



Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan Survey

Final Report

February 2016

Thornhill Brigg Mill, Thornhill Beck Lane, Brighouse, West Yorkshire, HD6 4AH

T: 01484 404797

W: www.enventure.co.uk

Report prepared by:

Andrew Cameron
andrew@enventure.co.uk

Kayleigh Haigh
kayleigh@enventure.co.uk

Report reviewed by:

Matt Thurman
matt@enventure.co.uk

Enventure Research

Head Office:

Thornhill Brigg Mill, Thornhill Beck Lane, Brighouse
West Yorkshire HD6 4AH
T: 01484 404797

London Office:

Smithfield Business Centre, 5 St John's Lane, London, EC1M 4BH
T: 0207 549 1616

W: www.enventure.co.uk E: info@enventure.co.uk

Reg no: 4693096
VAT no: 816927894



Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	4
Key findings.....	5
Cottenham today.....	5
Cottenham in the future.....	5
New facilities in Cottenham	7
Additional housing.....	7
Other challenges.....	8
Representativeness of responses	9
The Survey Programme	10
Introduction	10
Questionnaire.....	10
Methodology.....	11
Interpretation of the data	12
Sample profile	14
Survey Findings	17
Cottenham today	17
Cottenham in the future	23
New major facilities.....	42
Additional housing in Cottenham	54
Other challenges	62
Acknowledgments.....	68
Appendix A – Map of the village	69
Appendix B – Questionnaire.....	70

Executive Summary

Introduction

Cottenham Parish Council is leading the preparation of a **Neighbourhood Development Plan** to set out the **community's vision for the Cottenham area** over the next 15 years. The Plan will put policies in place that will help deliver that vision and influence planning permission for development in the Cottenham area.

Cottenham Parish Council wished to develop and conduct a survey amongst Parish residents in order to consult about issues, priorities and ideas, as well as evaluate likes and dislikes and satisfaction with living in the village. **The findings from the survey will be used to draft the initial Neighbourhood Development Plan.**

With this in mind, Cottenham Parish Council commissioned Enventure Research to develop and conduct the survey with Cottenham Parish residents to find out what they would like to see in the Plan in terms of development in the village over the next 15 years.

Residents' views were collected via a paper survey which was posted to every address in the village and copies of which were distributed in shops and other establishments, and an online survey which was sent to people via email and publicised via posters around the village and social media. The paper questionnaire also provided the link to the online survey on the front page. Residents who wished to complete the paper survey posted their completed questionnaire directly to Enventure Research using a pre-paid envelope. Residents were encouraged to take part in the survey by the Parish Council pledging to donate £0.50 to a local registered charity for every completed response.

This report details the feedback from the consultation. In total **973 people took part** in the consultation, providing a robust sample size to draw results from.

Key findings

Cottenham today – an understanding of how people currently see Cottenham (Questions 1, 2 & 3)¹

The majority of respondents (88%) said that they were very or fairly satisfied with Cottenham as a place to live at the moment. Satisfaction was highest amongst respondents from Tenison Manor (93% very or fairly satisfied) and lowest in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area where 13% said they were dissatisfied to some extent. Satisfaction was highest for the 25-34 year old age group (96% satisfied) with 35-44 year olds being next most satisfied (92%). In contrast, one in ten (9%) 16-24 year olds expressed dissatisfaction with Cottenham as a place to live. Those living in households of three or more people were also more satisfied compared to those living in single households (90% compared to 85%).

When it came to people describing what they liked about life in the village, the amenities and facilities the village has to offer were mentioned most frequently by 49% of respondents, followed by respondents saying it was the people in Cottenham that they liked the most (42%) whether that be their friends, family, and neighbours or the community spirit and people's friendliness in general. This was particularly high in the Beach Road and Tenison Manor areas, the newer parts of the village.

In contrast, when asked about what they disliked most about living in Cottenham, the volume of traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and speeding cars featured more frequently than any other theme (45%). This was a particular problem for Histon Road area residents, seven in ten (71%) of whom mentioned this and for those in the age brackets 45-54 (54%) and 55-64 (46%). This could be an explanation for why one in ten (10%) Histon Road area respondents were dissatisfied with life in Cottenham. Traffic was also mentioned more by those with three or more people in their household (48%) than those living on their own (42%).

Cottenham in the future – a vision for Cottenham in 2030 (Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 17)

Nine in ten respondents (92%) stated that they would like to be able to describe Cottenham as "safe" in 15 years' time and 89% said "friendly". The proportion of respondents giving the answer "safe" was greatest in the 25-34 and 35-44 age brackets (98% and 95% respectively), as was the word "friendly" (92% and 95% respectively). According to the data, these age groups were the most likely to have young children under the age of ten and this is corroborated by the fact that 97% of people with at least one child in their household aged 5-10 chose the word "safe" and 96% chose "friendly".

The majority of respondents (84%) feel that future development in the village will bring more traffic and three quarters (75%) think it will put pressure on existing medical facilities. Residents are also worried it will bring about a loss of identity and community (68%), place pressure on parking (62%), and on school places (58%) and create higher noise levels (55%). Histon Road area respondents were the most worried about more traffic (90%) whilst those aged 65-74 and above 75 were the most worried about pressure on medical facilities (86% and 84% respectively). People living in households of three or more were more worried about more traffic (84%) compared to those living alone (79%).

Over half of respondents (51%) thought that the biggest benefit that more development would bring would be to safeguard the future of the post office. This was followed by four in ten (41%) who felt that the biggest benefit would be better pavements and footpaths, and the same

¹ For a copy of the questionnaire please refer to Appendix B.

proportion cited better public transport. Safeguarding the future of the post office was particularly important for Beach Road area respondents (59%) and respondents from The Lanes (59%), as well as those aged over 75 (79%). Those aged 65-74 and 75 and over were more likely to say improved public transport was a benefit (46% each) than the other age groups and the 75 and over age group were also more likely to say that better pavements and footpaths would be a benefit (67%). Interestingly, only 15% of respondents thought there would be no benefits at all to new development, which suggests that for the majority of people new development would at least bring some benefits, albeit with worries too.

Nine in ten respondents (91%) said that improving medical services for all ages was important and 90% indicated that they felt that preserving the character of the village and Conservation area was important. This was followed by 89% who said that ensuring noise and pollution levels did not increase was important. A lot less importance was attributed to improving the number or availability of pre-school places (44%) and improving the number or availability of affordable homes (51%). Eight in ten (80%) said that improving movement into, out from and around the village was important, whilst 79% said that improving welfare and day care facilities for older residents was important.

Improving medical services for all ages was most important for those aged 25-34 (95%) and those with young children aged five and under (94%).

Preserving the character of the village and Conservation area was most important amongst 55-64 and 35-44 year olds (95% and 94% respectively said it was important) and amongst respondents from the Beach Road and Histon Road areas (95% each). Those aged 35-44 were also most likely to say that ensuring noise and pollution levels do not increase was important (95%), as were Histon Road area respondents (97%).

With regards to improvements required in the village, the majority of respondents (80%) said that the roads needed improving and eight in ten (79%) also felt the pavements and footpaths required improvement. The proportion indicating that the paths and pavements needed improving was the largest in the 75 and above age group. A particularly large proportion of Beach Road area residents also reported that pavements and footpaths (87%) and the roads (92%) needed improvement, indicating that the problems with footpath, pavement and road surfaces are most likely to be in that area of the village.

When it came to improvements needed for facilities in the village, almost two thirds of respondents (65%) indicated that either car parking facilities should be improved or action taken against inconsiderate and illegal parking in the village. This was followed by 64% each saying that medical facilities and pedestrian crossings required improvement, 63% bus services, 58% cycle paths, and 56% public toilets. Pedestrian crossing improvements were particularly important for those with children (74% of those living with children under five and 78% of those with children aged 5-10). All respondents aged 16-24 felt that the bus service needed improving, and those aged 65-74 and over 75 were most likely to say the pavements and footpaths required improvement (88% and 86% respectively).

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked to identify a single change that would improve their life in Cottenham. Improving the traffic situation, controlling speeding or introducing pedestrian crossings was the most popular theme arising from the comments provided, with 22% mentioning these. One in ten (10%) mentioned improving public transport and 7% said the pavements, footpaths or roads needed improving. Mentions of improving public transport were most frequent amongst the 16-24 year olds group (32%). People living in households of three or more were more likely to mention improvements to the traffic situation, controlling speeding or introducing pedestrian crossings (27%) in comparison to those living on their own (16%).

New facilities in Cottenham – strength of support for provision of new facilities and how they might be funded (Questions 9 & 10)

When asked about what the Neighbourhood Plan should identify money or land for, seven in ten respondents (71%) said they agreed that resources should be identified for a new medical centre, followed by a wider range of shops (63%), and a swimming pool (63%). A new medical centre was particularly important for Oakington Road area respondents, of which 81% agreed money or land should be identified for this. Those aged 16-24 recorded the lowest level of agreement that money or land should be identified for this purpose (55%).

In regards to identifying land or money for a wider range of shops, this was particularly important for those aged 65-74 (73% agreed) and those aged 75 and above (74% agreed). People who did not have children or young people living with them (67%) and those living on their own (70%) were more likely to agree that money or land should be identified for a wider range of shops. It should be noted that overall a quarter (26%) of respondents said they disagreed with identifying land or money for this purpose.

Females were more likely than males to agree with identifying land or money for a swimming pool (67% compared to 57%), as were those aged 25-34 (70%) in comparison to other age groups. Respondents with children under five were also more likely to agree with money or land being identified for a swimming pool than were those living in a household without any children or young people (74% compared to 61%).

Using donations and grants to fund improvements to village facilities was the most popularly identified source of funding, with 86% agreeing that these should be used. This was followed by 75% agreeing that sponsorship should be used. Two thirds of respondents (67%) agreed that improvements should be funded by developments. Raising local taxes was the least popular option, with only 45% agreeing. Only 5% of respondents felt that no improvements should be made to village facilities.

Funding improvements to facilities through housing development was least popular amongst 35-44 year olds, with over a quarter (27%) disagreeing. Likewise, a quarter (26%) of those living with children under five said they disagreed, as did 30% of those who were living with a child aged 5-10. Instead, those aged 35-44 were more likely to agree with paying for improvements to facilities through sponsorship (88%) and through donations and grants (95%). These two latter options were much less popular amongst 16-24 year olds (68% and 73% respectively). A larger proportion of males agreed with funding improvements through housing development than females (73% compared to 63%).

Additional housing – scale, type and location (Questions 11, 12 & 13)

When it came to building new houses in Cottenham, support for affordable or starter homes was highest, with 30% saying a lot more of this type of accommodation was needed and 38% saying a few more were needed. Support for a lot more affordable or starter homes was higher amongst people living in households with no children or young people (32% agreed) and amongst those in the older age groups (36% of those aged 65-74 and those over 75 agreed).

A fifth (20%) of those responding to the survey agreed that a lot more “growing family homes” and low cost rental accommodation should be built (20% and 19% respectively). Support for low cost rental accommodation was highest in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area (33% agreed). Twenty-eight per cent of those aged 75 and above agreed that a lot more rental accommodation was needed, the highest of any age group and those living on their own were most likely to agree that a lot more were needed (27%).

Over two-thirds of respondents said they agreed with small developments (69%) and just over half (53%) agreed that single plots should be allowed. There was a lot less support for large developments being built, with 66% disagreeing that these should be allowed.

Opposition to large housing developments was highest amongst Beach Road area and Histon Road area respondents (77% and 76% respectively disagreeing). However, males were more likely to agree with large housing developments than females (30% compared to 22%), as were those aged 25-34 (36%) compared to the other age groups. Those living in households of three or more people were more likely to disagree that large developments should be allowed (68%) compared to those living alone (54%).

When informed that Cottenham requires 100 more affordable homes and asked whether they agreed with small estates of affordable homes being built on the outskirts of the village or large developments of 200-250 homes being built, 60% agreed with the former and 60% disagreed with the latter. Residents of Tenison Manor were most likely to agree with large developments (34%), which is unsurprising given that it was itself a large estate built within the last fifteen years. Males were more likely to agree with large developments (32%) than females (24%) and those living in households of two people and three or more people were more likely to disagree (62% and 61% respectively) than those living on their own (50%).

In regards to building smaller estates, this was most popular amongst respondents from the High Street and Conservation area (67% agreeing) compared to other areas. For Oakington Road area respondents, however, a larger proportion disagreed with smaller estates (56%) than agreed (42%). Smaller estates were more popular amongst those living in households without any children (64% agreed) compared to those with children under five (55%) and aged 5-10 (46%), as well as amongst those aged 75 and above (70% agreed) in comparison to the other age groups.

Other challenges – increasing bus usage and people's preference for changes to improve traffic and pollution (Questions 14, 15 & 16)

Over half of those responding to the survey (52%) said that they used the bus at least once a month. Three in ten (30%) used it at least once a week, with one in ten (11%) saying they used it four or more times a week. However, a third (32%) said that they hardly ever or never used it. Bus usage was highest for Rampton Road area respondents, of whom 42% said they used the bus at least once a week. In regards to age, 16-24 were most likely to use the bus at least once a week (59%) and bus usage was lowest amongst 25-34 year olds, with 48% saying they hardly ever or never used the bus. Respondents with children aged over 11 years old in their household were more likely to use the bus at least once a week (38%) compared to those with younger children living with them or no children (30%).

To encourage people to use the bus more often, a shorter and more direct journey to Cambridge is the most popular incentive. Seven in ten (71%) said this would encourage them to use the bus service more frequently. Forty-eight per cent said a service to the guided bus at Oakington would encourage them and 44% cited cheaper fares. A shorter and more direct journey time was particularly important to those of sixth form or working-age, with more than three quarters in each sixth form or working-age age group saying this would encourage them more. Cheaper fares were most important for those aged 16-24 (82% said they would use the bus more) and for the older groups a service to the guided bus was more important (56% of those aged 65-74 chose this response, as did 53% of those aged 75 and above). Those with children under five living in their household were more likely to want a shorter journey time or a more direct service to Cambridge (81%), and a bus service to Waterbeach (30%) compared to those with older children or no children in their household.

