cambridge Area is well suited to satisfying this sub regional objective. It is accessible by a variety of modes of transport and is a sequentially appropriate location.</p> <p>Proposals have been put forward that demonstrate that a high quality, sustainable 'green' building could be delivered that would benefit both the local community, the University and the wider population.</p> <p>An extensive site search has been undertaken over several years to find a suitable location for this sub regional priority development. NW Cambridge is considered to be a uniquely suitable and viable location. The precise site of such a facility would require further investigation to satisfy site constraints and to optimise community and operating benefits.</p>	Support noted	Pursue Preferred Policy Option NW23

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3481 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>The University supports the provision of neighbourhood facilities, including sports facilities, on the site. Open space distribution and central green space will be provided in line with Open Space and Recreation Standards.</p> <p>The University's masterplan ensures an expanse of green space to allow for recreation and leisure uses and the protection of the SSSI. This open space and associated activity generators will encourage community interaction and social inclusion.</p> <p>The University will ensure that safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links are provided in all directions along the strategic green corridor, with good linkages to the adjacent countryside.</p>	Support noted	Pursue Preferred Policy Option NW23
3676 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The Policy is supported.	Support noted	Pursue Preferred Policy Option NW23
3836 - Sport England	Support	<p>Sport England are fully supportive of this policy which seeks to ensure that adequate indoor and outdoor sports facilities are provided as part of the development, and we are pleased to see that following our earlier representations the scope of facility provision has been widened to incorporate a full range of indoor and outdoor facilities such as sports pitches, indoor sports facilities and provision for teenagers such as multi-use games areas and play equipment, which could include skate parks etc.</p> <p>We agree with the dual approach to on-site/off-site provision given the different thresholds for different types of facility, but on-site provision should always be required if the facility will be below the threshold for on-site provision to serve the needs of the development.</p>	Concerns noted. Paragraph 8.3 clarifies the Councils' requirements for on-site provision in stating that 'where appropriate such provision should be made on site or otherwise through commuted payments. In most cases on site provision is preferred as the facility will be close to the development. However, for some facilities this will not be possible and in such cases a commuted sum will be required.'	Pursue Preferred Policy Option NW23
3707 - Natural England	Support	We support the requirement for development to provide improved linkages to the adjacent open countryside.	Support noted	Pursue Preferred Policy Option NW23

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
8.1				
3678 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Figures 2.1 (Concept Diagram) and Inset A (Pre-Submission Proposals Map 2007) show significant areas of Green Belt / Open Space. The Green Infrastructure Strategy proposes a City-scale new green corridor (C4) through the Cambridge NW site and on through the NIAB site. The design and management of these open spaces should reflect the fact that the green belt/open space will also function as a green corridor, and a reference added accordingly to Paragraph 8.1.	This matter is discussed in paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7, which confirm that a strategic gap runs broadly north to south through the development. In addition to preventing the coalescence of Girton and Cambridge, the broadened strategic gap provides linkage from the Green Belt to the north to a large open space at the heart of the development to provide for amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity.	
3708 - Natural England	Support	We welcome the recognition that open spaces provide a variety of interlinked uses that add to local character, amenity and biodiversity	Support noted	
8.2				
3709 - Natural England	Object	should include reference to the Natural England Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt) as a method of ensuring that semi natural open space provided is sufficient for the needs of the community, as recommended by PPG17.	Whilst recognising Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt) as a method of ensuring that semi natural open space is provided to meet the needs of the community, the Councils will continue to make reference to the locally derived standards contained within the Area Action Plan document. ANGSt should be considered by the Councils when reviews of open space standards SPDs take place.	
<hr/>				
8.4				
3677 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	We would like to see reference in the supporting text (paragraph 8.4) that Coton Countryside Reserve is identified as Major Green Infrastructure Site 'U' in the Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region.	Concern noted. Both Councils have endorsed Cambridgeshire Horizons' Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge's Sub-Region as technical guidance for the urban extensions. Whilst it is considered appropriate to acknowledge the Green Infrastructure Strategy, the Coton Countryside Reserve is already mentioned specifically as an area of Strategic Open Space in paragraph 8.4 and any further clarification of the site's numbering within the Green Infrastructure Strategy is considered superfluous.	Amend paragraph 8.4 to insert 'identified in Cambridgeshire Horizons' Green Infrastructure Strategy' following 'linkages' at the end of the first sentence.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3711 - Natural England	Support	<p>We support the required provision of Strategic Open Space and the contribution of such to the sub-regional network of green spaces. However, we believe that '...This could include improved access from...' be revised to '...This should include improved access from...'. We also believe that specific reference should be made to achieving the aims of the Cambridge Sub-region Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>	<p>1. Agree with '...This could include improved access from...' being revised to '...This should include improved access from...' in order to strengthen the requirement for access from the AAP site into the countryside and identified areas of Strategic Open Space. 2. Concern noted. Both Councils have endorsed Cambridgeshire Horizons' Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge's Sub-Region as technical guidance for the urban extensions and it is therefore considered appropriate to acknowledge the Green Infrastructure Strategy within the AAP document.</p>	<p>1. Revise paragraph 8.4 from '...This could include improved access from...' to '...This should include improved access from...'. 2. Amend paragraph 8.4 to insert 'identified in Cambridgeshire Horizons' Green Infrastructure Strategy' following 'linkages' at the end of the first sentence. 3. Amend paragraph 8.4 to delete 'is the' and include ' would form part of the' at the start of the first sentence in order to provide clarity.</p>
3767 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Support	The Cambridge Preservation Society supports this objectives and is proud to establish the Coton Countryside Reserve (just to the SW of the NW1-site) catering for local people from nearby rural or urban residential areas.	Support noted	
8.6				
3321	Object	<p>I am in favour of a facility of this kind, however I suspect that the example of an ice rink may be problematic and I question whether it would really be sustainable on two grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Energy usage. 2. Whether it could be operated profitably without a subsidy. 	Concerns noted. In relation to energy usage, it should be noted that policies within the Natural Resources chapter are intended to ensure that non-residential development will achieve a high degree of sustainable design and construction and that a minimum of 20% of the non-residential development's predicted energy requirements will be provided from the use of on-site low and zero carbon technologies. In terms of the potential for an ice rink to be operated profitably without the need for subsidy, this is not a matter for the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.	
3795	Object	Any facility likely to attract a wider public will have transport implications. These have not been addressed.	Concern noted. Any development of this scale would require a transport assessment to be submitted to support the planning application. Furthermore, any planning application would need to comply with the policies outlined in the Travel chapter, which encourage travel by sustainable modes of transport.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3891 - Cambridge Leisure & Ice Centre	Support	<p>The Preferred Policy acknowledges the suitability of the Plan Area for sports facilities. Paragraph 8.6 also recognises that the Plan Area may provide the opportunity to host a facility which may serve a wider area and the University community as a whole, such as an ice rink. Paragraph 8.6 is itself coherent and consistent with the Major Sports Facility strategy for the Sub Region. This proposes that an Ice Rink is a Sub Regional Priority on the basis that there is demand and a unique catchment area for a potential ice rink development.</p> <p>The Opportunity highlighted in Paragraph 8.6 within the North West Cambridge Area is well suited to satisfying this sub regional objective. It is accessible by a variety of modes of transport and is a sequentially appropriate location.</p> <p>Proposals have been put forward that demonstrate that a high quality, sustainable 'green' building could be delivered that would benefit both the local community, the University and the wider population.</p> <p>An extensive site search has been undertaken over several years to find a suitable location for this sub regional priority development. NW Cambridge is considered to be a uniquely suitable and viable location. The precise site of such a facility would require further investigation to satisfy site constraints and to optimise community and operating benefits.</p>	Support noted	
3837 - Sport England	Support	<p>We also support the opportunity afforded in Para. 8.6 for the development to host a facility which may serve a wider area and the University community as a whole (e.g. an ice rink), as the Cambridgeshire Horizons Study (2006) made reference to the need for major new developments to provide for sub-regional needs as well as local.</p>	Support noted	
8.7				
3838 - Sport England	Support	<p>Finally, we support the need for a more detailed recreation strategy to address the detailed requirements for sport, open space and play needs on the development, and we would welcome the opportunity to comment further on such a study at the appropriate time.</p>	Support noted	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

