

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Council
AUTHOR: Director of Development Services

8 March 2005

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN: RESULTS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON PREFERRED OPTIONS AND DIRECTION OF WAY FORWARD

Purpose

1. To advise Members of the results of the public participation on the Preferred Options Reports for the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, to identify the key issues raised and determine the general approach to be taken in drafting the document to be submitted to the Secretary of State. Members are reminded to bring to the meeting the Preferred Options Report for Cambridge East, published in October 2004.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

2.	High quality, accessible, value for money services	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assist the Council's objectives to deliver quality accessible development in the district• Include the provision of affordable housing and the effective delivery of sustainable development at Cambridge East and development of sustainable communities• Assist the delivery of the Community Strategy• Be used by Cambridgeshire Horizons (formerly the Infrastructure Partnership) to help the early and sustained development of the necessary services and infrastructure.
	Quality village life	
	A sustainable future	
	A better future through Partnerships	

Background

3. The Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP) is being prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council as this major new urban quarter for Cambridge will include land in both Council's areas. The Councils published the Preferred Options Report on 1st October 2004. Public participation on the matters raised took place over a six-week period ending on 12th November.
4. Public participation involved a number of exhibitions, public meetings, an inter-active website, a special edition of South Cambs magazine delivered to all households in the District, and copies of the reports being made available at the Council's offices and at public libraries and local access points. Copies of the Reports were sent to key organisations such as statutory bodies including Parish Councils.
5. For Cambridge East, exhibitions were held in Cherry Hinton (12th October, 86 visitors), at Christ the Redeemer, Newmarket Road (14th October, 27 visitors), Fen Ditton (30th October, 65 visitors) and Teversham (1st November, 50 visitors and 2nd

November, 6 visitors). There were also public meetings at Teversham on 1st November (40 attendees) and 2nd November (around 30 attendees).

6. A Stakeholder Workshop was held on Saturday, 29th January at Marshall's.
7. The participation process has resulted in a total of 1524 representations being made on the Cambridge East AAP Preferred Options Report. Members should be aware that these may have been increased as in some cases the representations covered more than one point in which case they have been split to allow consideration to be given to each point.
8. Council met on 20th/21st January to determine the direction to be taken on the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents.
9. The Cambridge East Joint Member Reference Group (JMRG) meeting of 21st February discussed the key issues arising from public participation. The views of the JMRG are contained in the draft minutes of the meeting, attached at **Appendix 1**.

Considerations

10. This is the last of a series of the special meetings of the Council which will consider the results of public participation on the Area Action Plans. It will determine the direction the Cambridge East AAP should take having considered the responses to the options. Account will need to be taken of the decisions reached by Council on the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPDs on 20th/21st January. The approach for the Cambridge East AAP will be as set out in the Preferred Options Report when changed as a result of recommendations in this report (with Appendices) or other decisions of Council.
11. As this is a joint Area Action Plan, Cambridge City Council will also be considering a report on the results of public participation at the meeting of its Environment Scrutiny Committee on 22nd March 2005. Any changes made by this Council will be reported to the City Council. If there are any issues where there are differing views between the Councils, these will be put before the next meeting of the Joint Member Reference Group on 5 April, before the Councils each consider the draft Area Action Plan at their respective meetings: Cambridge City Council on 12 April and this Council on 15 April 2005.
12. A final meeting of Council on 9th May is programmed to deal with any amendments which need to be considered as a result of any of the previous meetings (20th May has also been reserved as a fall-back position if required).

Report on the Stakeholder Workshop

13. The Cambridge East Area Action Plan stakeholder workshop took place on the 29th January 2005. The aim of the event was to ensure that all the main stakeholders had the opportunity to exchange views, explore key issues and contribute towards the preparation of the draft Area Action Plan.
14. Invitations were sent to a wide range of organisations representing local, City and District wide needs and interests. The event was well attended with over 60 people attending from 25 different organisations. The day included presentations on the strategic position of Cambridge East, Cambridge East Area Action Plan and a

possible vision for Cambridge East being developed by Marshall's, brainstorming of the key issues and working group sessions on eight key themes. The key themes were the green corridor, separation from villages, transport, achieving a quality neighbourhood North of Newmarket Road, community facilities/district centre, urban design, housing and sustainability.

15. The main points coming out of the workshop are listed below. A draft Event Record is attached at **Appendix 2** for information.