When asked about what traffic calming and pollution reducing measures residents were in favour of being introduced into Cottenham in the next 15 years, the most popular measure was prohibiting HGV traffic along the High Street (except for access), with 64% providing this response. Six in ten (59%) were in favour of changes to traffic routes to avoid sensitive areas of the village, 47% supported preventing buses from standing with their engines running at Victory Way, and 46% supported the introduction of 20mph zones. Changing the traffic routes was most popular for Histon Road area respondents (73%) and female respondents (64% compared to 54% of males). Those aged 35-44 and 45-54 were also more in favour of this option (69% and 68% respectively) compared to the other age groups, as were those living in households of three or more people (68%).

Prohibiting HGV traffic along the High Street was the most important introduction for people, with 23% favouring this choice. Like with the changes to traffic routes, prohibiting HGV traffic was the most important introduction for Histon Road area respondents (39%).

Representativeness of responses (Questions 18 to 25)

When comparing the demographic questions asked at the end of the survey to the 2011 Census data, it becomes apparent that females are over-represented in the survey sample, as are the older age groups (65-74 and 75+). On the other hand, the 16-24 age group is significantly under-represented and the number of people from this age group who responded to the survey was low (22). Therefore when interpreting the data for this age group, caution should be exercised. For more information about the representativeness of the survey responses please refer to pages 13 to 15.

The Survey Programme

Introduction

Cottenham Parish Council works in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other organisations to develop new and improve existing facilities in the village of Cottenham. Cottenham is a fen-edge Cambridgeshire village in which around 6,400 people reside in 2,700 homes across the Parish.

The Parish Council is leading the preparation of a **Neighbourhood Development Plan** to set out the **community's vision for the Cottenham area** over the next 15 years. The Plan will put policies in place that will help deliver that vision and influence planning permission for development in the Cottenham area. The Neighbourhood Development Plan will determine the development and use of land in the area and look at making other improvements to the neighbourhood, including the development and design of new homes, shops, offices, and other infrastructure.

Decisions on any future planning applications will have to legally take the Neighbourhood Development Plan into consideration.

This report presents the findings from the Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan survey conducted for Cottenham Parish Council by independent market research agency Enventure Research.

This survey plays an important role in capturing Parish residents' views, perceptions and opinions of development and improvements required to the village and the findings from the survey will be used to draft the initial Neighbourhood Plan.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed in partnership between Cottenham Parish Council and Enventure Research, asking a mix of single response questions, multiple response questions, open end questions, and grid questions. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in **Appendix B**.

A Neighbourhood Development Plan is mostly about the future use of land. The questionnaire was intended to help establish:

1. Cottenham today – understanding how people currently see Cottenham, especially what they like most and what they see as shortcomings (Questions 1, 2 and 3)
2. Cottenham in the future – a vision for Cottenham in 2030, based on what people like about Cottenham today and what they want to see improved in coming years (Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 17)
3. New facilities – how new facilities might be funded and the strength of support for their provision (Questions 9 and 10)
4. Additional housing – scale, type and location of new housing (Questions 11, 12 and 13)
5. Other challenges – increasing bus usage and people's preference for changes to improve traffic and pollution (Questions 14, 15 and 16)
6. Demographic questions – to determine whether the feedback is representative of the Parish's population (Questions 18 to 25)

Methodology

The survey was conducted with **residents of Cottenham aged 16 or over** via a paper and online survey.

The paper survey was distributed by post to 2,628 households in the Parish accompanied by a second class freepost envelope for residents to return the survey to Enventure Research. A further 1,372 questionnaires were provided to Cottenham Parish Council for distribution in local establishments such as shops, restaurants, public houses, and the village library.

The online survey was promoted via the following channels:

- On the front page of the paper questionnaire
- On the Cottenham Parish Council website
- On Facebook and Twitter using the Parish Council's social media accounts
- Emailed to a subscribed list of contacts
- Posters publicising the survey were circulated to community venues, shops and restaurants
- Flyers publicising the survey were circulated around the village
- On Streetlife
- Through a programme of meetings with community leaders

The online survey was fully optimised for all devices connected to the internet so respondents were able to take part on their mobile smartphones and tablets, as well as using PCs and laptops.

Parish residents were incentivised to take part via a £0.50 charity donation being made by the Parish Council to a registered charity of their choice for each completed questionnaire.

A total of **973 Cottenham Parish residents took part** in the survey between 15th December 2015 and 26th January 2016. To identify differences between different areas of the village, respondents were asked to indicate the area of the village in which they lived. Figure 1 below shows the responses. For a map of the village please refer to Appendix A.

Figure 1 – Q21. Which area best describes where you live?
Base: Those to whom the question was asked² (971)

Response	Number	Percentage
Beach Road area	75	8%
Fen (NW of Cottenham Lode)	7	<1%
Fen (East of Cottenham Lode)	5	<1%
High Street / Conservation Area	348	36%
Histon Road area	62	6%
Oakington Road area	43	4%
Rampton Road area	122	13%
Tenison Manor	160	17%
The Lanes	96	10%
Twenty Pence Road area	18	2%
Outside of the boundary	5	<1%
No response	30	3%

² Please note that the above question was not asked to two respondents who said they were business owners and did not live in the village.

When looking at the method of response, 658 respondents (68%) completed the paper questionnaire and returned it to Enventure Research and 315 respondents (32%) took part online.

Interpretation of the data

This report contains several tables and charts that present survey results. In some instances, the responses may not add up to 100%. There are several reasons why this might happen:

- The question may have allowed each respondent to give more than one answer
- Only the most common responses may be shown in the table or chart
- Individual percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number so the total may come to 99% or 101%
- A response of between 0% and 1% will be shown as <1%.

As the survey was completed by a sample of Cottenham Parish residents (973 people), and not the entire adult population, all results are subject to sampling tolerances.

Based on a total population of around 4,800 Parish residents aged 16 and above, a sample of 973 respondents will give results that are accurate to approximately $\pm 3\%$ at the 95% confidence level. This means, for example, if 50% of respondents responded with a particular answer to a question, we can be 95% sure that if all residents of Cottenham had responded to the survey, the actual result would be between 47% and 53%³.

As a self-completion questionnaire was used, not all respondents have answered all of the questions. For comparison purposes, each chart and table shown in this report will show the level of “no responses” for each question i.e. the percentage of respondents who did not leave an answer.

For the analysis of some questions, we have amalgamated some of the responses together in order to interpret the data. We have done this in cases where responses can be added together to indicate a level of agreement or disagreement or importance with a statement or question e.g. “Strongly agree” and “Agree”, and “Very important” and “Fairly important”.

Subgroup analysis has been undertaken to explore the results provided by key subgroups such as gender, age group, household size, age of children living in household, method of response (i.e. paper or online) and satisfaction with life in the village. This analysis has only been carried out where the sample size is seen to be sufficient for comment (over 20). Where sample sizes were not large enough, subgroups have been combined (such as areas of the village⁴) to create a larger group.

In order to compare results between subgroups, statistical analysis has been undertaken. This allows us to be confident that any difference between scores is real and is not due to chance. Results between subgroups have been tested at a 95% confidence level. Only those differences that are statistically significant according to the z-test have been commented on within this report. The z-test is a commonly used statistical test to highlight whether differences in results are ‘significant’. By ‘significant’ we mean the likelihood that two results would still be different if everyone in the village had responded to the survey.

³ Please note that this is an example only and does not correlate with any of the questions asked in this survey.

⁴ In the report, Fen (NW of Cottenham Lode), Fen (East of Cottenham Lode), and the Twenty Pence Road area have been combined to create a larger subgroup.


There were a number of open ended questions in the survey which allowed respondents to write their own response rather than tick a box. To analyse these answers and present them in an understandable way, responses to each open ended question have been sorted into a number of categories and themes, allowing them to be visually presented as charts and tables.

Sample profile

Figures 2 to 6 present key demographic data of survey respondents from Questions 18-25 of the survey. The majority of respondents (96%) identified themselves as being residents of Cottenham and 4% said they were both business owners and residents. Two people identified themselves as business owners, but said they were not residents of the village.

Figure 2 – Q18. Are you a resident of Cottenham or are you the owner of a business in Cottenham?

Base: All respondents (973)




Figures 3 to 6 show questions that were not asked to the two respondents who indicated they were business owners and did not live in Cottenham. Therefore the charts and tables below show only 971 responses.

Figure 3 shows that a larger proportion of females than males responded to the survey (54% and 40% respectively), whilst 6% preferred not to say whether they were male or female, or did not answer the question at all. This is in contrast to the 2011 Census data which indicates there is a more even split between males and females in the Parish.

Figure 3 – Q22. Gender

Base: Those to whom the question was asked (971)




In terms of area of the village, there was a fairly even split of males and females in the Oakington Road area (49% each) and in The Lanes 50% of the respondents were male. However, the proportion of males responding was very low in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area (30%) and Tenison Manor (35%). The proportion of males responding to the online survey (47%) was also larger than the proportion responding to the paper survey (37%).

Respondents were next asked to indicate which age category they were in. As Figure 4 shows, a broad range of age groups responded to the survey. When comparing this data to the 2011 Census data, it looks like the youngest age category (16-24) is under-represented and the older age categories (65-74 and 75+) are over-represented. This should therefore be kept in mind when interpreting the data represented in this report. It should also be kept in mind that the number of respondents aged 16-24 is low (22), therefore percentages for this age group should be interpreted with caution.

Figure 4 – Q23. Age

Base: Those to whom the question was asked (971)



The Oakington Road area saw the largest proportion of 16-24 year olds responding to the survey (9%), which was much higher than in any other area. Three in ten (30%) Oakington Road area respondents also identified themselves as being between the ages of 45 and 54. When it came to the 35-44 age category, over a quarter (26%) of Tenison Manor respondents said they were in this age group. Almost a third (32%) of Histon Road area respondents said they were aged 65-74, the highest proportion in any of the areas.

Respondents were asked how many people lived in their household and whether they had any children or young adults living in their household. Figures 5 and 6 show the results for these questions. As can be seen, over half of those responding (53%) said that they did not have any children living in their household. However, 44% of those responding to the survey said that they lived in a household of three or more people and only 16% said that they lived alone.

Figure 5 – Q24. How many people live in your household?
Base: Those to whom the question was asked (971)





Figure 6 – Q25. Do you have any children or young adults in your household?
Base: Those to whom the question was asked (971)



Considering household size by area, the proportion of respondents living on their own was much lower in the Histon Road area (3%) than in Tenison Manor (23%), the Beach Road area (15%), the High Street and Conservation area (16%), and the Rampton Road area (16%). Over half of Histon Road area respondents (52%) said that they lived in a household of two people. The largest proportion of respondents living alone was amongst the 75 and above age category (39%) and no 16-24 year olds said they lived on their own.

It should also be noted that the 35-44 age group were most likely to have at least one child under the age of five (63%) living in their household and at least one child aged between five and ten (65%). A quarter (25%) of those aged 25-34 also said they had at least one child under five living in their household.

Survey Findings

Cottenham today (Questions 1, 2 & 3)

Understanding how people see today's Cottenham, especially what they like most and what they see as shortcomings, provides important context to help Cottenham Parish Council understand attitudes and opinions on other issues such as improvements to the village. Respondents were therefore first asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with Cottenham as a place to live.

As Figure 7 shows below, the majority of respondents (88%) said that they were satisfied with Cottenham as a place to live (35% very satisfied and 53% fairly satisfied). A further 6% said they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and only 4% said they were dissatisfied (3% fairly dissatisfied and 1% very dissatisfied). The remaining 3% either did not answer the question or said that they did not know.

Figure 7 – Q1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with Cottenham as a place to live at the moment?

Base: All respondents (973)





Figure 8 presents the satisfaction levels reported by respondents in each area of the village. Satisfaction was highest in Tenison Manor, where 93% of respondents were either very or fairly satisfied and the Rampton Road area, where 92% gave the same answer. By contrast, satisfaction was lowest in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area where only 70% of respondents said they were very or fairly satisfied and amongst Histon Road area respondents, where 13% said they were dissatisfied. Although the Oakington Road area saw the smallest proportion of respondents saying they were very satisfied (19%), in comparison to the other areas, interestingly no-one from this area said they were dissatisfied.

Figure 8 – Q1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with Cottenham as a place to live at the moment?


Base: All respondents (973)



As can be seen in Figure 9, there was little difference between the levels of satisfaction of male and female respondents. Considering the results by age, respondents aged 25-34 reported the highest level of satisfaction (96% satisfied), followed by 35-44 year olds (93% satisfied). In contrast, satisfaction was lowest amongst the youngest age group, 16-24 year olds, with only 77% reporting they were satisfied and 9% reporting they were dissatisfied. However, it should be noted that the number of 16-24 year olds within the sample is low (22) so these figures should be treated with caution.

Figure 9 – Q1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with Cottenham as a place to live at the moment?

Base: All respondents (973)




A large proportion of those living in households of three or more people said they were satisfied with life in the village (90%). By contrast, 85% of those who lived alone said they were satisfied.

When looking at the results by method of survey completion, a greater proportion of those responding online (92%) were satisfied than those responding via the paper survey (86%).

Respondents were next asked to comment on what they most liked about living in Cottenham. These comments were themed and are presented in Figure 10. Almost half (49%) of the comments mentioned the amenities and facilities available in the village, followed by the general community spirit and friendliness of friends, family and neighbours (42%). A fifth (20%) mentioned the village's transport links and access to the city.