9. Natural Resources

NW24: Climate Change & Sustainable Design and Construction

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3719 - Government Office for the East of England	Object	There is a need for greater clarity and certainty in the proposed approach to higher environmental building standards, particularly clarification of the relationship between Policy Options NW24 and NW29. This could be achieved by inclusion of a single policy that deals with expected standards of building performance as a whole against the relevant Code levels; the policy could also be clear, where appropriate, to which elements of the Code the policy applies.	Concern noted. The Councils view is that all elements of the Code for Sustainable Homes should be applied to the residential element of the North West Cambridge Development. However the policy will be amended by the incorporation of preferred options NW24, NW25 and NW29 in order to ensure clarity.	Combine preferred options NW24, NW25 and NW29 to read: "Preferred Policy Option NW24: Climate Change & Sustainable Design and Construction 1. Development will be required to demonstrate that it has been designed to adapt to the predicted effects of climate change; 2. Combined Heat and Power (CHP), preferably fuelled by renewable energy sources, will be required to meet the needs of a substantial proportion of the development. Where it can be demonstrated that this would not be viable, then the provision of a District Heating Scheme, preferably fuelled by renewable energy sources, to meet the needs of a substantial proportion of the development will be required. 3. Residential development will be required to demonstrate that: a) All dwellings approved on or before 31st March 2013 will meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or higher, up to a maximum of 675 dwellings. All dwellings above 675 will meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 or higher; b) All dwellings approved on or after 1st April 2013 will meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 or higher; c) Water conservation measures will be incorporated to reduce per capita water consumption by at least 30% compared to 2006 levels to meet Code Level 4, rising to a 47% reduction compared to 2006 levels to meet Code Level 5; and d) There is no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity as a result of the management of water conservation measures. 4. Non residential development and student housing will be required to

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3681 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object A specific policy on biodiversity is missing & should be included stating that, to ensure that a thorough understanding of the site's biodiversity is achieved before, during and after construction, the AAP site will require biodiversity appraisal and a management strategy to be developed.	Concern noted. The issue of the protection and enhancement of biodiversity is dealt with in the Objectives of the Area Action Plan and Policy NW2 Development Principles. Paragraph 2.8 of the Area Action Plan calls for a number of studies and strategies to be in place prior to the granting of planning permission, including a Biodiversity Strategy that will address the protection and enhancement of biodiversity interests on the site. A long term management plan for biodiversity will also be required.	demonstrate that: e) It will achieve a high degree of sustainable design and construction in line with BREEAM "excellent " standards or the equivalent if this is replaced; f) It will reduce its predicted carbon emissions by at least 20% through the use of on-site low and zero carbon technologies; g) It will incorporate water conservation measures including water saving devices, greywater and/or rainwater recycling in all buildings to significantly reduce potable water consumption; and h) There is no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity as a result of the management of water conservation measures. 5. The above requirements are subject to wider viability testing. Pursue preferred option NW24.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3727 - Home Builders Federation	Object	<p>The relationship between the Code for Sustainable Homes and planning policies being interpreted in an inconsistent way throughout England (and, indeed, Wales) is becoming increasingly problematic for the house building industry. In their attempt to be seen to be rising to meet the challenges set by climate change many regions, sub regions and local authorities are taking it upon themselves to try to move faster than the timetable attached to the Code for carbon reduction.</p> <p>Planning and Climate Change (December 2006) was published as a draft supplement to PPS1. The document supports the HBF's viewpoint that the draft PPS should clearly recognise the need for planning policy not to duplicate the role of national building regulations. Furthermore, it must be recognised that if carbon emissions are to be properly tackled then there needs to be a concerted effort to reduce carbon emissions from the existing housing stock, which is far less environmentally friendly than any modern housing now being built.</p>	<p>Disagree, the Councils are not seeking to set their own standards, but are seeking to bring forward the Code for Sustainable Homes in line with the provisions of the PPS on Planning and Climate Change. Paragraph 31 of the PPS supports the Councils position on bringing forward the timetable for the Code for Sustainable Homes at this site. It states that "there will be situations where it could be appropriate for planning authorities to anticipate levels of building sustainability in advance of those set nationally". The Councils have commissioned a study which has found that the use of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) is viable on this site. The use of CHP at North West Cambridge will result in considerable carbon emission reduction and assist it in meeting the specified Code Levels.</p> <p>On the issue of duplication of Building Regulations, the Councils agree that planning policy should not duplicate Building Regulations. However, the PPS also supports planning authorities in specifying specific local requirements for sustainable buildings, "for example in the case of housing by expecting identified housing proposals to be delivered at a specific level of the Code for Sustainable Homes" (Paragraph 32).</p> <p>With regards to your concerns about emissions from the existing housing stock, the Councils agree that this is an issue that needs to be tackled. However, it is not for the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan to directly address this issue, as the document is concerned with bringing forward new development.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW24.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3482 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The University objects to PPO NW24 (item 1 b):Climate Change and Sustainable Design in terms of code level delivery.</p> <p>In response the University proposes that an approach which delivers Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 delivery up to 2016 and Code level 6 'Zero Emissions' beyond 2016 would provide a more realistic delivery path in terms of design planning and construction phasing timescales.</p> <p>The University supports remaining PPO NW 24 proposed policy requirements but would like to comment that standards for Non-Residential buildings in terms of sustainable design may be subject to emerging changes in the future.</p>	<p>Support for the Councils position on climate change adaptation and BREEAM standards noted. Concern in relation to Code for Sustainable Homes noted. The Councils have commissioned a study which has found that the use of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) is viable on this site. The use of CHP at North West Cambridge will result in considerable carbon emission reduction and assist it in meeting the specified Code Levels. This approach is supported by the recently adopted Planning Policy Statement on Planning and Climate Change, which at paragraph 31 states that "there will be situations where it could be appropriate for planning authorities to anticipate levels of building sustainability in advance of those set nationally". However the policy will be amended to bring the requirements more in line with the proposed housing trajectory for the site, although this will still bring forward higher environmental performance housing in advance of the Government's proposed timetable.</p> <p>With regards to the non-residential element of the development, the Council notes the University's concern that these standards may be subject to change. The policy will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW24 subject to combining the policy with preferred options NW25 and NW29 and amending the sections relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards.</p>
3669 - Environment Agency	Support	<p>We support the inclusion of PPO24 within the AAP. The site has the potential to be an exemplar development, incorporating high standards of sustainable construction and mitigating against the future effects of climate change.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW24.</p>
3712 - Natural England	Support	<p>Natural England supports the principle of this policy</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW24.</p>
3682 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Notwithstanding the objection on lack of a biodiversity policy, the Natural Resources policies are supported, as they will make a good contribution to making this a more sustainable new development and community. Policy NW24 on Climate Change and Sustainable Design and Construction is particularly supported for its requirements in relation to the Code for Sustainable Homes and the BREEAM standards for non-residential and community buildings to help meet national targets for the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>Pursue preferred option NW24.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>b)</i>				
3382 - Girton Parish Council	Object	These levels are far from a "high degree" of sustainability. Code Level 5 should be the absolute minimum, and there should be a demand for zero-carbon buildings from the outset.	Concern noted, however policy in the Area Action Plan has to be consistent with national planning policy. The Planning Policy Statement Planning and Climate Change states that in setting out specific requirements for sustainable buildings, planning authorities should ensure that this requirement is viable. The statement also goes on to say that planning authorities should "in the case of housing development and when setting development area or site-specific expectations, demonstrate that the proposed approach is consistent with securing the expected supply and pace of housing development shown in the housing trajectory required by PPS3, and does not inhibit the provision of affordable housing". Code level 4 represents a 44% improvement in energy/carbon performance than the current part L of the Building Regulations. Of the 2,250 dwellings proposed in the housing trajectory for North West Cambridge, it is envisaged that 1,700 dwellings will be brought forward at a minimum of Code Level 5.	Pursue preferred option NW24.
<i>c)</i>				
3383 - Girton Parish Council	Object	This is woefully inadequate for the present climate. "Excellent" should be the minimum standard from the start.	Agree that the policy should be amended. The Councils have commissioned a study which has found that the use of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) is viable on this site. The use of CHP at North West Cambridge will result in considerable carbon emission reduction for this site and assist it in meeting BREEAM 'excellent' standards from the outset as proposed.	Pursue preferred option NW24 subject to amending the BREEAM standard relating to non-residential development to require 'excellent' standard from the outset.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW25: Renewable Energy</i>				
3483 - University of Cambridge	Object	The 20% target is not consistent with adopted policy in the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire DC Policies DPD (both of which seek a minimum 10% renewable energy), and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (with regional targets for installed capacity for renewable energy, equivalent to 14% of total electricity consumption by 2010 and 17% by 2020, excluding off-shore wind). It also significantly exceeds the measurement criteria for local renewable/low carbon energy sources - 10% and 15% - set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes.	The University's ambition to achieve 20% on this site is welcomed. The North West Cambridge Area Action Plan is a stand-alone document from both the Cambridge Local Plan and the South Cambridgeshire DC Policies DPD. The decision to seek a higher level of renewable energy at North West Cambridge is consistent with Policy ENG1 of the Secretary of States Proposed Changes and Further Proposed Changes to the Draft Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which states that local authorities should maximise opportunities, particularly in major locations and Key Centres for Development Change, for developments to set new yardsticks of performance in the use of energy from on site renewable and/or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy sources, and for reducing emissions. Disagree that the Code for Sustainable Homes specifies a 10-15% renewables requirement for any of the different levels. The Code follows the Building Regulations methodology for achieving a percentage improvement on the mandatory dwelling emission rate (DER) for each level of the Code and awards additional points for provision of either 10% or 15% low or zero carbon technologies. However, in light of the fact that the Code uses this mandatory DER, it is considered unnecessary to add an onsite renewable energy requirement to the Code requirements, although such a requirement will remain for non-residential development and student accommodation as these are not covered by the Code. The Councils have commissioned a study into the viability of CHP at this site. If CHP using renewables is found to be viable, this will make a significant contribution to the 20% requirement.	Pursue preferred option NW25 subject to combining the policy with preferred options NW24 and NW29 and clarifying that the 20% requirement will apply to non-residential development and the student hostel accommodation.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3729 - Home Builders Federation	Object	Planning policy should not be a tool to define and control what are essentially energy generation considerations. That is the role of national energy policy and regulation and the role of planning is to facilitate the delivery of the energy supply solutions that stem from national energy policy. It is, therefore, considered that planning policy should be concerned solely with removing barriers to the siting or development of new innovations such as wind turbines, CHP plants and other energy generation development. It should not seek to control the use of power within dwellings (since this would, in any event, be unenforceable) or be concerned with the fabric of the building, which is covered adequately by the Code for Sustainable Homes as discussed above. Furthermore, it must be recognised that if carbon emissions are to be properly tackled then there needs to be a concerted effort to reduce carbon emissions from the existing housing stock, which is far less environmentally friendly than any modern housing now being built.	Disagree, as national planning policy supports planning authorities in setting renewable energy targets for new developments. For example, paragraph 20 of the Planning Policy Statement on Planning and Climate Change, which has superceded elements of PPS22, states that planning authorities should "expect a proportion of the energy supply of new development to be secured from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources". In addition, Policy ENG1 of the Secretary of States Proposed Changes and Further Proposed Changes to the Draft Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England states that local authorities should maximise opportunities, particularly in major growth locations and Key Centres for Development Change, for developments to set new yardsticks of performance in the use of energy from on site renewable and/or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy sources, and for reducing emissions. With regards to your concerns about emissions from the existing housing stock, the Councils agree that this is an issue that needs to be tackled. However, it is not for the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan to address this issue, as the document is concerned with bringing forward new development.	Pursue preferred option NW25.
3713 - Natural England	Support	support	Support noted. As the AAP requires the residential element of the development to be brought forward at specified Code for Sustainable Homes levels, and in light of the fact that the Code uses a mandatory Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) for each level of the Code, it is considered unnecessary to add an onsite renewable energy requirement to the Code requirements. However, the 20% requirement will remain for the non-residential development and student accommodation as these are not covered by the Code.	Pursue preferred option NW25 subject to combining the policy with preferred options NW24 and NW29 and clarifying the wording relating to 20% onsite renewables.
3772 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Willdife Trust supports the policy as the bare minimum that should be achieved through this development. We would hope that the University, City Council and developers will work together to achieve significantly higher rates.	Support noted. As the Area Action Plan requires the residential element of the development to be brought forward at specified Code for Sustainable Homes levels, and in light of the fact that the Code includes mandatory carbon emission requirements for each level of the Code, it is considered unnecessary to add an onsite renewable energy requirement to the Code requirements. However the 20% requirement will remain for non-residential development and student accommodation as these are not covered by the Code.	Pursue preferred option NW25 subject to combining the policy with preferred options NW24 and NW29 and clarifying the wording relating to 20% onsite renewables.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3675 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the inclusion of a policy in the AAP to address the requirement for the site to incorporate renewable energy provision. Whilst the proposed target of 20% may be in excess of regional and local targets, the approach of greater demand for the incorporation of renewable energy is supported.	Support noted. The Area Action Plan's approach to setting a higher target for renewable energy than that contained in both regional and local targets is supported by both national and regional policy. The key planning objectives contained in paragraph 9 of the New Planning and Climate Change PPS calls for local authorities to "secure the highest viable resource and energy efficiency and reduction in emissions". Policy ENG1 of the revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England states that local authorities should "maximise opportunities, particularly in major growth locations and Key Centres for Development Change, for developments to set new yardsticks of performance in the use of energy from on site renewable and/or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy sources, and for reducing emissions". As the Area Action Plan requires the residential element of the development to be brought forward at specified Code for Sustainable Homes levels, and in light of the fact that the Code uses a percentage mandatory Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) for each level of the Code, it is considered unnecessary to add an onsite renewable energy requirement to the Code requirements. However, the 20% requirement will remain for non-residential development and student accommodation as these are not covered by the Code.	Pursue preferred option NW25 subject to combining the policy with preferred options NW24 and NW29 and clarifying the wording relating to 20% onsite renewables.