Figure 10 – Q2. What do you currently most like about living in Cottenham? (Coded responses⁵)

Base: All respondents (973)



There were few differences in results between areas of the village, although it should be noted that a greater proportion of comments provided by Beach Road area and Tenison Manor residents mentioned friends/family/community/neighbours (48% for both) than other areas, particularly the Oakington Road area where this theme was only mentioned in 30% of the comments. A fifth (19%) of Oakington Road area residents mentioned the countryside and the rural feel of where they lived. In stark contrast, this was mentioned by only 8% of High Street and Conservation area residents, which is unsurprising given that this area is the centre of the village and not bordered by countryside.

Comments from female respondents were more likely to mention the amenities and facilities than those given by males (54% compared to 43%) and more likely also to mention friends, family, friendliness and sense of community (49% compared to 35%). A larger proportion of males mentioned the atmosphere, quietness and tranquillity (16% compared to 10% of females) and the countryside and rural location (13% compared to 9%). A greater proportion of males in comparison to females also did not leave a comment (13% compared to 7%).

The amenities and facilities were mentioned less by those aged 16-24 (36%) and 75 and over (33%) than the other age groups, indicating that this aspect was more important for those aged 25-65 in the village. Almost a fifth (19%) of those aged 75 and above chose not to provide a comment, the highest of any of the age groups.

⁵ By coded responses, we mean that comments have been themed so the themes can be presented in a chart format.


When it comes to household size, the larger the household, the more likely respondents were to mention the amenities and facilities (56% of respondents from households of three or more compared to 39% of people living alone), indicating that a key attraction for people with families is the facilities and amenities available on their doorstep.

People responding online were more likely to mention the amenities and facilities (53%), than those responding via the paper survey (47%).

Respondents were then asked about what they disliked about living in Cottenham in the form of a verbatim comment. The most common theme emerging was traffic and speeding of vehicles in the village (45% of comments), followed by the public transport provision and access to Cambridge (15%), the state of the roads, pavements, and footpaths (14%) and bad parking / lack of parking facilities (13%). This is shown in Figure 11.

Figure 11 – Q3. What do you currently most dislike about living in Cottenham? (Coded responses)

Base: All respondents (973)



Looking at the results by area in the village, traffic and speeding seems to be a particular problem for Histon Road area residents, with 71% of comments mentioning this, the highest out of any of the village areas. By contrast, this was only mentioned by 29% of Beach Road area residents, indicating that traffic and speeding might be less of a problem in that area. However, for Beach Road area residents, the state of the roads, pavements, and footpaths is a particular problem, with almost a quarter of comments mentioning this (23%), the highest out of all of the areas.

There were very few differences between responses provided by males and females, although it should be noted that a greater proportion of females (17%) mentioned the public transport and access links to Cambridge than males (10%).

When it comes to age, speeding and traffic in general was more likely to be mentioned by 45-54 and 55-64 year olds (54% and 48% respectively), particularly in comparison to 16-24 year olds (27%) and 25-34 year olds (32%). Those with three or more people in their household

were also more likely to mention traffic and speeding (48%) than those from single households (42%), indicating that this might be a particular worry for those with families.

Parking was a particular problem mentioned the most in comments from people aged 75 and over (18%), whilst the state of the roads, footpaths and pavements was most mentioned by 55-64 year olds (19%) and 65-74 year olds (18%). This theme was not mentioned at all by 16-24 year olds, and neither were parking or crime and antisocial behaviour.

Looking at the themes emerging compared to satisfaction with life in the village, traffic and speeding were mentioned most frequently by those who said they were dissatisfied with living in the village, or neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (47%), followed by the state of the pavements, footpaths and pavements (21%).


Traffic and speeding were more likely to be mentioned by those who completed the survey online (49%), compared to 43% of those who completed the paper survey. This was also the case when it came to a lack of access to facilities and services, with this mentioned in 17% of the comments provided online, in comparison to 10% of the comments provided by people completing the paper survey.

Cottenham in the future (Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 17)

In order to determine the vision for Cottenham in 2030 to feed into the Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council wanted to understand what people wanted Cottenham to be like in 15 years' time and what they wanted to see improved.

Respondents were asked about how they would like Cottenham to be described in 15 years' time, choosing from a list of adjectives and phrases. The most commonly chosen word or phrase was "safe", with 92% of respondents choosing this response, closely followed by "friendly" (89%). The other most commonly selected words or phrases were "attractive" (59%), "accessible" (57%), "rural" (56%) and "proud of its heritage" (55%). The least popular words or phrases were "suburban", which only saw 5% chose it from the list, and "town" (4%), perhaps indicating that the majority of people do not want the size of the village to increase substantially or to become a suburb of Cambridge. This is shown in Figure 12.

Figure 12 – Q4. How would you like Cottenham to be described in 15 years?
Base: All respondents (973)



Five per cent of the respondents chose "other" from the list and the majority of comments provided were about how people would like the village to stay the same size as it is and retain its identity as a village.

The word "safe" was the most commonly chosen by residents from all village areas, with "friendly" being the second most common. However, a smaller proportion of respondents from the Oakington Road area chose "friendly" (77%) in comparison to the other areas. In contrast, 93% from both the Fens and Twenty Pence area and Tenison Manor chose this word.


There was little difference between responses from males and females. However, when it comes to looking at the results by age subgroups, larger proportions of 25-34 year olds (98%) and 35-44 year olds (95%) said "safe" than the 16-24 age group (91%). Likewise the word "friendly" was chosen less by 16-24 year olds (82%) than 25-34 year olds (92%) and 35-44

year olds (95%). According to the data the latter age groups were most likely to have young children.

When it then comes to households with children, 97% of those living in households with children aged 5-10 chose the word “safe” compared to 91% of those who did not have any children living in the household. This was also true for the word “friendly” which was chosen by 96% of those with children aged 5-10 in the household, compared to 86% of those without children.

Respondents were then asked two questions about future developments in Cottenham. First of all they were asked if they had any worries about development and were asked to choose from a list of potential worries. The most commonly chosen worry was more traffic, chosen by 84% of respondents, followed by pressure on medical facilities which was chosen by three-quarters of respondents (75%) and loss of village identity and community (chosen by 68%). Only 2% of respondents said that they did not have any worries, indicating that much would need to be done to allay the fears of Parish residents if proposed development went ahead. This is shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 – Q5. What, if anything, worries you about future development in Cottenham?
Base: All respondents (973)



Five per cent of respondents gave other responses. Out of these, the most common theme cited was the worry that facilities and services would not cope with the additional pressure and the negative impact development would have on the level of traffic in the village.

When it comes to worries about future development, for both genders the biggest preoccupations were traffic, followed by pressure on medical facilities (84% each). However, females were more likely than males to mention pressure on facilities for young people (41%

compared to 30%), pressure on school places (62% compared to 55%), pressure on shops and services (44% compared to 37%), pressure on pre-school places (46% compared to 40%), and loss of village identity and community (72% compared to 63%).

More traffic was a worry chosen by a larger proportion of Histon Road area residents (90%) than any other area, and loss of village identity and community was cited the most by Rampton Road area respondents (76%). This is in contrast to the responses provided by Fens and Twenty Pence Road area residents, of whom only 57% said loss of village identity and community was a worry and 70% said more traffic was a concern.

When it comes to pressure on medical facilities as a worry, this was cited more by 65-74 year olds, and those 75 and over than any other group (86% and 84% respectively). By contrast, only 59% of 16-24 year olds and 58% of 25-34 year olds cited this as a worry. More traffic was also a greater concern for the age groups of 25 and over (all 79% and above) than for 16-24 year olds (68%). For the latter, more traffic and loss of identity and community were the biggest worries with 68% citing each of these, closely followed by pressure on public transport (64%). Unsurprisingly, the youngest age category also worried about fewer jobs and businesses (23%), and pressure on leisure facilities (36%) more than the other age groups, however it is worth bearing in mind that the number of 16-24 year olds in the sample is low (just 22).


Interestingly, those from households of three or more worried less about pressure on facilities for older people than respondents from single households (29% compared to 50%) and people living on their own worried less about traffic (79%) compared to those from households of two (87%) and three or more (84%).

When looking at the differences between those who completed the survey online and those who completed the survey on paper, those who responded via the paper questionnaire were more likely to cite pressure on facilities for older people as a worry (41% compared to 32%) and those completing the survey online were more likely to mention pressure on leisure facilities as a worry (32% compared to 23%).

Respondents were next asked about the biggest benefits, if any, that development and/or changes in the village could bring. Although residents have concerns and worries about new housing development in the village as Figure 13 showed, the majority of people agreed that there would be at least some benefits to the village that development could bring. As can be seen in Figure 14, only 15% of respondents said there would be no benefits, with leaves 85% saying there would be at least some benefit. In terms of benefits that development might bring, the most common response was “safe-guarding the future of the post office”, chosen by 51% of respondents. Better pavements and footpaths and improved public transport were also cited by large proportions of respondents, at 41% each. At the other end of the scale, improved air quality and lower noise levels were suggested by much smaller proportions of respondents (4% and 8% respectively).

Figure 14 – Q6. What, if any, do you think are the biggest benefits which development and/or changes could bring to Cottenham?

Base: All respondents (973)



Few differences could be identified in the responses provided by male and female respondents, however a slightly larger proportion of female respondents mentioned safeguarding the future of the post office as a potential benefit than male respondents (54% compared to 48%).

A greater proportion of respondents from The Lanes (26%) felt one of the biggest benefits of development in Cottenham was more school places in comparison to the other areas. This is in comparison to just 14% of residents from the High Street and Conservation area providing this response. Residents of The Lanes were also more likely to suggest having a community with a balance of ages and incomes as a benefit at 40%, in comparison to just 18% from the Rampton Road area who felt that this was a benefit.

Differences could also be identified between those who felt that safeguarding the post office was the biggest benefit. Whilst 59% of respondents from both the Beach Road area and The Lanes felt that this was a benefit, just 32% of Histon Road area respondents gave this

response. Residents of the Beach Road area were also more likely to suggest more leisure facilities as a benefit in comparison to respondents residing in the Rampton Road area (40% and 17% respectively).

Improved public transport was perceived as a benefit by 41% of the sample overall, however a smaller proportion of those aged 35-44 suggested this in comparison to those aged 75 and over, and 65-74 (33% and 45% respectively).

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, a greater proportion of respondents aged 75 and over felt that ensuring more school places was a benefit (24%), in comparison to just 12% of those aged 35-44 and 11% of those aged 45-54. Less surprising was the finding that 42% of those aged 75 and above felt that better facilities for older people was a benefit (in comparison to 22% of the sample overall and just 15% of those aged 45-54).

Whilst safeguarding the future of the post office was the most common response overall, this was highlighted as a benefit more commonly by respondents from the older age groups, with 79% of those aged 75 and over, and 62% of those aged 65-74 providing this response. This is in comparison to respondents aged 25-34 and 35-44, of whom 37% in each age group suggested that this was a benefit. Again, for respondents aged 75 and above, better pavements and footpaths was suggested by a greater proportion (67%) in comparison to respondents aged 35-44 and 45-54 (33% each).

When comparing the responses of those who participated in the survey online and those who completed the survey on paper, a larger proportion of paper respondents (26%) felt that improved parking was a benefit, in comparison to 13% of online respondents. Fifty six per cent of those completing the questionnaire on paper said that safeguarding the future of the post office was a benefit, whilst 40% of online respondents provided this response. More cycle routes (39%) and more leisure facilities (34%) were highlighted as benefits by a greater proportion of online respondents than paper questionnaire respondents (29% and 25% respectively).

Seven per cent of respondents provided other responses. Of these, the most common response was that no development should take place in Cottenham, whilst others suggested that development would have a positive impact on other facilities, amenities or services not listed above. Some respondents suggested that development would have a positive impact on affordable housing whilst others felt that they were unable to comment, as their views would depend on the nature and management of the development in question.


Respondents were next asked to indicate how important they thought a number of potential improvements to Cottenham were over the next 10-15 years.

As can be seen in Figure 15, respondents attached the most importance to improving medical services for all ages, with nine in ten respondents (91%) saying that this was important. This was closely followed by preserving the character of the village and Conservation area, with 90% indicating that this was important, and ensuring noise and pollution levels do not increase (89% important). Improving movement into, out from and around the village and improving welfare and day care facilities for older and less able residents were also perceived as important, with 80% and 79% respectively suggesting they were important.

A smaller proportion of respondents indicated that improving the number / availability of pre-school places was important at 44%, with 37% stating that this was not important. A similar proportion (38%) said that improving the number or availability of affordable homes was not important.

Figure 15 – Q7. Thinking about Cottenham in 10-15 years' time, how important are the following to you?

Base: All respondents (973)



The importance attached to each of the potential improvements to Cottenham varies across different subgroups. The following tables (Figures 16 to 25) demonstrate the proportions who indicated that each statement was either important or not important, according to gender, age and area subgroups. Only those differences which are statistically significant have been commented on in the accompanying text.

Figure 16 – Q7. Importance of improving number / availability of affordable homes (either to purchase or rent)
Base: All respondents (973)

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	51%	39%	10%
	Female	52%	38%	11%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	50%	40%	10%
Age	16-24	50%	41%	41%
	25-34	57%	36%	36%
	35-44	39%	55%	55%
	45-54	58%	37%	37%
	55-64	53%	40%	40%
	65-74	51%	35%	35%
	75+	53%	24%	24%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	49%	33%	19%
Area	Beach Road area	43%	49%	8%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	57%	30%	13%
	High Street / Conservation area	55%	37%	9%
	Histon Road area	50%	45%	5%
	Oakington Road area	44%	49%	7%
	Rampton Road area	48%	40%	12%
	Tenison Manor area	51%	38%	11%
	The Lanes	55%	32%	13%
	Outside or no reply	49%	31%	20%

As can be seen in Figure 16, there was little difference identified between males and females in the importance attached to improving the number or availability of affordable homes. Considering the differences between age groups, just 39% of those aged 35-44 said that this was important, compared to 44% of the overall sample. A greater proportion of residents aged 45-54 and 25-34 felt that this was important, at 58% and 57% respectively. It should also be noted that over half (55%) of those aged 35-44 felt that this was not important, which was also far higher than any other age group and higher than the proportion who said it was important.