<i>I.</i>				
3384 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The figure should be 100% with no possibility of relaxation. If the development is not viable it should not be built.	Concern noted, however the policy in the Area Action Plan has to be consistent with national planning policy. In particular, paragraph 33 of the Planning Policy Statement Planning and Climate Change states that planning authorities should "in the case of housing development and when setting development area or site-specific expectations, demonstrate that the proposed approach is consistent with securing the expected supply and pace of housing development shown in the housing trajectory required by PPS3, and does not inhibit the provision of affordable housing." It is felt that at present, it would not be possible to bring forward 100% renewable energy provision at this site without there being a negative impact on bringing forward the housing numbers required in both Councils areas.	Pursue preferred option NW25.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
9.5				
3798	Object	It is disappointing to see the explicit admission that no feasibility studies have been done even for CHP. Without such work for all forms of alternative energy *any* goal for renewable provision is mere wishful thinking.	Concern noted. The Councils have commissioned an assessment of the viability of CHP on this site, in order to inform policy development. The University have also commissioned consultants to carry out a Renewable Energy Strategy looking at a number of different renewable and/or low carbon sources. This will be tested by the Councils.	
9.6				
3714 - Natural England	Support	We welcome the policy and support the statement in paragraph 9.6 about the need to minimise any potential impacts of renewable energy sources on the environment and local amenity.	Support noted.	
NW26: Surface Water Drainage				
3853 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	These policies should reflect recent development in strategic management of water resources and the Catchment Wide Strategies now being developed by the Environment Agency. We refer particularly to the recently published draft Great Ouse Catchment Management Plan and to the Cambridge Water Cycle Strategy Scoping Report. The comments on page 94 in Volume 2 concerning flood risk in Histon, Impington and Girton are acknowledged and noted. We would however only add that recent survey information on the 350 metre long culvert carrying the Award Drain beneath the B1049 in Histon and Impington has amplified our grave concerns over flood risk and structural soundness. A critical watercourse which can jeopardise a key radial transport link.	Concern noted, however the information requested to be inserted into the policy is considered to be too detailed for the Area Action Plan, which is intended to give a strategic overview to development. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the development of Policy NW26 and have indicated their support for the Area Action Plan. The developer will be required to submit a flood risk assessment with their planning application and this will be scrutinised by the Environment Agency. In line with the requirements of PPS25, this site specific flood risk assessment will be required to demonstrate how all types of flood risk to the development itself and flood risk to others will be managed now and taking climate change into account. PPS25 also requires the management of flood "pathways" to reduce the likelihood of flooding by ensuring that the design and location of new development maximises the use of SUDs, and takes account of its susceptibility to flooding, the performance and processes of river systems and appropriate flood defence infrastructure, and of the likely routes and storage of floodwater and its influence on flood risk downstream. The flood risk assessment will also be expected to make use of all up to date information available for the area.	Pursue preferred option NW26.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3912 - cottenham parish council	Object	<p>In response to your invitation Cottenham Parish Council offers the following comments - regarding traffic and surface water drainage - on the NWCDAAP.</p> <p>This draft of the area action plan was, no doubt, underway prior to, or at least conterminous with: (i) the Cambridge North West Transport Strategy (CNWTS) and (ii) the planning application for houses, a school, and retail units etc on land twixt Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge (DWHPA).</p> <p>Unfortunately, the nature of, and general lack of some detail in the draft AAP leaves this Council with the same concerns as were expressed in response to both the CNWTS and DWHPA. As a consequence, therefore, this Council encloses a copy of each of the three responses already made and asks that they be read as directly applicable to the draft AAP. We appreciate that this may not be the norm but by making such a submission we remain consistent in our treatment of this area of Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. The developer will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment with their planning application. In line with the requirements of PPS25, this site specific flood risk assessment will be required to demonstrate how all types of flood risk to the development itself and flood risk to others will be managed now and taking climate change into account. Any necessary flood risk management measures that are required as a direct result of development at the North West Cambridge site will need to be sufficiently funded to ensure that the site can be developed and occupied safely throughout its proposed lifetime.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW26.
3395 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>The University will ensure that a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) will be developed utilising a combination of infiltration to ground and as much of the existing ditch system for attenuation as part of the masterplan to reduce overall run-off volumes leaving the site. The SUDS system will control the rate of flow and improve water quality before it joins any water course to those agreed with the Environment Agency. The integrated SUDs system will, together with habitat enhancement as part of the green open space network, support a greater number of species in the wetland habitat.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW26.
3679 - Environment Agency	Support	<p>We support the inclusion of PPNW26: Surface Water Drainage within the AAP.</p> <p>Due to the size of the site, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required for the whole site. This should address the surface water discharge from the site and identify any draiange mitigation measures (including SuDS) to be incorporated within the site. The FRA will need to be produced in accordance with PPS25: Development and Flood Risk.</p>	<p>Support noted. The developer will be required to submit a flood risk assessment with their planning application and this will be scrutinised by the Environment Agency. In line with the requirements of PPS25, this site specific flood risk assessment will be required to demonstrate how all types of flood risk to the development itself and flood risk to others will be managed now and taking climate change into account. PPS25 also requires the management of flood "pathways" to reduce the likelihood of flooding by ensuring that the design and location of new development maximises the use of SUDs, and takes account of its susceptibility to flooding, the performance and processes of river systems and appropriate flood defence infrastructure, and of the likely routes and storage of floodwater and its influence on flood risk downstream. The flood risk assessment will also be expected to make use of all up to date information available for the area.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW26.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3776 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports this policy and would encourage enhancement of biodiversity as part of the SuDS design process.	Support noted. The University has indicated their support for an integrated SUDs system that together with habitat enhancement as part of the green open space network, will support a greater number of species in the wetland habitat.	Pursue preferred option NW26.
3774 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Support	The Cambridge Preservation Society supports the implementation of SuDS and welcomes the identification at an early stage of future ownership and management responsibilities of SuDS. However the Society notes with reference to other urban extensions currently being proposed that at times old ditches are culverted (e.g. Addenbrookes 20:20) and considers such not as sustainable design nor adequate response to SuDS.	Support noted. The specific types of SUDs to be employed at North West Cambridge will be decided at the planning application stage. A Strategic Water and Drainage Strategy will be required at the outline planning application stage, detailing which SUDs systems are to be used. This will be scrutinised by the Councils. However, the supporting text of the policy will be amended to reflect that the provision of SuDs will need to be in line with the SuDs management train to reduce the risk of conventional drainage measures being employed where SuDs are more appropriate.	Pursue preferred option NW26. Amend last sentence of paragraph 9.10 to read "This reduces the risk of flood downstream of the development, helps replenish ground water and remove pollutants gathered during run-off, benefiting local wildlife, in line with the SuDs management train."
3751 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support	Anglian Water fully supports the implementation of SuDS.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW26.
3716 - Natural England	Support	We support this policy approach, in particular clause 3 relating to capturing recreation, biodiversity and amenity value from water storage areas. This is especially important in order to create wetland connectivity to the River Cam, and should be undertaken in conjunction with the aims of the Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy.	Support noted. Both the City Council's Nature Conservation Strategy, which is a material consideration, and South Cambridgeshire District Council's Biodiversity Strategy will be important background documents that will need to be taken into account when considering biodiversity as part of the masterplanning for North West Cambridge.	Pursue preferred option NW26.
4. 3385 - Girton Parish Council 3593	Support	We expect to see a rigorous Flood Risk Assessment, and a Section 106 grant to enable the Parish Council to appoint professional advice to scrutinise it and to implement necessary desirable ameliorations. I support the proposal from Girton Parish Council that there should be a rigorous Flood Risk Assessment and a Section 106 grant to enable the Parish Council to appoint professional advice to scrutinise it and to implement necessary desirable ameliorations	Support noted. The developer will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment with their planning application. In line with the requirements of PPS25, this site specific flood risk assessment will be required to demonstrate how all types of flood risk to the development itself and flood risk to others will be managed now and taking climate change into account. The Environment Agency, who have statutory responsibility for flood management and defence in England, will scrutinise this flood risk assessment, and where necessary recommend ameliorations where these are considered appropriate. The Councils may also, at their discretion, seek to appoint additional consultants to scrutinise the flood risk assessment. Therefore, in accordance with the requirements of Circular 05/05, it is not considered appropriate for S106 monies to be given to the Parish Council to carry out their own appraisal of the flood risk assessment.	Pursue preferred option NW26.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>9.10</i>				
3717 - Natural England	Support	We support this aim, and would welcome a co-ordinated plan to ensure that sustainable drainage benefits wildlife both through filtering potential pollutants, but also from provision of new waterbodies and reed bed habitats.	Support noted. The University has indicated their support for an integrated SUDs system that together with habitat enhancement as part of the green open space network, will support a greater number of species in the wetland habitat.	
<i>NW27: Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal</i>				
3854 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	These policies should reflect recent development in strategic management of water resources and the Catchment Wide Strategies how being developed by the Environment Agency. We refer particularly to the recently published draft Great Ouse Catchment Management Plan and to the Cambridge Water Cycle Strategy Scoping Report. The comments on page 94 in Volume 2 concerning flood risk in Histon, Impington and Girton are acknowledged and noted. We would however only add that recent survey information on the 350 metre long culvert carrying the Award Drain beneath the B1049 in Histon and Impington has amplified our grave concerns over flood risk and structural soundness. A critical watercourse which can jeopardise a key radial transport link.	Concern noted. The Environment Agency and Anglian Water have been consulted on the development of Policy NW27 and have indicated their support for the Area Action Plan. The developer will be required to submit a flood risk assessment with their planning application and this will be scrutinised by the Environment Agency. In line with the requirements of PPS25, this site specific flood risk assessment will be required to demonstrate how all types of flood risk to the development itself and flood risk to others will be managed now and taking climate change into account. PPS25 also requires the management of flood "pathways" to reduce the likelihood of flooding by ensuring that the design and location of new development maximises the use of SUDs, and takes account of its susceptibility to flooding, the performance and processes of river systems and appropriate flood defence infrastructure, and of the likely routes and storage of floodwater and its influence on flood risk downstream. The flood risk assessment will also be expected to make use of all up to date information available for the area.	Pursue preferred option NW27.
3396 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University has made initial inquiries of Anglian Water with regard to a point of connection to their network and capacity at the appropriate treatment works. Anglian Water's advice is that subject to contributions towards planned improvements they will be able to accommodate wastewater from the development.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW27.
3684 - Environment Agency	Support	We support PPO27 in that there must be sufficient foul drainage and capacity in recipient watercourses, to accept foul water discharges from the development.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW27.
3757 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support	Provision of wastewater infrastructure should be in accordance with the emerging Water Cycle Strategy currently being prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons. Phasing of development should take into account the practicability and sustainability of wastewater infrastructure improvements recommended by the Strategy.	Support noted. Provision of wastewater infrastructure at North West Cambridge will be in accordance with the Water Cycle Strategy when this becomes available.	Pursue preferred option NW27.

NW28: Management and Maintenance of Surface Water Drainage Systems

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW28: Management and Maintenance of Surface Water Drainage Systems</i>				
3855 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	These policies should reflect recent development in strategic management of water resources and the Catchment Wide Strategies now being developed by the Environment Agency. We refer particularly to the recently published draft Great Ouse Catchment Management Plan and to the Cambridge Water Cycle Strategy Scoping Report. The comments on page 94 in Volume 2 concerning flood risk in Histon, Impington and Girton are acknowledged and noted. We would however only add that recent survey information on the 350 metre long culvert carrying the Award Drain beneath the B1049 in Histon and Impington has amplified our grave concerns over flood risk and structural soundness. A critical watercourse which can jeopardise a key radial transport link.	Concern noted. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the development of Policy NW28 and have indicated their support for the Area Action Plan. The developer will be required to submit a flood risk assessment with their planning application and this will be scrutinised by the Environment Agency. In line with the requirements of PPS25, this site specific flood risk assessment will be required to demonstrate how all types of flood risk to the development itself and flood risk to others will be managed now and taking climate change into account. PPS25 also requires the management of flood "pathways" to reduce the likelihood of flooding by ensuring that the design and location of new development maximises the use of SUDs, and takes account of its susceptibility to flooding, the performance and processes of river systems and appropriate flood defence infrastructure, and of the likely routes and storage of floodwater and its influence on flood risk downstream. The flood risk assessment will also be expected to make use of all up to date information available for the area.	Pursue preferred option NW28.
3397 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University is aware, in general terms, of the conditions that the Environment Agency and Cambridge Water Company with regard to maintenance and management of the existing ditch system on the site as well as Washpit Brook. The conditions and standards will be incorporated into the detailed design.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW28.
3683 - Environment Agency	Support	The requirement for a publically accountable body to be appointed to ensure the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage system is supported. Management and maintenance of such systems is an integral requirement to ensure their ongoing effectiveness and ensure they do not increase flood risk to either the site itself or third parties elsewhere.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW28.
3758 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support	See our response to NW26	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW28.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2. 3386 - Girton Parish Council 3594	Object	The Council is concerned that the major problems begin when the water leaves the site, and obligations should be built in concerning the history of the water at least as far as the Cottenham Lode, preferably all the way to the Ouse. I share Girton Parish Council's concerns. The impact of the site on water levels and drainage should be investigated over a wider area.	Concern noted. PPS25 requires that in planning for development in areas at risk of flooding, a strategic approach should be taken that avoids adding to the causes or "sources" of flood risk by a number of means including minimising flood risk from new development onto adjacent and other downstream property and into river systems. PPS25 also requires the management of flood 'pathways' to reduce the likelihood of flooding by ensuring that the design and location of new development maximises the use of SUDs, and takes account of its susceptibility of flooding, the performance and processes of river systems and appropriate flood defence infrastructure, and of the likely routes and storage of flood water and its influence on flood risk downstream. The developer will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment with their planning application. In line with the requirements of PPS25, this site specific flood risk assessment will need to be proportionate to the risk and appropriate to the scale, nature and location of the development and consider the effects of a range of flooding events, including extreme events, on people, property, the natural and historic environment and river and coastal processes. The developer will be required to provide mitigation measures to deal with any negative impacts that are a result of the proposed development. The flood risk assessment and any proposed mitigation measures will be scrutinised by the Environment Agency and planning conditions will be used to ensure that these mitigation measures are put in place.	Pursue preferred option NW28.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW29: Water Conservation</i>				
3730 - Home Builders Federation	Object	It is unclear as to the precise justification and evidence base for the water consumption specified, particularly in relation to whether or not they are at all realistic in terms of actual delivery.	The rates specified relate to the levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes being sought on this site, which sets minimum standards for water consumption. However, the policy will be amended to clarify that these specific levels only apply to the residential element of the development, although water conservation measures will also be required for the non-residential and student hostel accommodation elements. In a report relating to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England, the Environment Agency advised that there would be sufficient water resources to support the planned growth in the region PROVIDED that water efficiency measures were incorporated into new developments. The provision of a new development allows for the infrastructure necessary to support such levels of water conservation to be put in place before the first residents move in.	Pursue preferred option NW29 subject to combining it with preferred options NW24 and NW25 and clarifying the wording relating to water conservation.
3856 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	These policies should reflect recent development in strategic management of water resources and the Catchment Wide Strategies how being developed by the Environment Agency. We refer particularly to the recently published draft Great Ouse Catchment Management Plan and to the Cambridge Water Cycle Strategy Scoping Report. The comments on page 94 in Volume 2 concerning flood risk in Histon, Impington and Girton are acknowledged and noted. We would however only add that recent survey information on the 350 metre long culvert carrying the Award Drain beneath the B1049 in Histon and Impington has amplified our grave concerns over flood risk and structural soundness. A critical watercourse which can jeopardise a key radial transport link.	Concern noted. The Environment Agency have indicated their support for the levels of water conservation being sought at North West Cambridge. Issues of flooding are more adequately dealt with by Policies NW26 and NW27.	Pursue preferred option NW29.
3805	Object	I do not see how "including water saving devices, rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling" can be made part of the AAP when the University admits it has not investigated the issue ("The University will carry out an assessment into the practicality of incorporating a grey water recycling system" says its response). What happens if the University decides it is not practicable? As a member of "Sustainable Girton" I endorse the Parish Council's comments about the implausibility of the proposed consumption figures.	Disagree was the provision of a new development allows for the infrastructure necessary to support such levels of water conservation to be put in place before the first residents move in. Any assessment carried out with regards to the practicality of incorporating Grey Water Recycling at North West Cambridge will be scrutinised by the Councils.	Pursue preferred option NW29.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3720 - Government Office for the East of England	Object	There is a need for greater clarity and certainty in the proposed approach to higher environmental building standards, particularly clarification of the relationship between Policy Options NW24 and NW29. This could be achieved by inclusion of a single policy that deals with expected standards of building performance as a whole against the relevant Code levels; the policy could also be clear, where appropriate, to which elements of the Code the policy applies.	Concern noted. The Councils view is that all elements of the Code for Sustainable Homes should be applied to the residential element of the North West Cambridge Development. However the policy will be amended by the incorporation of preferred options NW24, NW25 and NW29 in order to ensure clarity.	Combine preferred options NW24, NW25 and NW29 to read: "Preferred Policy Option NW24: Climate Change & Sustainable Design and Construction 1. Development will be required to demonstrate that it has been designed to adapt to the predicted effects of climate change; 2. Combined Heat and Power (CHP), preferably fuelled by renewable energy sources, will be required to meet the needs of a substantial proportion of the development. Where it can be demonstrated that this would not be viable, then the provision of a District Heating Scheme, preferably fuelled by renewable energy sources, to meet the needs of a substantial proportion of the development will be required. 3. Residential development will be required to demonstrate that: a) All dwellings approved on or before 31st March 2013 will meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or higher, up to a maximum of 675 dwellings. All dwellings above 675 will meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 or higher; b) All dwellings approved on or after 1st April 2013 will meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 or higher; c) Water conservation measures will be incorporated to reduce per capita water consumption by at least 30% compared to 2006 levels to meet Code Level 4, rising to a 47% reduction compared to 2006 levels to meet Code Level 5; and d) There is no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity as a result of the management of water conservation measures. 4. Non residential development and student housing will be required to demonstrate that: e) It will achieve a high degree of sustainable design

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
				and construction in line with BREEAM "excellent " standards or the equivalent if this is replaced; f) It will reduce its predicted carbon emissions by at least 20% through the use of on-site low and zero carbon technologies; g) It will incorporate water conservation measures including water saving devices, greywater and/or rainwater recycling in all buildings to significantly reduce potable water consumption; and h) There is no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity as a result of the management of water conservation measures. 5. The above requirements are subject to wider viability testing.
3387 - Girton Parish Council	Object	These levels would appear to be totally unrealistic. A recent survey among members of Sustainable Girton indicated that the target of 100lpppd is extremely difficult to reach, even by people who have water conservation high on their personal agenda. We therefore feel 105lpppd is an inappropriate goal for such important planning.	Disagree, as the provision of a new development allows for the infrastructure necessary to support such levels of water conservation to be put in place before the first residents move in.	Pursue preferred option NW29.
3759 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support	Water efficiency measures will mitigate the effect of increased wastewater discharges on the environment.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW29.
3398 - University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports water conservation and will design the residential developments in accordance with Code for Sustainable Homes. The University will carry out an assessment into the practicality of incorporating a grey water recycling system.	Support noted. Water conservation measures will also be required in non-residential development and student accommodation and the policy will be altered to clarify this.	Pursue preferred option NW29 subject to combining the policy with preferred options NW24 and NW25 and clarifying the wording relating to water conservation measures.
3780 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports this policy as the bare minimum that should be aimed for. Water resources are already critical for many wetland habitats in the south of Cambridgeshire and the situation will only get worse with the level of development planned. The Trust would strongly encourage the University, City Council and developers to aim for even greater standards.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW29.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3687 - Environment Agency	Support	<p>We support the proposed water conservation policy (NW29) for the AAP. The site offers the potential to incorporate new technologies and water efficiency measures.</p> <p>Our report to the RSS14 public inquiry advised that there was sufficient water resources in order to facilitate the planned growth of Cambridge. This was subject to water efficiency measures being incorporated into new developments.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW29.
3718 - Natural England	Support	<p>Water Conservation - we support this policy approach and welcome the recognition in clause 2 that water conservation measures should have no adverse impact on biodiversity. We suggest that it would be better to quote target consumption figures in terms of litres/head/day rather than percentage reductions from an unspecified 2006 level. The RSS (Further Proposed Changes draft) target is 105 l/h/d - i.e. level 3 or 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Policy NW24 calls for Level 5 after 2012, which would mean 80 l/h/d.</p>	Support noted. Agree that for the sake of clarity, the actual consumption figures should also be referred to in the Area Action Plan.	<p>Pursue preferred option NW29. Add the following wording to the end of paragraph 9.16:</p> <p>"For residential development, a 30% reduction compared to 2006 levels equates to 105 litres/head/day, while a 47% reduction equates to 80 litres/head/day."</p>