Respondents from the various areas of Cottenham did not differ greatly in the importance they attached to improving the number or availability of affordable homes. Residents of The Lanes felt that this was less important than the overall sample, with 32% indicating that this was not important. In comparison, 49% of Beach Road and Oakington road areas each said that this was not important. On the other hand, a greater proportion of Fens and Twenty Pence Road area respondents felt this was important (57%) compared to those saying it was not.

Interestingly, a greater proportion of respondents with children aged 11 and over felt that this was an important aim, with 58% stating that this was important. In comparison, only 46% of those with children under five and 45% of those with children aged 5-10 felt that improving the number and availability of affordable homes was important.

Figure 17 – Q7. Importance of improving number / availability of pre-school places
Base: All respondents (973)

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	44%	36%	20%
	Female	45%	36%	19%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	43%	43%	13%
Age	16-24	59%	23%	18%
	25-34	70%	23%	7%
	35-44	46%	43%	11%
	45-54	44%	48%	8%
	55-64	40%	43%	17%
	65-74	41%	28%	31%
	75+	39%	26%	36%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	33%	42%	26%
Area	Beach Road area	55%	29%	16%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	57%	20%	23%
	High Street / Conservation area	44%	37%	19%
	Histon Road area	32%	53%	15%
	Oakington Road area	42%	47%	12%
	Rampton Road area	41%	36%	23%
	Tenison Manor area	46%	38%	16%
	The Lanes	45%	33%	22%
	Outside or no reply	49%	23%	29%

Again, there was very little difference in the responses provided between male and female respondents with regards to the importance of improving the number / availability of pre-school places, as can be seen in Figure 17. Both genders saw larger proportions saying this was important compared to the proportions of those saying it was not important.

Respondents aged 25-34 were most likely to suggest that this was important (70% compared to 44% of the overall sample) out of all of the age groups because this group of respondents were very likely to have young children living in their household. By comparison, only 23% said this was not important, the lowest of any age group, along with 16-24 year olds. Sixty-six per cent of respondents with children aged under five living with them said that this was either very or quite important, in contrast to just 41% of those who had no children.

Residents from the Beach Road and Fens & Twenty Pence Road areas were more likely to indicate that this was important (55% and 57% respectively) in comparison to respondents from other areas. In contrast, just 32% of residents from the Histon Road area said that this was important and over half of the respondents from this area (53%) said it was not important.

Figure 18 – Q7. Importance of keeping the primary school at its current size, serving its current catchment**Base: All respondents (973)**

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	61%	26%	14%
	Female	65%	19%	15%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	52%	30%	18%
Age	16-24	73%	14%	14%
	25-34	68%	18%	14%
	35-44	74%	16%	10%
	45-54	64%	30%	6%
	55-64	60%	28%	12%
	65-74	60%	21%	20%
	75+	54%	19%	27%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	44%	30%	26%
Area	Beach Road area	67%	20%	13%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	53%	17%	30%
	High Street / Conservation area	62%	23%	16%
	Histon Road area	65%	31%	5%
	Oakington Road area	63%	21%	16%
	Rampton Road area	75%	15%	10%
	Tenison Manor area	56%	28%	16%
	The Lanes	60%	25%	15%
	Outside or no reply	60%	11%	29%

As can be seen in Figure 18, a slightly larger proportion of female respondents (65%) indicated that keeping the primary school at its current size was important than male respondents (61%). Interestingly, 74% of those aged 35-44 felt that this was important, compared to 62% of the overall sample. There was also a larger difference in the younger age groups (16-24 and 25-34) between the proportions of those saying this was important and those saying it was not.

Considering the results by area subgroups, respondents from the Rampton Road area were more likely to state that this was important (75%) and least likely to say it was not important (15%). In contrast, 53% from the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area and 56% from the Tenison Manor area said that this was important, although it should be kept in mind that this is affected by the fact that 30% of respondents from this area did not answer. However, it should also be noted that 31% of Histon Road respondents felt that this was not important.

Four-fifths (79%) of respondents with children under ten living with them felt that this was important, compared to 54% with no children.

Figure 19 – Q7. Importance of improving medical services for all ages
Base: All respondents (973)

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	90%	6%	4%
	Female	91%	3%	6%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	93%	3%	3%
Age	16-24	86%	9%	5%
	25-34	95%	1%	4%
	35-44	91%	7%	2%
	45-54	91%	6%	3%
	55-64	89%	5%	6%
	65-74	92%	2%	6%
	75+	87%	2%	11%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	91%	5%	5%
Area	Beach Road area	91%	5%	4%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	80%	7%	13%
	High Street / Conservation area	91%	4%	6%
	Histon Road area	92%	7%	2%
	Oakington Road area	95%	-	5%
	Rampton Road area	92%	4%	4%
	Tenison Manor area	96%	3%	2%
	The Lanes	82%	7%	11%
	Outside or no reply	86%	6%	9%

A greater proportion of male respondents felt that improving medical services for all ages was not important, at 6%, in comparison to 3% of female respondents. However, nine out of ten respondents from both genders felt that this was important (90% male and 91% female). When it comes to differences by age group, those aged 25-34 were more likely to say this was important (95%) than those aged 75 and above (87%). Those aged 25-34 were also least likely to say that improving medical services was not important (1%). The proportions of 65-74 year olds and those aged 75 and above saying that this was not important were also small (2% each).

Improving medical services was viewed as important by the majority of respondents from all areas; however smaller proportions from The Lanes and the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area felt that this was important, at 82% and 80% respectively. It should also be noted that no respondents from the Oakington Road area felt that improving medical services was not important.

Figure 20 – Q7. Importance of improving welfare and day care facilities for older and less able residents**Base: All respondents (973)**

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	77%	11%	12%
	Female	81%	9%	10%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	85%	8%	7%
Age	16-24	73%	18%	9%
	25-34	71%	19%	10%
	35-44	72%	17%	11%
	45-54	81%	14%	5%
	55-64	86%	5%	9%
	65-74	86%	5%	10%
	75+	77%	1%	22%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	77%	9%	14%
Area	Beach Road area	77%	13%	9%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	70%	7%	23%
	High Street / Conservation area	81%	9%	10%
	Histon Road area	77%	18%	5%
	Oakington Road area	74%	14%	12%
	Rampton Road area	77%	12%	11%
	Tenison Manor area	84%	7%	9%
	The Lanes	78%	8%	14%
	Outside or no reply	77%	9%	14%

As could perhaps be anticipated, respondents from the older age groups tended to state that improving welfare and day care facilities for older and less able residents was important more frequently than respondents from the younger age groups. This is shown in Figure 20. Almost three quarters (73%) of those aged 16-24 indicated that this was important, rising to 86% of respondents aged 55-64 and 64-74. Although at first glance it appears that 77% of those aged 75 and above felt that improving these facilities was important, this was due largely to the fact that a fifth (22%) did not answer this question. Only 1% of those aged 75 and above felt this was not important. Looking at the proportion of those who said that improving these facilities was not important, only 1% gave this answer which was the lowest of any age group.

There was very little difference in the responses by gender or by area of the village. However, it should be noted that almost a fifth (18%) of Histon Road area respondents said that improving welfare and day care facilities for older and less able residents was not important. Comparing the differences between those who felt improving welfare for older people and day care facilities was important and those who did not, Tenison Manor saw the greatest difference (84% vs 7%).

A greater proportion of those who completed the survey in paper format reported that this was important (81%) in comparison to those who completed it online (75%).

Figure 21 – Q7. Importance of improving local employment
Base: All respondents (973)

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	60%	29%	11%
	Female	54%	27%	19%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	62%	20%	18%
Age	16-24	55%	32%	14%
	25-34	49%	43%	8%
	35-44	54%	35%	11%
	45-54	60%	31%	10%
	55-64	64%	24%	13%
	65-74	55%	27%	18%
	75+	53%	14%	33%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	65%	12%	23%
Area	Beach Road area	61%	25%	13%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	73%	13%	13%
	High Street / Conservation area	58%	28%	14%
	Histon Road area	48%	39%	13%
	Oakington Road area	56%	28%	16%
	Rampton Road area	52%	30%	18%
	Tenison Manor area	59%	27%	14%
	The Lanes	57%	22%	21%
	Outside or no reply	46%	26%	29%

Male respondents (60%) were more likely than female respondents (54%) to state that improving local employment was important. The importance allocated to this statement was highest amongst 55-64 year olds (64%), and lowest amongst those aged 25-34 (49%). The difference between those who felt that improving local employment was important and those who felt it was not important was greatest amongst the 55-64 and 75+ age groups.

A greater proportion of respondents residing in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area indicated that this was important (73%), contrasting with the overall sample (57%), and particularly with Histon Road area respondents (48%).

Respondents with children aged 11 and above in their household were more likely to indicate that improving local employment was important (61%), compared to respondents with children aged 5-10 (50%).

Figure 22 – Q7. Importance of improving leisure and recreation facilities
Base: All respondents (973)

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	66%	21%	13%
	Female	71%	14%	15%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	63%	25%	12%
Age	16-24	68%	23%	10%
	25-34	79%	19%	2%
	35-44	86%	10%	5%
	45-54	80%	15%	5%
	55-64	65%	22%	14%
	65-74	63%	17%	20%
	75+	42%	24%	34%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	49%	26%	26%
Area	Beach Road area	75%	11%	15%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	50%	27%	23%
	High Street / Conservation area	69%	20%	11%
	Histon Road area	71%	19%	10%
	Oakington Road area	67%	14%	19%
	Rampton Road area	66%	19%	16%
	Tenison Manor area	80%	12%	8%
	The Lanes	59%	22%	19%
	Outside or no reply	43%	17%	40%

Female respondents were more likely to say that improving leisure and recreation facilities were important (71%) compared to males (66%). Improving leisure and recreation facilities was viewed as important by a greater proportion of respondents aged 35-44 and 45-54 (at 86% and 80% respectively) and by a smaller proportion of respondents aged 75 and over (42%) in comparison to 68% of the overall sample. The difference between those saying improving leisure and recreation facilities was important and those saying it was not, was highest amongst the 35-44 year old group, the group most likely to have children under ten living in their household.

In comparison to 68% of respondents overall, 80% of Tenison Manor respondents said that improving leisure and recreation facilities was important and only 12% said it was not important. In contrast, 59% of those residing in The Lanes felt that this aim was important.

Respondents with children tended to allocate greater importance to leisure and recreation facilities than those without children (61%). Of those who did have children, 84% of those with children under ten said that improving these facilities was important. Greater importance was also allocated to leisure and recreation facilities when respondents lived in a household of three or more people (80%) than when they lived alone (60%).

Figure 23 – Q7. Importance of improving movement into, out from and around the village**Base: All respondents (973)**

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	80%	11%	9%
	Female	81%	8%	11%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	75%	20%	5%
Age	16-24	82%	9%	9%
	25-34	94%	2%	4%
	35-44	85%	11%	4%
	45-54	84%	10%	6%
	55-64	84%	8%	8%
	65-74	77%	12%	11%
	75+	67%	6%	27%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	58%	26%	16%
Area	Beach Road area	87%	8%	5%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	60%	20%	20%
	High Street / Conservation area	83%	10%	8%
	Histon Road area	92%	5%	3%
	Oakington Road area	74%	9%	16%
	Rampton Road area	76%	11%	13%
	Tenison Manor area	84%	8%	8%
	The Lanes	72%	13%	16%
	Outside or no reply	66%	17%	17%

No significant differences were identified between male and female respondents with regards to access into, out from and around the village. This was, however, perceived as important by a greater proportion of those aged 25-34 (94%), than those in the other age categories. Only 2% in this age group said this was not important. Those aged 75 and over felt that this was less important, with 67% stating this was important.

Survey respondents residing in the Histon Road area were more likely to regard improving movement into, out from and around the village as important, with 92% stating that this was either very or quite important. The difference between those saying this was important and those saying it was not, was highest amongst respondents from this area (92% compared to 5%). In comparison, 72% of residents of The Lanes said that this was important. Respondents from households with three or more residents were also more likely than the overall sample (80%) to rate access as important (84%).

Figure 24 – Q7. Importance of preserving the character of our village and Conservation area**Base: All respondents (973)**

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	89%	9%	3%
	Female	91%	4%	5%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	85%	10%	5%
Age	16-24	86%	9%	5%
	25-34	86%	13%	1%
	35-44	94%	5%	1%
	45-54	90%	8%	2%
	55-64	95%	2%	2%
	65-74	91%	5%	4%
	75+	83%	2%	14%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	77%	16%	7%
Area	Beach Road area	95%	4%	1%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	77%	13%	10%
	High Street / Conservation area	89%	8%	4%
	Histon Road area	95%	5%	-
	Oakington Road area	84%	9%	7%
	Rampton Road area	90%	7%	3%
	Tenison Manor area	92%	3%	5%
	The Lanes	90%	6%	4%
	Outside or no reply	89%	-	11%

Preserving the character of the village and Conservation area was perceived as important by 90% of respondents overall. Whilst the differences between male and female respondents were not significant, differences could be identified between those in different age groups. Those aged 55-64 (95%) and 35-44 (94%) were more likely to agree that this was important than were those aged 75 and above (83%) and those aged 25-34 (86%). The difference between those saying this was important and those saying it was not was highest amongst 55-64 year olds.

Whilst a large proportion of respondents from all areas felt that preserving the character of the village and Conservation area was important, those from the Histon Road and Beach Road areas were more likely to give this response, at 95% each. In comparison to 90% of the overall sample, a smaller proportion of Fens and Twenty Pence Road area respondents (77%) felt that this was important.

Figure 25 – Q7. Importance of ensuring noise and pollution levels do not increase
Base: All respondents (973)

		Important	Not important	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	88%	7%	5%
	Female	90%	3%	7%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	92%	7%	2%
Age	16-24	91%	9%	-
	25-34	91%	8%	1%
	35-44	95%	4%	1%
	45-54	89%	7%	3%
	55-64	91%	4%	5%
	65-74	88%	5%	7%
	75+	84%	1%	15%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	81%	9%	9%
Area	Beach Road area	93%	4%	3%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	83%	7%	10%
	High Street / Conservation area	88%	5%	7%
	Histon Road area	97%	2%	2%
	Oakington Road area	86%	7%	7%
	Rampton Road area	90%	5%	5%
	Tenison Manor area	92%	5%	3%
	The Lanes	85%	7%	7%
	Outside or no reply	86%	3%	11%

Ensuring that noise and pollution levels do not increase was again perceived as important by a large proportion of the overall sample (89%). In comparison with many of the other statements examined, there were no significant differences between the responses given by male and female respondents. Respondents aged 75 and above were less likely to state that this was important at 84%, compared to 95% of those aged 35-44. The proportion of those who felt this was important compared to those who felt it was not important, was largest amongst the 35-44 age group (95% compared to 4%).

Noise and pollution levels were a particular concern for those residing in the Histon Road area, with 97% stating that it was important to ensure these do not increase; this is compared to 2% from that area who felt it was not important. In comparison, smaller proportions of those residing in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road and Oakington Road areas said that it was important (83% and 86% respectively).

Differences were also demonstrated between those who participated in the survey online and those who completed a paper copy of the questionnaire. Ninety-three per cent of online respondents said that ensuring noise and pollution levels do not increase was important, compared to 88% of paper respondents.


Survey respondents also had the opportunity to provide other responses to this question. The greatest proportion of these comments related to improving or maintaining facilities, amenities or services not listed in the questionnaire. Other responses included comments about traffic and speed reduction, better parking, and improved transport links, access and cycle paths.

The next section of the questionnaire asked respondents to consider which facilities in Cottenham they felt were in need of improvement. As shown in Figure 26, roads, pavements and footpaths were perceived to be in need of improvement by the greatest proportions of survey respondents (80% roads and 79% pavements and footpaths). These were followed by people saying car parking facilities need improving (65%). Similar proportions also felt that medical facilities (64%), pedestrian crossings (64%) and bus services (63%) required improvement. In contrast, few respondents said that public showers, the gas supply, the water supply and the electricity supply needed improvement (4%, 6%, 9% and 9% respectively). It should be noted, however, that over half of respondents said that they did not know if the public showers, rugby facilities or day centre for older residents needed improvement (55%, 54% and 58% respectively), suggesting that many were not familiar with these facilities.

Positively, over half (54%) of respondents felt that street lighting was not in need of improvement, whilst 49% said that the primary school did not require improvement.

Figure 26 – Q8. Please indicate which things require improvement or do not require improvement.

Base: All respondents (973)



Looking at the patterns in the data, female respondents were more likely than males to indicate that the day centre for older residents needed improvement (32% compared to 25%), as well as pedestrian crossings (69% vs 58%), bus services (67% vs 58%), and public toilets (49% vs 40%). Residents aged 75 and above were more likely than other age groups (particularly 16-24 year olds) to say that the day centre for older residents (44%), pedestrian crossings (71%), medical facilities (67%), car parking (77%), and public toilets (50%) needed improving.

Improvements to the early years and pre-school facilities and to children's playgrounds were most important for the age groups 25-34 (33% and 29%) and 35-44 (38% and 30%) and improvements were needed to the primary school for 23% of 16-24 year olds and 20% of 25-34 year olds. Likewise, the majority of 16-24 year olds (68%) said that the secondary school needed improving.

For 35-44 year olds improvements were needed to the village hall and cycle paths (58% and 74% respectively). All 16-24 year olds who took part in the survey said that the bus services needed improvement and a quarter (23%) said improvement was needed for the rugby pitch and changing rooms. Pavements and footpaths needed the most improvement amongst 65-74 year olds (88%) and those over the age of 75 (86%).

A large proportion of Beach Road area residents felt that the roads needed improving at 92%, which was the highest out of any of the areas in the village. Likewise, for the majority of Beach Road area residents the pavements and footpaths also needed improving (87%). Pedestrian crossings need improving particularly for Histon Road area residents (73%), Tenison Manor residents (73%) and those living in the Oakington Road area (72%). The Oakington Road area also saw the greatest proportion of residents saying that security cameras (47%), the medical facilities (84%), and the sewerage / drainage (51%) needed improving. A large proportion of Oakington Road area residents also felt the pavements and footpaths needed improving (86%) and as did a large proportion of 65-74 year olds (87%) and those aged 75 and above (86%).

For those who had young children living in their household, the day centre was less important (18% of those with children under five and 17% with children aged 5-10 said it required improvement, compared to 31% of respondents who didn't have children). Instead, for respondents who had young children, pedestrian crossings required improvement (74% of those living with children under five and 78% of those with children aged 5-10). Early years and pre-school facilities also needed improvement according to this group (55% of those who had children under five), as did primary school facilities (19%), and children's playgrounds (38%). Improvements to the bus service were required for a greater proportion of those with children aged 11 and above (70%), as was improvement to the rugby facilities (17%) and the secondary school (46%).


Of the other responses provided to this question, the most common related to pedestrian and cycling access or other informal leisure pursuits, speed limits and traffic calming measures, parking restrictions, and other sports facilities. There was a particular mention of the Colts Football team requiring better facilities.

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked to identify a single change that would improve their quality of life as a resident of the village in the form of a verbatim comment. These comments were themed and are presented in Figure 27. As can be seen, over a fifth of respondents (22%) said that more traffic calming measures should be introduced and speed limits imposed, including safety measures such as pedestrian crossings. This was particularly popular amongst Histon Road area residents (39%). Better public transport was identified by a tenth of respondents (10%) and this was particularly high for respondents from The Lanes (16%).

Only 2% of respondents said that no changes were needed and they were happy with the way things were. Female respondents were more likely to say this (3%) than males (1%).

Figure 27 – Q17. What single change to Cottenham would most improve your quality of life as a resident of the village? (Coded responses)

Base: All respondents (973)



Better public transport was mentioned by a larger proportion of 16-24 year olds (32%), compared to the other age groups. People living in households of three or more people were more likely to mention speed limits, traffic calming measures or pedestrian crossings (27%) in comparison to those living alone (16%).

New major facilities (Questions 9 & 10)


Respondents were asked two questions about what they would like to see improved in coming years, and how they might be funded.

First of all they were asked whether they agreed or disagreed that the Neighbourhood Plan should identify land or money for a range of facilities. These results are presented in Figure 28. Identifying land or money for a new medical centre was the most popular option, with 71% agreeing to some extent that the Neighbourhood Plan should identify resources for this. Sixty-three per cent each felt that the Neighbourhood Plan should help to support the development of a wider range of shops or a swimming pool. However, when it came to a wider range of shops, a quarter (26%) also disagreed that money or land should be identified for these, indicating that a substantial number of people may be satisfied with the current number of shops.

Although just 39% agreed that resources should be provided for an additional pre-school facility it should be noted that only 18% disagreed, with over a third (36%) stating that they did not know. Similarly, 29% of respondents did not know whether or not they agreed that land or money should be provided for a day centre for older residents, suggesting that they may have limited knowledge about the facilities already available.

Figure 28 – Q9. Do you agree or disagree that the Neighbourhood Plan should identify land and / or money for the following?


Base: All respondents (973)



As can be seen in Figure 29, when it came to identifying resources for a business centre with low cost space for local business start-ups, a larger proportion of males said that they agreed with identifying land or money for this (62%) compared to females (54%). Looking at the result by age, over a third of respondents aged 75 and over who responded to the survey said they did not know, or did not respond to this question (37%). Agreement was highest for the 55-64 age group (65%) and lowest for 16-24 year olds (36%).

Figure 29 – Q9. Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify land and/or money for a business centre with low cost space for local business start-ups?

Base: All respondents (973)




There was little difference in responses by area, although it should be noted that Tenison Manor had the lowest proportion disagreeing with allocating land or money for a business centre, with 14% saying they disagreed. Those with children over the age of 11 tended to agree more (61%) than those with children under five (51%).

Figure 30 shows that females were more likely to agree that money and/or land should be identified for a swimming pool (67%) than males (57%), as were those aged 25-34 (70%) in comparison to other age groups, particularly those aged 16-24 years (46%).

Figure 30 – Q9. Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify land and/or money for a swimming pool?

Base: All respondents (973)




Again there was little difference between responses from residents of different village areas. Interestingly, respondents from households of three or more people were more likely to disagree that money or land should be identified for a swimming pool (25%), in comparison to those living on their own (13%), as were those responding to the survey online (25%) in comparison to those responding via the paper survey (19%). However, respondents who had children under five living in their household were more likely to agree that money or land should be identified for this (74%) compared to those who did not have children (61%).

When it came to identifying money or land for a new medical centre, as Figure 31 shows, the 16-24 age group saw the lowest proportion of respondents agreeing (55%) in comparison to all of the other age groups. There was little difference between male and female respondents' views.

Figure 31 – Q9. Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify land and/or money for a new medical centre?

Base: All respondents (973)




Identifying money or land for a new medical centre was more important for Oakington Road area residents than for residents of any other area, with 81% agreeing. In comparison, the Beach Road and Fens and Twenty Pence Road areas only each saw 63% of respondents agreeing.

Those responding to the survey on paper were also more likely than online respondents to agree that money or land should be identified for a new medical centre (73% compared to 66%).

Comparing the overall satisfaction question asked at the beginning of the survey with this question highlights that those who were very satisfied with life in the village were more likely to disagree that money or land should be identified for a new medical centre (15%) than those who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied or dissatisfied to some extent (8%). A greater proportion of those with children aged 5-10 disagreed with this as well (25%), in comparison to those who did not have children living in their household (12%). Those responding to the survey on paper were also more likely than online respondents to agree that money or land should be identified for a new medical centre (73% compared to 66%).

Looking at the responses of those who agreed that money or land should be identified for additional pre-school facilities, as Figure 32 shows, the proportion of those agreeing was greatest for 25-34 year olds (56%), followed by 35-44 year olds (49%). A very large proportion of respondents aged 75 and above did not respond to this question or said they did not know (61%) and a greater proportion of females (41%) than males (37%) said they agreed.

Figure 32 – Q9. Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify land and/or money for an additional pre-school facility?
Base: All respondents (973)




By area, the Beach Road and Oakington Road areas saw larger proportions of respondents agreeing (48% and 44% respectively) than in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area (27%). Unsurprisingly, respondents from households with a child under five years old were more likely to agree that land or money should be identified for an additional pre-school facility (69%) in comparison to those who had older children in their household or no children at all, as were respondents from households of three or more (46%) in comparison to smaller households.

When it came to identifying money or land for a wider range of shops, three quarters of Beach Road area respondents (75%) said that they agreed, which was the greatest proportion out of any of the areas. The Histon Road area saw the largest proportion disagreeing, at 37%. As shown in Figure 33, identifying land or money for a wider range of shops was more important for 65-74 year olds and those aged 75 and above, with 73% and 74% respectively agreeing. In comparison, under 60% agreed in the age groups 16-24, 25-34, 35-44, and 45-54. A greater proportion of female respondents agreed than male respondents (66% compared to 62%).

Figure 33 – Q9. Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify land and/or money for a wider range of shops?

Base: All respondents (973)




Those who did not have any children or young adults living in their household were more likely to agree (67%) compared to those with children or young adults, as were people who lived alone (70%).

A larger proportion of those who said they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied or were dissatisfied to some extent with life in the village agreed that money or land should be identified for a wider range of shops (78%) in comparison to those who were very or fairly satisfied (62%).

As Figure 34 shows, when it comes to identifying land or money for a day centre for older residents, unsurprisingly respondents aged 75 and above and those in the age group 65-74 were more likely to agree (67% and 66% respectively) compared to the other age groups. Over half (54%) of those aged 25-34 said that they did not know or did not answer the question.

Figure 34 – Q9. Should the Neighbourhood Plan identify land and/or money for a day centre for older residents?

Base: All respondents (973)



Tenison Manor saw the largest proportion of respondents agreeing that land or money should be identified for a day centre for older residents, with 63% agreeing. In contrast, only 52% of Beach Road area residents agreed. Those with no children in their household (62%) or those in households of one or two people were also more likely to agree than those with children or young people in their households, or those living in households of three or more people (49%).


When respondents were asked what else money and land should be identified for, common responses related to sports and leisure facilities (particularly for the Colts football team), walking routes, cycling links or more open space, improved public transport and parking facilities.

Respondents were next asked their opinions about a number of different potential sources of funding for improvements in the village. The results are presented in Figure 35. As shown, donations and grants were the most popular source of funding, with 86% of respondents agreeing that the improvements should be paid for by these methods. This was followed by three quarters (75%) of respondents who agreed that improvements should be funded through sponsorship, which may have a commercial connotation for some people, thus potentially explaining why there was less support for this funding option than for donations and grants.

Two-thirds of respondents (67%) agreed that improvements should be funded by housing developments and less than half (45%) supported higher local taxes. Just 5% of respondents agreed that facilities did not need improving, indicating that, on the whole, there would be support for funding improvements through some means or another; however, there is still strong opposition to improvements being funded through housing development, as is evident in the fact that a fifth (20%) of respondents disagreed that improvements should be funded by them.

Figure 35 – Q10. Do you agree or disagree with using the following for funding improvements to the village facilities?

Base: All respondents (973)



The agreement with each of the sources of funding for improvements in the village varies across different subgroups. The following tables (Figures 36 to 39) demonstrate the levels of agreement with each source of funding according to gender, age and area subgroups. Only those differences which are statistically significant have been commented on in the accompanying text.

As shown in Figure 36, a larger proportion of males agreed that funding for improvements to facilities should come from housing development than females (73% compared to 63%). However, it should be kept in mind that a larger proportion of females did not answer the question (16%) compared to males (10%). Considering the differences between age groups, just 46% of those aged 16-24 said they agreed, compared to 67% of the overall sample. A greater proportion of residents aged 35-44 than any other age group disagreed, with 27%. The difference between those who agreed and those who disagreed that housing development should fund improvements was highest amongst the 75 and above age category. By comparison, the percentages were closer amongst 16-24 year olds.