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

10. Delivery

10. Delivery

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3722 - Government Office for the East of England	Object	The Government Office is pleased to see that a section on Delivery is included in the Area Action Plan. We take the view however that greater detail should be provided about how the development will be delivered, particularly where this requires the involvement of other bodies or agencies, for example in relation to health or education. We set out below our expectations in this regard which are derived from Government policy and guidance.	<p>Concern noted, however, the Area Action Plan includes a separate section on Delivery. This includes policies in relation to the construction process, strategic landscaping, phasing and need, and infrastructure provision. It also includes a housing trajectory and monitoring section. The monitoring section includes indicators to test the implementation of the AAP and these will in turn inform the production of the Councils' Annual Monitoring Reports.</p> <p>In terms of its style, format and content, the AAP has been prepared to provide a balance between flexibility and providing a sufficient level of detail to guide the development of North West Cambridge and the production of a detailed Masterplan. In drawing up the AAP account has been taken of national, regional and local policy, Issues & Options consultation, Preferred Options consultation, local circumstance and the available evidence base. Furthermore, the AAP has been informed by the binding Inspectors' Reports into the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF), which have emphasised a need for conciseness and in the case on the Northstowe AAP, clarified the level of policy detail appropriate for an AAP for a large development.</p> <p>Go-East made similar representations to the submission Draft South Cambridgeshire LDF Northstowe, Cambridge East and Cambridge Southern Fringe AAPs, on their respective Delivery sections. However, the Inspectors endorsed the level of detail in the plans as submitted, and found them to be 'sound'. A similar approach has been followed in the NWCAAP.</p> <p>The Structure Plan and the Cambridge Local Plan clearly state that this land should only be brought forward when the University can show a clear need for it to be released. Accordingly, a needs statement is required to support planning applications for built development to satisfactorily demonstrate the need for development and that it cannot reasonably be met elsewhere. It would therefore not be possible or appropriate to include such detail in the Area Action Plan.</p> <p>However, it is accepted the AAP could provide some detail on delivery mechanisms, consistent with the approach in the adopted AAPs.</p>	<p>Include new paragraphs referring to delivery mechanisms:</p> <p>"The Area Action Plan has been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders involved in the delivery of North West Cambridge and various partnership working arrangements have been in place for the development since 2006, including Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridgeshire Horizons, the Primary Care Trust, the Environment Agency, and the Highways Agency. Joint working arrangements have also included the developers of land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road in order to ensure a holistic approach to the planning and delivery of development in this area. A joint planning committee has been set up to ensure this objective is met in the determination of any planning applications. The Councils are also involved in the preparation of other key strategies and plans that will impact on the development of NW Cambridge such as their respective Community Strategies and strategies prepared by others including the County Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Horizons' key focus is on the delivery of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. As such, it is assisting the local authorities with mechanisms to ensure prompt and efficient delivery of the major developments and necessary infrastructure."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>NW30: Construction Process</i>				
3399 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>The construction impacts and mitigation measures will be identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment which will accompany a planning application.</p> <p>The University will endeavour to accommodate construction spoil within the development, maximise the recycling of raw building materials and construction waste, and avoid the disruption of adjacent residential areas. These impacts and necessary mitigation measures will be fully identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment which will accompany a planning application.</p>	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW30.
3577	Support	<p>But note that NW30 is generally very vague and weak and offers virtually nothing that could reassure those who are going to have to live with many years of development. Look forward to seeing more details and teeth during later stages of the planning process</p>	<p>Concern noted. The AAP does acknowledge in paragraph 10.4 that the development at North West Cambridge will take place over a number of years and the construction process can have implications for amenity, public safety and the landscape setting of Cambridge and Girton if not properly planned. Realistically, it will not be possible to avoid any impact when development is being undertaken immediately adjoining existing areas but measures should be taken to reduce the impact as far as possible. A Construction Environmental management Plan including a Site Waste Management Plan will be required to support a planning application.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW30.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>b.</i>				
3820	Object	Construction waste must not be placed in mounds or berms near the boundary of the site where it will diminish the amenity of the neighbouring houses. The construction spoil must not be placed in such a way as to create surface or sub-surface runoff from the site.	<p>Concern noted. Paragraph 10.2 does state that it would not be acceptable to alter the land forms locally by concentrating the spoil into one or more large mounds as this would introduce an alien character into the area. Furthermore, Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development of North West Cambridge, with the aim that development takes account of its surroundings, including existing buildings, open spaces and existing urban and villages edges to ensure that development does not harm local amenity and where possible brings benefits to the area. In accordance with this policy, planning permission would not be granted where the proposed development or associated mitigation measures would have an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity, on the quality of the urban edge, on flooding and flood risk, on quality of ground or surface water and on adjacent conservation areas.</p> <p>However, in order to provide more clarity part b of Policy NW30 should be amended to include reference to local urban character in addition to landscape character.</p>	Pursue preferred option NW30 subject to amending part b by inserting 'local urban and' before landscape character.
<i>10.2</i>				
3512 - 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA) 3306 3548 3338 3414 3439 3452 3503 3525 3536 3543 3561 3597 3609 3634 3754 - Lettering Arts	Object	Add: "Construction spoil will not be placed along the boundary of the site where it would create mounds or berms that diminish the amenity of existing adjoining and adjacent houses. Construction spoil will not be placed on the site in a position that leads to surface run-off or sub-surface seepage from the site into the gardens and houses of existing adjoining and adjacent properties on Huntingdon Road and in All Souls Lane or into the Ascension Parish Burial Ground."	<p>Concern noted. Paragraph 10.2 does state that it would not be acceptable to alter the land forms locally by concentrating the spoil into one or more large mounds as this would introduce an alien character into the area. Furthermore, Policy NW2 sets out a number of overarching development principles that will guide the development of North West Cambridge, with the aim that development takes account of its surroundings, including existing buildings, open spaces and existing urban and villages edges to ensure that development does not harm local amenity and where possible brings benefits to the area. In accordance with this policy, planning permission would not be granted where the proposed development or associated mitigation measures would have an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity, on the quality of the urban edge, on flooding and flood risk, on quality of ground or surface water and on adjacent conservation areas.</p> <p>However, in order to provide more clarity part b of Policy NW30 should be amended to include reference to local urban character in addition to landscape character.</p>	Amend part b of policy NW30 by inserting 'local urban and' before landscape character.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>10.4</i>				
3388 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The Parish Council wishes it to be built in to the requirements that the Parish Council will be involved at all stages of the delivery planning process, and in all Section 106 discussions.	Disagree as this is not an appropriate matter for the Area Action Plan. The Councils have a statutory duty to consult a variety of people about planning applications, including neighbours and other relevant bodies, so that their views can be taken into account in the determination of applications. Planning Committee meetings are open to the public and members of the public who have made written comments on an application are able to speak at the Committee either in support of, or against, the application.	
3595	Object	I support the proposal from Girton Parish Council that they should be included in the planning process for the site and in Section 106 discussions.	Disagree as this is not an appropriate matter for the Area Action Plan. The Councils have a statutory duty to consult a variety of people about planning applications, including neighbours and other relevant bodies, so that their views can be taken into account in the determination of applications. Planning Committee meetings are open to the public and members of the public who have made written comments on an application are able to speak at the Committee either in support of, or against, the application.	
<i>NW31: Strategic Landscaping</i>				
3401 - University of Cambridge	Object	Provision of landscape treatment at appropriate times throughout the construction of the development is important to establishing a community identity for incoming residents and workers. The implementation and phasing of strategic landscaping must, however, also take into account overall development viability and consideration of additional infrastructure provision at the same time.	Concern noted, however, paragraph 10.15 of the AAP states that the overall viability of the development will be taken into consideration in the decision on the level of planning obligations to be incorporated into the S106 Agreement at the planning application stage.	Pursue preferred policy NW31.
3578	Support	Strongly agree with this, but note that there's a risk that the consequences of the shortcomings of NW30 will be allowed to get through as "landscaping". They are not alternatives.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred policy NW31.
3788 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Support	The Cambridge Preservation Society strongly supports the provision of adequate mitigation landscape at and early stage. It is paramount to ensure high integration of the new developments, establishment at an early stage quality amenity for greens spaces users and to enhance the setting of Cambridge. This chapter's subsection should also refer to mitigation works being carried out in relation to noise and air pollution emanating from the M11 and quality designs (noise attenuation barriers etc) must be established and all implemented once 1/3 of the development has been completed (i.e. as 2/3 housing etc is close to the M11).	Support noted. Paragraph 2.9 of the AAP states that it is important that the design of the development fully takes into account the impact of noise and air pollution arising from the M11 and A14, in relation to the amenity and health of residents, workers and school children, the amenity and use of open spaces and impact upon the setting of Cambridge. Furthermore, the use of certain types of physical acoustic barrier such as a fence alongside the M11 is unlikely to be acceptable in this sensitive location.	Pursue preferred option NW31.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3782 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust fully supports the provision of advanced landscaping so that the development is attractive and ready to use for the first residents and employers that move into the area.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW31.
3689 - Environment Agency	Support	We would request that Natural England confirm their continued acceptance of the proposals. Appropriate ecological surveys should be undertaken to inform the determination of any future planning application of the existing species and habitats and identify any mitigation measures necessary.	Support noted. A number of studies and strategies need to be in place before planning permission can be granted, to ensure that the policy requirements of the plan are met and a high quality, sustainable development is achieved. A biodiversity strategy will need to address the protection and enhancement of biodiversity interests on the site and any appropriate mitigation measures and close liaison with Natural England will be required during the planning application process.	Pursue preferred option NW31.