There were a few differences identified between respondents from the various areas of Cottenham. For example, residents of the Beach Road area agreed more than the other areas (76%), particularly compared to Rampton Road area residents, where only 49% agreed. The highest level of disagreement was found amongst Oakington Road area residents, 35% of whom disagreed that improvements should be funded from housing developments.

Figure 36 – Q10. Agreement with paying for improvement to village facilities through housing development

Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	73%	18%	10%
	Female	63%	21%	16%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	65%	23%	12%
Age	16-24	46%	36%	18%
	25-34	70%	21%	8%
	35-44	61%	27%	12%
	45-54	71%	23%	6%
	55-64	71%	22%	8%
	65-74	69%	15%	16%
	75+	67%	8%	26%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	63%	19%	19%
Area	Beach Road area	76%	12%	12%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	57%	23%	20%
	High Street / Conservation area	71%	18%	11%
	Histon Road area	65%	24%	11%
	Oakington Road area	54%	35%	12%
	Rampton Road area	49%	31%	20%
	Tenison Manor area	74%	14%	11%
	The Lanes	69%	21%	11%
	Outside or no reply	63%	11%	26%

Interestingly, disagreement was highest for respondents who lived in a household with children aged 5-10 (30%) and those living in a household of three or more people (25%). There was also a higher level of disagreement amongst those responding to the survey online (25%) in comparison to those who completed the paper survey (17%).

Funding improvements to village facilities through higher local taxes was supported by 45% of respondents overall. As shown in Figure 37, again a greater proportion of males supported this source of funding than females, with 53% saying they agreed compared to 39% of females. Amongst females, a higher proportion disagreed than agreed (45% compared to 39%). Those aged 55-64 (50%) were the most likely to agree with this source of funding and those aged 25-34 were the least likely to agree (36%). The lower age groups (16-24, 25-34 and 35-44) all saw larger proportions disagreeing than agreeing.

Support for higher local taxes to fund improvements to facilities was highest amongst residents of The Lanes (55% agreeing) and lowest for Fens and Twenty Pence Road area residents (30%). In the latter, six in ten (63%) said they disagreed.

Figure 37 – Q10. Agreement with paying for improvement to village facilities through higher local taxes

Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
<i>Gender</i>	Male	53%	37%	10%
	Female	39%	45%	15%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	38%	47%	15%
<i>Age</i>	16-24	41%	50%	9%
	25-34	36%	56%	8%
	35-44	45%	48%	8%
	45-54	46%	45%	9%
	55-64	50%	38%	12%
	65-74	48%	39%	13%
	75+	37%	31%	32%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	47%	44%	9%
<i>Area</i>	Beach Road area	35%	52%	13%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	30%	63%	7%
	High Street / Conservation area	49%	40%	11%
	Histon Road area	55%	37%	8%
	Oakington Road area	42%	44%	14%
	Rampton Road area	38%	41%	21%
	Tenison Manor area	43%	41%	16%
	The Lanes	55%	39%	6%
	Outside or no reply	23%	51%	26%

Those people who were very or fairly satisfied with life in Cottenham were more likely to say they agreed with funding improvements through higher local taxation (46% each) compared to those who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, or dissatisfied to some extent (35%). Respondents from households of two people (50%), or three or more (47%) were also more likely to say they agreed than those who lived on their own (33%).

When asked about whether they agreed with funding improvements to village facilities through sponsorship, a greater proportion of males disagreed than females (12% compared to 6%). Looking at the level of agreement by area in the village, the Beach Road area saw the largest proportion agreeing with 84%, followed by the Histon Road area, Oakington Road area and Tenison Manor, which each saw 81% agreeing. Only 2% of respondents from the Oakington Road area disagreed. The smallest proportion of respondents agreeing was from the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area (57%). By age, agreement was highest amongst 35-44 year olds (88%) and lowest for the 75 and above age group (55%). The age groups 25-34 and 35-44 saw the greatest difference between those saying they agree with funding from sponsorship and those disagreeing. This is shown in Figure 38.

Figure 38 – Q10. Agreement with paying for improvement to village facilities through sponsorship

Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	73%	12%	16%
	Female	78%	6%	17%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	70%	7%	23%
Age	16-24	68%	5%	27%
	25-34	86%	5%	10%
	35-44	88%	5%	7%
	45-54	83%	9%	8%
	55-64	72%	13%	14%
	65-74	71%	9%	20%
	75+	55%	6%	39%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	72%	9%	19%
Area	Beach Road area	84%	11%	5%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	57%	10%	33%
	High Street / Conservation area	75%	9%	16%
	Histon Road area	81%	7%	13%
	Oakington Road area	81%	2%	16%
	Rampton Road area	71%	12%	17%
	Tenison Manor area	81%	4%	16%
	The Lanes	73%	12%	16%
	Outside or no reply	54%	3%	43%

The level of agreement was highest amongst respondents who lived in households with at least one child under the age of five (92%). In comparison, only 70% of respondents who did not have any children or young people in their household agreed. A larger proportion of those completing the survey online (80%) also agreed in comparison to those who completed the paper questionnaire (73%).

When it came to agreeing whether improvements to facilities should be funded through donations and grants, those living in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area agreed less frequently than those living in other areas (73%) and no respondents from the Oakington Road area disagreed. As shown in Figure 39, there was little difference between genders, but when it came to age, support for this method of funding was highest amongst 35-44 year olds (95% agreement), followed by 25-34 year olds (92% agreement). In contrast, only 73% of 16-24 year olds and those of the age of 75 and above agreed. However, it should be kept in mind that over a quarter of respondents in these age groups (27% and 25%) did not answer the question; the proportions from these age groups saying they did not agree were small (5% and 6%).

Figure 39 – Q10. Agreement with paying for improvement to village facilities through donations and grants

Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	86%	4%	9%
	Female	87%	2%	11%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	77%	-	23%
Age	16-24	73%	-	27%
	25-34	92%	1%	7%
	35-44	95%	2%	4%
	45-54	90%	5%	6%
	55-64	87%	5%	8%
	65-74	84%	2%	14%
	75+	73%	2%	25%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	79%	-	21%
Area	Beach Road area	87%	4%	9%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	73%	3%	23%
	High Street / Conservation area	87%	3%	10%
	Histon Road area	89%	3%	8%
	Oakington Road area	84%	-	16%
	Rampton Road area	87%	4%	9%
	Tenison Manor area	88%	1%	11%
	The Lanes	88%	2%	11%
	Outside or no reply	74%	-	26%

Agreement with this source of funding was highest amongst those who lived in a household of three or more people (91%). By contrast, 78% of those living on their own agreed. Agreement was also higher for those completing the online survey (91%), compared to those completing the paper questionnaire (83%).


Respondents were also asked for their own ideas for funding improvements to the village. Answers ranged from lottery grants to central government funding and community fundraising. However, a number of people chose to express their opposition to additional development in the village, with some arguing that it should not be a trade-off for improvements to facilities.

Additional housing in Cottenham (Questions 11, 12 & 13)

This section of the questionnaire was designed to give the Parish Council an idea of whether people in Cottenham felt that the village needed more housing, and if so, the scale, type and size of developments.

First of all respondents were asked whether they felt additional accommodation was needed in Cottenham. As can be seen in Figure 40, support for affordable or starter homes saw the highest level of support out of all the different types of accommodation, with 30% saying a lot more housing of this type was needed and a further 38% saying a few more houses were needed. This was then followed by the need for growing family homes, which saw a fifth (20%) saying a lot more were needed and a further 39% saying a few more were needed, closely followed by low cost rental housing which saw 19% say a lot more was needed. Pitches for travellers were suggested by only 4% of respondents (1% saying they wanted a lot more and 3% saying a few more). There was not a lot of support for more luxury houses (5+ bedrooms) either, with only 3% saying a lot more were needed.

Figure 40 – Q11. Which of these types of accommodation, if any, do you think we need more of in Cottenham?
Base: All respondents (973)



Considering the results of those who said that a lot more affordable or starter homes were needed, support was highest amongst the older age groups, with 34% of those aged 55-64 saying a lot more were needed, as did 36% of both 65-74 year olds and those aged 75 and above. In contrast, only 19% of 35-44 year olds felt that a lot more of this type of property were required. Looking at the results by area of the village, support for a lot more affordable or starter homes was highest in the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area (37%) and lowest in the

Rampton Road area (17%). Support was higher for a lot more houses amongst those who did not have children (32%) and those with older children aged over 11 (32%), than those with children under five (21%) and with children aged 5-10 (18%).

There was little difference in responses by subgroups when it came to the need for a lot more “growing family” homes, but when it came to the need for more low cost rental housing there was a lot more variation. By area, a third (33%) of Fens and Twenty Pence Road area respondents and a quarter of Beach Road area respondents (23%) wanted a lot more of this type of property. Support for a lot more low cost rental accommodation was lowest amongst Rampton Road area respondents (15%) and Histon Road area respondents (16%).

When it came to age, a larger proportion of respondents aged 75 and above indicated that a lot more low cost rental accommodation was needed (28%) than 35-44 year olds, with only 8% of the latter age group saying a lot more was needed. Perhaps unsurprisingly, a greater proportion of those living on their own (27%) said a lot more low cost rental accommodation was needed than those living in households of three or more (16%). Likewise, more people responding via the paper survey said a lot more of this type of accommodation was needed (21%), compared to those responding online (16%).

There were also a few comments provided by respondents in relation to this question expressing their desire for no more development to the village.

The next question asked respondents if they agreed that the village should allow large developments to bring in more money for facilities, small plots which brought in less money or single plots which brought in no money to be built. As can be seen in Figure 41, support was highest for small developments, with 69% of people agreeing that this type of development should be allowed. This was followed by single plots (with 53% agreeing). Allowing large developments was least preferred, with only 26% agreeing.

Figure 41 – Q12. Thinking about housing development in Cottenham, do you think we should allow?

Base: All respondents (973)




Figure 42 shows that support for large housing developments was most prevalent amongst Tenison Manor respondents (32%) and respondents from the Fens and Twenty Pence Road area (30%). Opposition was strongest amongst Beach Road area respondents (77%) and Histon Road area respondents (76%). There was also a large difference between the proportion of Rampton Road area respondents saying they agree and those saying they disagree (76% compared to 19%). Males were more likely than females to agree with allowing large developments (30% compared to 22%), as were those aged 25-34 (36%) in comparison to the other age groups. There were also large differences between those saying they agreed and those saying they disagreed amongst 35-44 year olds (22% agree; 73% disagree) and 65-74 year olds (20% agree; 71% disagree). Those living in households of three or more people were more likely to disagree that large developments should be allowed (68%) compared to those living alone (54%).

Figure 42 – Q12. Agreement with allowing large developments which bring in more money for Cottenham

Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	30%	65%	6%
	Female	22%	68%	11%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	32%	58%	10%
Age	16-24	27%	59%	14%
	25-34	36%	57%	7%
	35-44	22%	73%	5%
	45-54	25%	70%	5%
	55-64	29%	68%	4%
	65-74	20%	71%	10%
	75+	26%	53%	21%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	33%	49%	19%
Area	Beach Road area	17%	77%	5%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road	30%	63%	7%
	High Street / Conservation area	29%	63%	8%
	Histon Road area	19%	76%	5%
	Oakington Road area	21%	67%	12%
	Rampton Road area	16%	74%	11%
	Tenison Manor area	32%	58%	10%
	The Lanes	24%	71%	5%
	Outside or no reply	31%	46%	23%

As shown in Figure 43, 16-24 year olds were most likely to disagree that small developments should be built out of all of the age groups (41%). The proportion of this age group disagreeing was larger than the proportion agreeing (41% compared to 36%). In comparison, 75% of 65-74 year olds agreed with this, as did 74% of 55-64 year olds. Those living in households with children under five were also more likely to agree that small developments should be allowed (69%) compared to those with children aged 5-10 years old (58%). Support for small developments was highest amongst Histon Road area respondents (77% agreed) and Beach Road area respondents (76% agreed).

Figure 43 – Q12. Agreement with allowing small developments which bring in less money for Cottenham
Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	68%	23%	9%
	Female	69%	20%	10%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	73%	17%	10%
Age	16-24	36%	41%	23%
	25-34	69%	20%	11%
	35-44	64%	29%	7%
	45-54	71%	22%	7%
	55-64	74%	21%	5%
	65-74	75%	18%	7%
	75+	67%	14%	19%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	63%	16%	21%
Area	Beach Road area	76%	21%	3%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road	63%	20%	17%
	High Street / Conservation area	74%	16%	10%
	Histon Road area	77%	18%	5%
	Oakington Road area	54%	37%	9%
	Rampton Road area	59%	29%	12%
	Tenison Manor area	68%	21%	11%
	The Lanes	73%	21%	6%
	Outside or no reply	49%	29%	23%

In relation to allowing single plots which bring in no money to Cottenham, those aged 65-74, and 75 and over were the least likely to disagree (21% and 24% respectively). In contrast, 39% of 25-34 year olds disagreed. Those in the Histon Road area were most likely to agree with single plots (65%), which was much higher than the agreement level in Tenison Manor (48%) and the Beach Road area (43%). The Histon road area also saw the largest difference between the proportions of respondents agreeing (65%) and the proportion disagreeing (26%). Male respondents were more likely than female respondents to agree with single plots (57% compared to 50%). This is shown in Figure 44. Those living in households of three or more were also more likely to agree with allowing single plots (59%) particularly in comparison to those living alone (44%), as were those responding to the survey online (58%) in comparison to those completing the paper questionnaire (51%). Those responding to the survey online were also more likely to agree with allowing single plots to be built (58%) than those completing the paper questionnaire (51%).