<i>NW32: Phasing & Need</i>				
3484 - University of Cambridge	Object	The University has demonstrated its needs case for residential housing provision and student housing. This is reflected in the Cambridge City Council Inspector's Report and in the Preferred Options AAP. The Cambridge Local Plan Inspector's Report establishes that 'part of the University's justification for the release of this land is the significant need for key worker housing for University staff, over which there is no dispute. The case for this was accepted in the EIP Panel report.' In addition, the Preferred Options AAP (paragraph 4.1, 4.2, & 4.6) reinforces the University's stated needs for key worker and student housing.	Concern noted, however, in accordance with saved Structure Plan policy P9/2c, land should be released from the Green Belt for predominantly University related uses and only brought forward when the University can show a clear need for land to be released. The AAP clearly states that as the purpose of this development is to address the University's needs, the priority must be on the provision of housing for Cambridge University and College key workers and the provision of open market housing is necessary to make the whole development viable. However, housing is not the only use that is being sought on site and therefore given the site is in proximity to the University's existing West Cambridge site, south of Madingley Road, which is the current focus for the growth of the University and other sites in the City are allocated for University and student housing uses in the Cambridge Local Plan, it is important that as development comes forward, the University can satisfactorily demonstrate the need for the development and that it cannot reasonably be met elsewhere. A needs statement would therefore take in account factors such as viability, land availability, ownership, location, accessibility and suitability. Part 3 of policy should be amended to reflect that the AAP does not have an end date and therefore such safeguarding is not required.	Pursue preferred policy NW32 subject to the following amendment: Delete part 3 of the policy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3656 - Bursars' Building and Planning Sub-Committee	Object	Policy NW32 should not require demonstration that there is a need for University or collegiate housing. This need was established through the Local Plan Inquiry where it was accepted that not all of the housing needs of the University and colleges could be met through new development at North West Cambridge. This need is not going to go away or diminish.	Concern noted, however, in accordance with saved Structure Plan policy P9/2c, land should be released from the Green Belt for predominantly University related uses and only brought forward when the University can show a clear need for land to be released. The AAP clearly states that as the purpose of this development is to address the University's needs, the priority must be on the provision of housing for Cambridge University and College key workers and the provision of open market housing is necessary to make the whole development viable. However, housing is not the only use that is being sought on site and therefore given the site is in proximity to the University's existing West Cambridge site, south of Madingley Road, which is the current focus for the growth of the University and other sites in the City are allocated for University and student housing uses in the Cambridge Local Plan, it is important that as development comes forward, the University can satisfactorily demonstrate the need for the development and that it cannot reasonably be met elsewhere. A needs statement would therefore take in account factors such as viability, land availability, ownership, location, accessibility and suitability.	Pursue preferred option NW32.
3797	Support	It is very important that this development is proved to be needed before it is allowed to proceed. In particular South Cambridgeshire had, in the past, assured residents that development would not take place in the district unless it was shown that available land in the city was already being used. The detrimental effect of the development on existing residents in terms of loss of amenity (open views), traffic chaos and construction noise/dust/traffic is going to be considerable and can only be justified if there is an absolute need for the development.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW32.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2. 3579	Object	Object strongly. Phasing is far too important to be left to masterplanning. There is a real risk this could end up being a piecemeal development if the need for each phase has to be proven individually. This in turn means extending the misery for those living close to a perpetual building site. What's needed is a clear plan at the outset, with dates.	Disagree. Before any planning permission for development at North West Cambridge can be granted it will be necessary to ensure that the development will be delivered in accordance with the principles set out in the Area Action Plan and as required by policy NW3, a masterplan will be prepared as part of the supporting information to the application for the grant of planning permission to ensure that a comprehensive and high quality accessible development can be achieved. In order to ensure that development is not before forward in a piecemeal way a phasing and implementation strategy will be required to support a planning application and paragraph 10.10 to policy NW32 highlights that the phasing of the development should have regard to the creation of a sustainable community from the outset and as the development progresses.	Pursue preferred option NW32.
<i>NW33: Infrastructure Provision</i>				
3924 - Network Rail	Object	Network Rail considers that accessibility is a significant issue when determining where developer contributions are utilised. Support is given to contributions that fund the cost of providing infrastructure needed as a result of development. If it is identified that rail patronage at Cambridge Station would increase as a result of the proposed development, and necessary station enhancements are required, contributions should be sought from the development. Improvements to Cambridge Station should be identified as one of the possible transport infrastructure schemes in the Area Action Plan. This station is very near to its pedestrian capacity and would require new infrastructure to cope with anticipated growth. There are current proposals to redevelop Chesterton Sidings to provide a new interchange including a rail station. If it is considered that this rail facility would be more accessible to the Cambridge North West site than Cambridge station, contributions should be directed towards this proposal. We would welcome support from the Council to improve Cambridge Station and/or facilitate other projects such as at Chesterton Sidings to cope with anticipated growth. The document contains too little detail on how any contributions will be managed and distributed. To this end the Council should pool planning obligations from developers, in line with Circular 05.05, to mitigate their impact upon the railway network.	Disagree as this level of detail is not a matter for the Area Action Plan. The precise nature and scale of contributions sought will be related to the size of the development and to the extent it places additional demand on the area and such detail will be discussed at the planning application stage, through focused S106 discussions.	Pursue preferred policy NW33.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3760 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support	A key piece of evidence for phasing will be the Water Cycle Strategy currently in development by Cambridgeshire Horizons.	Support noted.	Pursue preferred option NW33.
<i>10.13</i>				
3685 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	To the list of possible contributions for community infrastructure should be added, "Countryside access".	Disagree as the contributions listed in paragraph 10.13 are not intended to be exhaustive and such detail will be relevant at the planning application stage and detailed S106 discussions.	
3784 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	The Cambridge Preservation Society strongly objects to the omission of contributions targeting nearby Strategic Open Spaces and other green spaces and corridors as identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy. The Society's strategic open space currently being developed - the Coton Countryside Reserve - is increasingly being used by students and staff of University's West Cambridge development and will also form an essential recreational area for local people of the NW1 development. Support from nearby development must be ensured for strategic and other green spaces as part of Section 106 and other Planning obligation payments.	Concern noted. Whilst the Councils support Strategic Open Space in principle, there is not currently considered to be a sufficient evidence base to support a requirement for commuted payments to support Strategic Open Spaces. In the Inspectors' report of the Examination into the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, Policy SF11 was not considered to be soundly supported in its reference to minimum standards for Strategic Open Space. The basis for the standard was a calculation of the existing Strategic Open Space (according to a particular definition) within Cambridgeshire County Council. It was decided to adopt an approach which aimed to maintain the overall ratio of provision to population while improving accessibility to Strategic Open Space, by encouraging provision close to new development. The methodology utilised made no attempt to identify a particular requirement for a given population level, and did not truly assess whether the current provision was adequate or not. In the absence of set minimum standards of Strategic Open Space, there is insufficient justification to require commuted payments towards Strategic Open Space. Furthermore, such detail will more appropriately be discussed at the planning application stage and detailed S106 discussions.	
<i>C.</i>				
3803 - Cambridgeshire PCT	Support	We support the need for contribution towards Health care and that this is not limited to GP services but recognises the impact the development will have on all Health care and services locally.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>m.</i>				
3562	Object	Crucial to the long-term viability of the entire AAP are early assurances of the expected availability of adequate water supply and the affordability of extensions to an already heavily loaded sewerage infrastructure. This subject surely deserves discrete listing here and early commissioning of expert study to produce authoritative projections - not least of costs and where they might lie - in the context of climate change and this region's long history of being prone to periods of sustained drought. Water is not merely an "other utility" and the Plan cannot sensibly take its availability for granted.	Concern noted, however, in a report relating to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England, the Environment Agency advised that there would be sufficient water resources to support the planned growth in the region provided that water efficiency measures were incorporated into new developments. Consequently, the AAP will seek high levels of water conservation from both the residential element, via the standards set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes, and the non-residential and student accommodation. Furthermore, options for the treatment of foul drainage and sewage disposal from the site will need to be agreed with the Environment Agency to ensure that development does not result in further pressure on the water environment.	
<i>10.19</i>				
3686 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The need to monitor and - if necessary - consider a review is supported.	Support noted.	
<i>Housing Trajectory For North West Cambridge (2009 - 2017)</i>				
3485 - University of Cambridge	Object	The build rates have not been agreed with the University and appear to be overly ambitious. A start on site in 2010/11 would require compliance between the University masterplan and the Councils' Preferred Option for the development site footprint, early submission of a planning application in parallel with AAP production, and early approval of a planning permission and reserved matters. As the Council's preferred option for the development site footprint is not consistent with the University masterplan, there is no certainty about the early submission and approval of a planning application and reserved matters.	Disagree. The build rates were subject to correspondence between the Local Planning Authorities and the University in July 2007 and the housing trajectory in the Preferred Options AAP was based upon that correspondence. The proposed University trajectory is based upon their consultants work undertaken in September 2007 and has not had regard to proposed changes to the built footprint proposed since then. Discussions with the University have subsequently revealed that it may be possible to advance the start of development by one year compared to their trajectory, so that the first completions arise in 2011/12. This would require submission of a planning application towards the end of 2008 and the University are keen to achieve this progress to meet their development and housing needs. The housing trajectory will be amended to provide a better fit to the proposed University trajectory based upon our preferred site development footprint.	Amend the housing trajectory and include an indicative split between planned provision in each authority area.
<i>11. Monitoring</i>				
<i>11.4</i>				
3688 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The need to monitor and - if necessary - consider a review is supported.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