Figure 44 – Q12. Agreement with allowing single plots which bring in no money for Cottenham


Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	57%	29%	14%
	Female	50%	30%	20%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	57%	25%	18%
Age	16-24	36%	36%	27%
	25-34	46%	39%	14%
	35-44	59%	30%	11%
	45-54	59%	30%	11%
	55-64	52%	36%	13%
	65-74	59%	21%	20%
	75+	44%	24%	33%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	40%	33%	28%
Area	Beach Road area	43%	41%	16%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road	50%	33%	17%
	High Street / Conservation area	56%	27%	18%
	Histon Road area	65%	26%	10%
	Oakington Road area	61%	33%	7%
	Rampton Road area	56%	25%	19%
	Tenison Manor area	48%	32%	20%
	The Lanes	55%	30%	15%
	Outside or no reply	40%	29%	32%

Respondents were then informed that the village needed around 100 affordable homes to be built and were asked if they agreed that these should be built within large mixed estates of 200-250 houses or in small estates on the outskirts of the village. There was more widespread support for small estates of affordable houses being built on the outskirts of the village (60% agreement) than for building large mixed housing estates (28% agreement), as can be seen in Figure 45. Six in ten (60%) said they disagreed with large mixed estates.

Figure 45 – Q13. Cottenham needs 100 additional affordable homes. Usually larger housing developments include more affordable homes. Do you agree or disagree with the following?

Base: All respondents (973)



In regards to agreement with whether or not large developments should be allowed, there were a few differences between the different areas of Cottenham. For example, residents of Tenison Manor (34%) agreed more than the other areas, particularly compared to Rampton Road area residents, where only 20% agreed. As Figure 46 shows, the highest level of disagreement was found amongst Oakington Road area residents, 77% of whom disagreed that the village should allow 200-250 houses to be built in large mixed estates to include the 100 affordable homes. By contrast only 21% of Oakington Road area respondents said they agreed. Males were more likely to agree than females (32% compared to 24%), as were those completing the survey online (34%), compared to those answering the paper survey (25%). In regards to age, the difference in the proportion of those agreeing and the proportion disagreeing was largest amongst the 35-44 age group.

Figure 46 – Q13. Agreement that village should allow large mixed estates to be built to include 100 affordable homes

Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	32%	59%	9%
	Female	24%	60%	16%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	30%	62%	8%
Age	16-24	32%	68%	-
	25-34	29%	56%	16%
	35-44	26%	65%	9%
	45-54	28%	64%	7%
	55-64	33%	57%	10%
	65-74	25%	60%	16%
	75+	25%	52%	24%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	30%	56%	14%
Area	Beach Road area	21%	65%	13%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	27%	63%	10%
	High Street / Conservation area	29%	60%	11%
	Histon Road area	31%	58%	11%
	Oakington Road area	21%	77%	2%
	Rampton Road area	20%	62%	18%
	Tenison Manor area	34%	51%	16%
	The Lanes	31%	57%	12%
	Outside or no reply	26%	57%	17%

When it came to disagreeing with large estates being built, those in single households disagreed less frequently (50%) than those in households of two people (62%) or households of three or more (61%).

Allowing small estates of affordable homes to be built on the outskirts of the village was supported by 60% of respondents overall. As shown in Figure 47, a greater proportion of females supported this idea than males, with 62% saying they agreed, compared to 57% of males. Those aged 75 and over (70%) were the most likely to agree with building smaller estates on the edge of the village and those aged 16-24 were the least likely to agree (50%). The difference between those who agreed and those who disagreed was greatest amongst the 75 and over age group (70% compared to 20%).

Support for allowing smaller estates to be built on the outskirts of the village was highest amongst residents of the High Street and Conservation area (67% agreeing) and lowest amongst Oakington Road area residents (42% agree). A greater proportion of Oakington Road area respondents disagreed (56%) than agreed, which was not true of any other area.

Figure 47 – Q13. Agreement that village should allow small estates of affordable homes to be built on the outskirts of the village
Base: All respondents (973)

		Agree	Disagree	Don't know / no reply
Gender	Male	57%	37%	5%
	Female	62%	27%	11%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	58%	32%	10%
Age	16-24	50%	50%	-
	25-34	64%	24%	12%
	35-44	53%	38%	10%
	45-54	51%	45%	4%
	55-64	63%	29%	8%
	65-74	65%	26%	10%
	75+	70%	20%	11%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	61%	26%	14%
Area	Beach Road area	52%	37%	11%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road	57%	33%	10%
	High Street / Conservation area	67%	26%	7%
	Histon Road area	53%	37%	10%
	Oakington Road area	42%	56%	2%
	Rampton Road area	57%	32%	11%
	Tenison Manor area	59%	30%	11%
	The Lanes	62%	30%	8%
	Outside or no reply	57%	34%	9%

People living in households without any children were more likely to agree (64%) than those with children under five (55%) and aged 5-10 (46%), as were those who completed the survey in paper format (64%) compared to online (51%). When it came to those saying they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with life in the village or dissatisfied to some extent, a greater proportion said they disagreed with small estates (37%) compared to those who were satisfied with life in Cottenham (31%).

There were a few comments from respondents regarding the fact that people did not want development at all (40 comments), that affordable or social housing was needed (35 comments) and that only small or in-fill developments should be allowed (32 comments).

Other challenges


(Questions 14, 15 & 16)

Respondents were asked a series of questions about bus usage, incentives to use the bus more, and possible future introductions to reduce traffic and pollution in the village.

In this section of the questionnaire, respondents were first asked how often they or someone in their household used the bus service to travel to or from Cambridge. As shown in Figure 48, one in ten people surveyed (11%) said that they or someone in their household used the bus four or more times a week and a further fifth (18%) said they used it at least once a week. However, almost a third (32%) said that they or people in their household hardly ever or never used the bus.

Figure 48 – Q14. How often do you or anyone in your household use the bus service to/from Cambridge?

Base: All respondents (973)



As shown in Figure 49, Rampton Road area respondents used the bus most frequently, with 20% saying they or someone in their household used the bus four or more times a week and a further 22% using it at least once a week. Bus usage was lowest for Oakington Road area residents, 54% of whom said hardly ever or never. There was little difference between male and female respondents. However, in relation to age 16-24 year olds said they or someone in their household used the bus most frequently, with 46% saying four or more times a week and 14% at least once a week. It is likely that a large proportion of this age group use the bus to travel to college or commute. Bus usage was lowest amongst 25-34 year olds, with 48% saying they or people in their household hardly ever or never used the bus. The older age groups (65-74 and 75+) seem to be more casual users of the bus with three in ten in both age groups saying they use the bus at least once a week (30% and 31% respectively), but relatively small proportions saying they used the bus four or more times a week (8% and 6% respectively).

Figure 49 – Q14. How often do you or anyone in your household use the bus services to/from Cambridge?

Base: All respondents (973)⁶

		4 or more times a week	At least once a week	1-3 times a month	Less than once a month	Never or hardly ever
<i>Gender</i>	Male	10%	19%	19%	17%	33%
	Female	12%	18%	23%	16%	30%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	13%	15%	23%	12%	35%
<i>Age</i>	16-24	46%	14%	23%	-	18%
	25-34	10%	6%	19%	18%	48%
	35-44	5%	11%	22%	26%	36%
	45-54	22%	12%	19%	13%	34%
	55-64	10%	17%	21%	16%	37%
	65-74	8%	30%	26%	15%	20%
	75+	6%	31%	20%	17%	25%
	Prefer not to say / no reply	14%	21%	21%	7%	35%
<i>Area</i>	Beach Road area	13%	16%	24%	15%	32%
	Fens & Twenty Pence Road area	17%	13%	13%	17%	40%
	High Street / Conservation area	11%	18%	24%	17%	30%
	Histon Road area	8%	29%	21%	21%	21%
	Oakington Road area	7%	14%	19%	7%	54%
	Rampton Road area	20%	22%	22%	12%	23%
	Tenison Manor area	9%	12%	21%	19%	39%
	The Lanes	8%	25%	21%	18%	28%
	Outside or no reply	9%	17%	6%	17%	43%


Those with children over the age of 11 living in their household were more likely to use the bus (or have someone in their household who uses the bus) four or more times a week (24%) than those with children aged 5-10 in their household (8%), children under five (3%), or no children (7%).

⁶ Please note that the percentages of those who didn't reply to this question have been removed from this table so each row of percentages will not add up to 100%.

Respondents were then asked what, if anything, would encourage them to use the bus service more frequently. As shown in Figure 50, a shorter journey time to Cambridge was the improvement that would encourage them the most (71%), followed by a service to the guided bus at Oakington (48%) and cheaper fares (44%).

Figure 50 – Q15. Which, if any, would encourage you to use the bus service more frequently?

Base: All respondents (973)



A shorter journey time to Cambridge was particularly important to those of sixth form or working age in comparison to those aged 65-74 and 75 and above. For example, for all of the working age groups, over 75% of people said that this would encourage them to use the bus more. In contrast, only 51% of those aged 75 and above said it would encourage them, and 68% of respondents aged 65-74 said it would. Likewise, cheaper fares were more important for those aged 16-24 (82%) and 25-34 (66%) than for those aged 65-74 (10%) and over 75 (12%). Eligibility for free travel for those aged 65 and above may be the influence for the difference between these age groups. For the older age groups, a service to the guided bus at Oakington was more important (56% of those aged 65-74 chose this response, as did 53% of those aged 75 and above), as was more frequent services to Ely (54% aged 75+), and a service to the north end of the village (42% of those aged 75+). For the youngest age group, a more reliable service (59%) was more important than for other age groups.

Those with children under five living in their household were most likely to want a shorter journey time to Cambridge (81%) and a bus service to Waterbeach (30%) in comparison to those with older children or those living on their own. People living alone were more likely to say that more frequent services to Ely (36%) and a service to the north end of the village (27%) would encourage them more.

Looking at the results by area of the village, residents of the Histon Road area were most likely to say a shorter journey time to Cambridge would encourage them to use the bus more (82%), particularly in comparison to Fens and Twenty Pence Road area residents (47%). Oakington Road area residents were more likely to be encouraged by a service to the guided bus at Oakington (61%). In contrast only 20% of Fens and Twenty Pence Road area residents gave this answer. Residents from The Lanes were most likely to say it would be a more reliable service (43%). A much larger proportion of residents from the Fens and Twenty Pence Road

area (53%) said that a service to the north end of the village would encourage them more than Beach Road area residents (9%).


Females were more likely to say that a shorter journey time would encourage them more than males (76% compared to 68%) and that cheaper fares would encourage them (47% compared to 39%).

When asked what else would encourage them to use the bus more frequently, some respondents reiterated that a more direct and quicker service to Cambridge would and there was mention about the need for the bus to Addenbrookes Hospital to be reinstated.

When looking at incentives to use the bus more frequently amongst those who said they used the bus between once a week and once a month, as shown in Figure 51, the majority said a shorter journey time (78%), followed by over half (53%) saying a service to the guided bus at Oakington. Cheaper fares, a more reliable service, and a more frequent service to Ely were also each cited by more than a third (39%, 36%, and 37% respectively).

Figure 51 – Q15. Which, if any, would encourage you to use the bus service more frequently?


Base: Those who used the bus between once a week and once a month (388)



Respondents were next asked which measures to reduce traffic and pollution they were in favour of introducing to Cottenham in the next 15 years. As shown in Figure 52, prohibiting HGV traffic from using the High Street (except for access) was the most popular introduction, with 64% saying they were in favour of this. This was followed by changes to traffic routes to avoid sensitive areas (59%), preventing buses standing with their engines running at Victory Way (47%) and introducing 20mph zones (46%). Only 3% responded that none of the proposed options should be implemented.

Figure 52 – Q16. Which of these measures, if any, would you be in favour of being introduced in the next 15 years or so?

Base: All respondents (973)




Changing traffic routes to avoid sensitive areas was more popular amongst Histon Road area respondents (73%) in comparison to Fens and Twenty Pence Road area respondents (43%) and Beach Road area respondents (49%). Female respondents were also more likely to choose this response (64%) compared to males (54%). Those in the 35-44 and 45-54 age groups were more likely to be in favour of changing the traffic routes (69% and 68% respectively), in comparison to the youngest age groups (46% amongst 16-24 year olds and 42% amongst 25-34 year olds) and compared to the older generations (52% amongst those aged 75 and over and 54% of 65-74 year olds). Those in households of three or more people were also more likely to choose this option (68%) compared to those living on their own (51%) or households in which two people lived (52%).

Ten per cent of respondents also provided other ideas that they would be in favour of. The majority of these were ideas related to the introduction of speed restrictions and other traffic calming measures.

Respondents were next asked to consider what would be the most important introduction for them. As shown in Figure 53, and like in the previous question, prohibiting HGV traffic along the High Street except for access was the most popular most important introduction, with 23% selecting this option. This was closely followed by changes to the traffic routes to avoid sensitive areas (17%). However, it should be kept in mind that almost a third of respondents (32%) did not answer this question.

Figure 53 – Q16. Which of these measures, if any, is the most important introduction in the next 15 years or so?

Base: All respondents (973)




Out of all of the areas of the village, those living in the Histon Road area were most likely to say that prohibiting HGV traffic along the High Street was the most important introduction (39%), whereas respondents from Tenison Manor were most likely to say it was changes to traffic routes to avoid sensitive areas (27%).

Female respondents were more likely to choose prohibiting HGV traffic in the High Street (26%) than male respondents (21%). Respondents aged 16-24 were the least likely age group to choose introducing prohibitions to HGV traffic (5%) and changing the traffic routes was most popular amongst 35-44 year olds (32%).

Acknowledgments

Enventure Research would like to express its gratitude to everyone who took part in the survey. We would also like to thank Councillors Frank Morris, Christine Ward and Tony Nicholas from Cottenham Parish Council for their help throughout the survey process.

Appendix A – Map of the village



Appendix B – Questionnaire

Taking Control of Cottenham's Future

What is the survey about?

Residents have the chance to influence what Cottenham will be like in 2030 by creating a Neighbourhood Plan. Cottenham Parish Council is taking a lead but you, the residents, are the most important part of the Neighbourhood Plan. This survey is vital for finding out what residents want and do not want in Cottenham in the next fifteen years.

Please refer to the next page of this survey for more information about the Neighbourhood Plan, this survey and what happens next.

By taking part you will be helping to shape the Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan. The final Neighbourhood Plan will then be voted on by the whole village before being adopted.

Who should take part in the survey?

We want to hear the views of everyone over the age of 16 who lives in or owns a business in the Parish of Cottenham. Please encourage as many people from your household to take part as possible. Please see below for how they can go online or download another paper questionnaire to take part. **For every completed and returned questionnaire, the Parish Council will donate 50p to a registered Cottenham charity of your choice.**

What will be done with the information I provide?

All information provided will be analysed by an independent research company called Enventure Research and treated in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. We will only use this information to inform the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan. If you provide your contact details, they will not be passed on to any third parties and they will also be kept separate from your questionnaire answers, meaning that you will not be identified in any way.

How can I take part?

There are different ways that you can take part in this survey:

- Fill in the questionnaire and post it in the envelope provided or hand it to one of our volunteers when they visit in January
- Download the questionnaire and print it from www.enventure.co.uk/cottenhamqre
- Go to www.enventure.co.uk/cottenham to take part online.

The deadline for replies is 18th January 2016

Questions or help?

If you have any queries about the questionnaire, please call our helpline on **0844 522 0100** or email info@enventure.co.uk.

To complete online go to www.enventure.co.uk/cottenham

Please use the password:

Can we all work together to provide better facilities in Cottenham while making it easier to move around the village and not damaging the character of the village core?


What is it?

A Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led initiative to prepare a plan that becomes part of the statutory development plan for the area. The Plan influences how and where development can take place.

It really is a chance for all of us to influence what happens here in the coming years.

And yes, our plan will cover the whole of Cottenham Civil Parish.

Please see back page for larger map.



How does it work?

We have already begun to assess some of your main concerns; that has shaped this survey.

This survey will tell us, in much more detail, where we need to work hardest to shape our village's future.

Early in 2016 we will run a series of meetings to discuss what this survey has told us about what you like and don't like now and what you would like and would not like to see here in ten or fifteen years.

Once we have identified specific areas to work on, we will work out policies to help shape the future of the village in terms of what types of development are desirable or undesirable, where they should be, and what they should look like.

Our proposals have to be examined by a planning inspector to test that they are consistent with national and district planning policies.

Finally, towards the middle of 2016, the plan will be put to a referendum in which you have the final say.

Your part?

There are lots of ways for you to help us:

- First, complete this survey so we know what you think
- If you belong to a group, remind other members to complete this survey
- Ask other people in your household to complete the survey
- Provide your contact details at the end of the survey to be involved in a discussion group
- Provide your contact details at the end of the survey to be part of the wider team developing the Plan
- Or you could help us personally by asking us how else you might help.
- Finally, make sure you, your family and friends vote in next year's referendum on our Plan

To become more involved, contact our Clerk, Chair or any Parish Councillor.

Jo Brook
Parish Clerk

clerk@cottenhampc.org.uk

Frank Morris
Parish Council Chair

Cllr.Morris@cottenhampc.org.uk

Visit our website at: www.cottenhampc.org.uk

Cottenham today

Q1 Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with Cottenham as a place to live at the moment? *Tick one only*

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> Fairly dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fairly satisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> Very dissatisfied |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |

Q2 What do you currently like most about living in Cottenham? *Please write in the box below*

Q3 What do you currently most dislike about living in Cottenham? *Please write in the box below*

Cottenham in the future

Q4 How would you like Cottenham to be described in 15 years? *Tick all that apply*

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accessible | <input type="checkbox"/> Safe |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable | <input type="checkbox"/> Tranquil |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vibrant | <input type="checkbox"/> Attractive |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Proud of its heritage | <input type="checkbox"/> Friendly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Town | <input type="checkbox"/> Suburban |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prosperous | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>Please specify below</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rural | <div></div> |

Q5 What, if anything, worries you about future development and changes in Cottenham? By this we mean new housing developments, new business parks, new buildings etc. *Tick all that apply*

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on medical facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of variety of new housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on facilities for young people | <input type="checkbox"/> Higher noise levels |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fewer jobs and businesses | <input type="checkbox"/> Feeling of being less safe / higher crime levels |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fewer rental properties | <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on facilities for older people |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on public transport | <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on leisure facilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reduction in house prices | <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on parking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Becoming a dormitory town | <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on shops and services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Worse air quality / pollution | <input type="checkbox"/> Loss of village identity and community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on facilities for less mobile people | <input type="checkbox"/> More traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on school places | <input type="checkbox"/> I do not have any worries |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pressure on pre-school places | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>Please specify below</i> |

Q6 What, if any, do you think are the biggest benefits which development and/or changes could bring to Cottenham? *Tick all that apply*

<input type="checkbox"/> Improved air quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Safe-guarding the future of the post office
<input type="checkbox"/> Better facilities for young people	<input type="checkbox"/> Improved care facilities for less mobile people
<input type="checkbox"/> Variety of new housing	<input type="checkbox"/> More cycle routes
<input type="checkbox"/> More school places	<input type="checkbox"/> More leisure facilities
<input type="checkbox"/> Improved public transport	<input type="checkbox"/> Improved medical facilities
<input type="checkbox"/> Community with a balance of ages and incomes	<input type="checkbox"/> More rental properties
<input type="checkbox"/> More jobs and businesses	<input type="checkbox"/> More shops and services
<input type="checkbox"/> Lower noise levels	<input type="checkbox"/> Improved sense of community
<input type="checkbox"/> Better facilities for older people	<input type="checkbox"/> Better pavements and paths
<input type="checkbox"/> Improved parking	<input type="checkbox"/> There are no benefits
<input type="checkbox"/> More pre-school places	<input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>Please specify below</i>

Facilities in Cottenham

Q7 Thinking about Cottenham in 10-15 years’ time, how important are the following to you?
Tick one option for each

	Very important	Quite important	Not very important	Not at all important	Don’t know
Improving number/availability of affordable homes (either to purchase or rent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving number/availability of pre-school places	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Keeping the primary school at its current size, serving its current catchment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving medical services for all ages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving welfare and day care facilities for older and less able residents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving local employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving leisure and recreation facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving movement into, out from and around the village	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preserving the character of our village and conservation area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ensuring noise and pollution levels do not increase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other important things <i>Please specify below</i>					

Q8 From the list below, please indicate which things in Cottenham i) require improvement or ii) do not require improvement. *Tick one option for each*

	i) Require improvement	ii) Do not require improvement	Don't know
Day centre for older residents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Electricity supply	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roads	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pedestrian crossings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Security cameras	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medical facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bridleways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Early years / pre-school facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sewerage / drainage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gas supply	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Car-parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bus services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multi-use games area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Village hall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Primary school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public toilets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rugby pitch and changing rooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floodlit sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water supply	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pavements and footpaths	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Street lights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Children's playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
All weather sports pitch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Secondary school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public showers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycle paths	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other suggestions for improvement *Please specify below*

Q9 Do you agree or disagree that the Neighbourhood Plan should identify land and/or money for the following?

Tick one option for each

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Business centre with low cost space for local business start-ups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A swimming pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A new medical centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional pre-school facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wider range of shops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Day centre for older residents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other suggestions <i>Please specify below</i>					

Q10 There are several ways of paying for improvements in village facilities. Do you agree or disagree with using the following for funding improvements to the village facilities?

Tick one option for each

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Funding from housing developments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Higher local taxes (the parish council tax)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sponsorship	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Donations and grants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do nothing – do not improve facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other suggestions for funding <i>Please specify below</i>					

Future changes and development in Cottenham – the trade-off

Q11 Which of these types of accommodation, if any, do you think we need more of in Cottenham? Tick one option for each

	Need a lot more	Need a few more	Do not need any more	Don't know/ No opinion
Flats	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bungalows	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Affordable or starter homes (1–2 bedrooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
“Growing family” home (2-3 bedrooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Family housing (3–4 bedrooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Luxury homes (5 or more bedrooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sheltered housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Care home places	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low cost rental housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pitches for travellers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other types of accommodation needed <i>Please specify below</i>				

Q12 Now we would like you to think about housing development in Cottenham. Do you agree or disagree that we should allow...?

Tick one option for each

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Large developments (which bring in more money for facilities in Cottenham)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Small developments (which bring in less money for facilities in Cottenham)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Single plots (which bring in no additional money for facilities in Cottenham)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q13 Cottenham needs around 100 additional affordable homes. Usually larger housing developments include more affordable homes. Do you agree or disagree with the following?

Tick one option for each

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Allow 200 – 250 houses to be built in large mixed estates which include 100 affordable homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Small estates of affordable homes to be built on the outskirts of the village	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other suggestions <i>Please specify below</i>					

Reducing traffic and pollution

Q14 How often do you or anyone in your household use the bus services to/from Cambridge? *Tick one only*

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Four or more times a week | <input type="checkbox"/> Roughly once a month |
| <input type="checkbox"/> At least once a week | <input type="checkbox"/> Less often than once a month |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2–3 times a month | <input type="checkbox"/> Never or hardly ever |

Q15 Which, if any, of these improvements would encourage you to use the bus service more frequently?

Tick all that apply

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shorter journey time to Cambridge (30 mins rather than 45 mins) | <input type="checkbox"/> Service to north end of village i.e. parish church |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cheaper fares | <input type="checkbox"/> Bus service to Waterbeach |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Service to guided bus at Oakington | <input type="checkbox"/> None of the above |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More frequent buses (more than every 20 mins) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>Please specify below</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More reliable service | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More frequent service to Ely | |

Q16 Which of these measures, if any, would you be in favour of being introduced in the next 15 years or so?

	Introduced in next 15 years <i>Tick all that apply</i>	Most important introduction <i>Tick one only</i>
Changes to traffic routes to avoid sensitive areas (e.g. primary school, narrow pavement sections)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prevent buses standing with engines running at Victory Way (near primary school)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fewer speed bumps/cushions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 mph zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minimise pollution from diesel engines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prohibit HGV traffic (except for access) along High Street	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More speed bumps/cushions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
None of the above	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other <i>Please specify below</i>		

Quality of life

Q17 What single change to Cottenham would most improve your quality of life as a resident of the village?

Please write in the box below

About you

The next few questions will help us to make sure that we hear everyone's views, whatever your background or circumstances. The information will not be held alongside your name if you have given this. Your identity and the personal information you have shared with us will remain confidential.

Q18 Are you a resident of Cottenham or are you the owner of a business in Cottenham? Tick one only

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham resident | Go to Q19 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham business owner | Go to Q26 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Both | Go to Q19 |


Q19 Please tell us your postcode

C	B	2	4			
---	---	---	---	--	--	--

Q20 Please tell us your road name

Q21 Please look at the map and tick the box for the area that best describes where you live. Tick one only

- | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Beach Road area |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Fen (NW of Cottenham Lode) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Fen (East of Cottenham Lode) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 High Street / Conservation Area |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Histon Road area |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Oakington Road area |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Rampton Road area |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8 Tenison Manor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9 The Lanes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10 Twenty Pence Road |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outside of the boundary |



Q22 Are you...? Tick one only

- | |
|--------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Male |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Female |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |

Please see back page for larger map.

Q23 Which of the following age categories do you fall into? Tick one only

- | |
|--------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under 16 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 16-24 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 25-34 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 35-44 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 45-54 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 55-64 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 65-74 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 75+ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |

Q24 How many people live in your household?
Please write a number in the box

Q25 Do you have any children or young adults in your household? *Tick all that apply*

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes, aged under 5
- ☐ Yes, aged 5-10
- ☐ Yes, aged 11-17
- ☐ Yes, aged 18+

Please answer the next three questions if you are the owner of a business in Cottenham. If you do not own a business, please go to Q29.

Q26 Approximately how many people do you employ in Cottenham?
Please write a number in the box

Q27 What would help you expand your business in Cottenham?
Please write in the box below

Q28 How many extra staff might you then employ?
Please write a number in the box

Taking part in developing the Neighbourhood Plan

If you are interested in being part of the wider team developing the Neighbourhood Plan or taking part in a future discussion group, please indicate your interest below and supply your contact details.

Q29 Are you interested in being part of the wider development team? *Tick one only*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q30 Are you interested in attending a discussion group? *Tick one only*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If you have indicated you are interested in being part of the team developing the plan or you would like to take part in a future discussion group, please provide us with your details below.

Name

Contact telephone number

Email address


Your details will be kept strictly confidential, will be kept separate from your questionnaire answers, and not passed on to any third parties. Your details will only be used for the purposes of contacting you about how you can get involved in the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Q31 Finally, please let us know which charity you would like us to donate 50p to. *Tick one only*

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham British School Trust | <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham Mobile Warden Scheme |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham Charities | <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham Primary School PTCA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham Community Centre | <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham Toy Library |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham Day Centre | <input type="checkbox"/> Fen Edge Community Association |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cottenham Dissenters Cemetery CIO | <input type="checkbox"/> The Ladybird Pre-School |

Now please post this questionnaire back to us in the envelope provided or give it to one of the volunteers who will be knocking on doors in early January. If you have not been visited by the 14th January please post it back anyway.

Can we all work together to provide better facilities in Cottenham while making it easier to move around the village and not damaging the character of the village core?



- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Beach Road area | 6. Oakington Road area |
| 2. Fen (NW of Cottenham Lode) | 7. Rampton Road area |
| 3. Fen (East of Cottenham Lode) | 8. Tenison Manor |
| 4. High Street / Conservation Area | 9. The Lanes |
| 5. Histon Road area | 10. Twenty Pence Road |

Thank you for having your say on the future of Cottenham.