Appendix 1: Car Parking Standards

Table 1: Residential Development

3322	Object	Do current planning guidelines take into account the width of modern cars? Garages that are of insufficient width cannot in practice be used as parking spaces. Such facilities are actually used as storage areas or converted into living space. This in turn places increased pressure on on-street parking and negates assumptions such as the ones made here.	This is not a matter for the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.	
------	--------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Table 3: Retail, Culture, Leisure and Sports Uses

3323	Object	No mention of pubs or clubs, resulting in increased travel by all modes.	Noted. All proposed land-uses will generate some traffic and this is taken into account in the car parking standards but will also be relevant in the development of Travel Plans as a means of encouraging journeys to be made by non-car modes.	
------	--------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Appendix 2: Cycle Parking Standards				
<i>b.</i>				
3888 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	As an additional point, we disagree that in new developments the use of a garage is acceptable for cycle parking, unless the garage is on the same side of the house as the main entrance. We ask that the wording be updated accordingly.	Agree that cycle parking space in garages and sheds should be clarified.	Amend 1.2b ...For individual houses this could be in the form of additional space in a shed or garage...
<i>Table 1: Residential Use</i>				
3814	Object	Elsewhere you argue that students don't use cars; here you are making it hard for them to cycle. There should be *3* cycle spaces per 3 bedspaces and at least 3 visitor spaces per 5 bedspaces.	Concern noted. These minimum standards are in accordance with cycling parking standards in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The councils will encourage developers to provide cycle parking provision above this minimum.	Amend the headings of the second column of tables 1-4 of Appendix 2 to "Minimum Number of Spaces".
<i>2.1.1</i>				
3889 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	The diagram of a Sheffield Stand in 2.1.1 is incorrect and should be corrected.	Agree that the diagram of the Sheffield cycle stand in paragraph 2.1.1 of Appendix 2 is inaccurate.	Amend the diagram of the Sheffield cycle stand in paragraph 2.1.1 of Appendix 2.
<i>2.2.1</i>				
3815	Object	900mm between stands is too small: as a visit to any location will show, only one cycle will fit comfortably into such a space, halving the capacity of the provision.	Concern noted. To facilitate the moving of cycles around parking areas the aisle spaces should be increased.	Amend 2.2.1 This diagram shows the spacing required for cycle stands. There should be a minimum space of 2000mm space between the centres of a single row of stands and a minimum space of 3000mm between the centres of a double row of stands. All measurements are shown in millimetres.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2.3.1 3887 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Object	<p>We strongly welcome the basing of this appendix on the City Council's cycle parking standards, a document we endorse in the main. However, at the time of the Local Plan Hearing when this was adopted, we raised a number of practical points and desired corrections to wording, which still stand. We ask that these points be incorporated if possible.</p> <p>The biggest deficiency, which we feel must be corrected in the NWC AAP is the reference to "High Capacity Stands". The standards do not define the conditions under which high-capacity stands could be used, which leaves their use open to abuse by developers. In a new development, there should be no need for such stands, which are designed for the case of dense existing developments where no alternative exists. We ask that the section on high-capacity stands simply be omitted.</p>	Agree that rounded A frame stands and Sheffield stands are preferable to the high capacity stands.	delete section 2.3.
3817	Object	<p>These racks are not suitable for all types of cycle; they should not be seen as a replacement for adequate "Rounded A" type stands.</p>	Agree that rounded A frame and Sheffield stands are preferable to the high capacity stands.	delete section 2.3

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment****Action****Appendix 3: Open Space and Recreation Standards****2. Definition of Public Open Space**

3793 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	The Cambridge Preservation Society supports the provision of adequate green spaces however objects to the omission of any support in relation of Strategic Open Spaces. Reference should be made to the Green Infrastructure Strategy 2006 to support aspirations set out and supported by both Planning Authorities.	Paragraph 8.4 has been amended to refer to Cambridgeshire Horizons' Green Infrastructure Strategy.
---------------------------------------	--------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. Commuted Payments

3799 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	<p>Representation ID: 3793 Document: North West Cambridge Draft Area Action Plan - Preferred Options Volume 1 Section: Appendix 3: Open Space and Recreation Standards, 2. Definition of Public Open Space</p> <p>The Cambridge Preservation Society supports the provision of adequate green spaces however objects to the omission of commuted payments supporting Strategic Open Spaces. Reference should be made to the Green Infrastructure Strategy 2006 and must support aspirations set out and must be supported by both Planning Authorities.</p>	<p>Concern noted. Whilst the Councils support Strategic Open Space in principle, there is not currently considered to be a sufficient evidence base to support a requirement for commuted payments to support Strategic Open Spaces. In the Inspectors' report of the Examination into the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, Policy SF11 was not considered to be soundly supported in its reference to minimum standards for Strategic Open Space. The basis for the standard was a calculation of the existing Strategic Open Space (according to a particular definition) within Cambridgeshire County Council. It was decided to adopt an approach which aimed to maintain the overall ratio of provision to population while improving accessibility to Strategic Open Space, by encouraging provision close to new development. The methodology utilised made no attempt to identify a particular requirement for a given population level, and did not truly assess whether the current provision was adequate or not. In the absence of set minimum standards of Strategic Open Space, there is insufficient justification to require commuted payments towards Strategic Open Space.</p> <p>Reference is being made to Cambridgeshire Horizons' Green Infrastructure Strategy in paragraph 8.4.</p>
---------------------------------------	--------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Appendix 4: Glossary</i>				
<i>Appendix 4: Glossary</i>				
3695 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The current Local Transport plan is LTP2 2006-11.	Concern noted. The Area Action Plan will be amended accordingly.	Change wording to "Cambridgeshire Transport Plan (LTP2 2006 - 11)Cambridgeshire County Council."
3657 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The term 'sui generis' as used in the employment policies is unhelpfully described in the Glossary as it gives a misleading impression of uses proposed.	Concern noted, however this is the description used by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2006. The main text does refer to "...associated sui generis.." and is used to show examples rather than the actual uses.	Combine definitions under the heading "Use Class sui generis" to read "Those uses not allocated to a particular Use Class in The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). Examples given in the Use Classes Order include theatres, night clubs, retail warehouse clubs, laundrettes and motor car showrooms."
3694 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	"Regional Planning Guidance" - an additional reference to it being replaced by the Regional Spatial Strategy could be added.	Concern noted. The AAP will be amended accordingly.	Add Regional Spatial Strategy to the glossary "A strategy for the region, to guide development, incorporating Regional Transport Strategy."
3693 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	"Household Waste Recycling Centre" is now known as a Recycling Centre.	Concerns noted. The Area Action Plan will be changed accordingly.	Change text from "Household Waste Recycling Centre" to "Recycling Centre."