- Green Corridor
 - The main corridor must link to Coldham's Common and the country park and be seen as a network of corridors i.e. a main corridor with branches;
 - Strong aversion to formal sports pitches & facilities in the green corridor;
 - Minimum width of the green corridor should be 300m;
 - Crossing should be limited to walking, cycling, public transport and emergency vehicles;
 - Good lighting & design is necessary to ensure safety.
 - The open space needs a variety of treatment e.g. varied habitat, landscaping, trees.

- Separation from Villages
 - There should be physical & visual separation between existing village frameworks and new development;
 - There should be lower densities at the edge of the new development – no more than two storeys high;
 - There should be no urban related developments such as sports facilities in the green separation;
 - At Teversham, landscaping should screen development but allow longer views into the green corridor to maintain a sense of space;
 - There should be no development on High Ditch Road. This area would serve as an appropriate separation between Fen Ditton and the new development.

- Transport
 - Access to the A14 needs to be resolved. There are pros & cons to all four options put forward.
 - There is the need to provide links to all destinations in the wider area in and around Cambridge;
 - High quality public transport must be provided;
 - Need to create a transport system in the long term which is robust to changing circumstances;
 - Alternative forms of transport must be more attractive than cars.

- Achieving a quality neighbourhood North of Newmarket Road
 - There needs to be early provision of facilities for the community;
 - Concerns regarding only one key access;
 - If the car showrooms are retained it may present a difficult boundary for the new community but it could possibly be an area for future mixed use;
 - Pedestrian, cycle and emergency links are critical;
 - Continuous bus priority is essential along Newmarket Road;
 - Question floated regarding limited access to High Ditch Road;
 - Should the centre be central to the community or should it be off centre to help link with existing communities.

- Community Facilities/ District Centre
 - There is a need for an assessment of existing facilities in the City and to assess what the impact of the new development will have on them;
 - Need to fit with and complement existing facilities;
 - Early facilities North of Newmarket Road should be multifunctional to allow for change of use once the district centre develops;
 - Issue of management/ownership of community facilities;
 - Uncertainty exists concerning the number of faith facilities needed
 - There is a need for a strategic review of existing sport, arts/cultural and commercial leisure facilities and an assessment for what is need for Cambridge East and what is needed for the sub-region.

- Urban Design
 - Links to adjoining urban areas are very important;
 - A mix of densities would avoid social zoning;
 - There is a need to plan community facilities for the whole of Cambridge East;
 - Need to consider the relationship with the rest of Cambridge;
 - Open space is important especially with higher densities.

- Housing
 - Need to provide housing for everyone, including those who need specialist or supported housing;
 - Want to involve local people in construction and enable people to get jobs and learn new skills;
 - Design is very important;
 - It is important that local people who can't afford market housing are able to access the affordable housing.

- Sustainability
 - Renewable energy should be incorporated as a matter of good practice in all new development;
 - Potential for economies of scale with renewable technologies which are currently expensive;
 - Recycle runway on site for hardcore;
 - Earth can be used to create a landmark e.g. raised areas;
 - Reuse some of the existing buildings on site where possible e.g. for community purposes;

Options

16. In the Preferred Options reports options were presented as:

- A *preferred approach* where it was considered that there were no appropriate alternative options
- A *preferred option* where it was considered that alternatives were available other than that favoured by the Council
- An *alternative option* where it was considered that there was a genuine choice to be made although the Council had indicated its preference

- *A rejected option* where it was considered that there should be open debate about an option often put forward by other parties
 - *A series of options* where there was no preference expressed by the Council and there was a genuine choice to be made.
17. Council is now requested to consider the options which were the subject of participation and indicate, in the light of responses and any material considerations since the publication of the Preferred Options but also taking into account the views of the independent consultants who undertook the SEA/SA, whether particular options and approaches set out in the Cambridge East AAP Preferred Options report should be confirmed, whether they need any amendment or refinement, or whether there should be a change in direction. This will enable officers to draft the Cambridge East Area Action Plan which will come before Council on 15th April 2005.

Key Issues from Public Participation

18. This section of the report highlights the *main* issues which arose during the participation process. Attached is **Appendix 3**, the detailed schedule which sets out a summary of each representation or group of like representations and an officer response with an action as appropriate. Members will need to consider the details set out in the Appendix, noting that the main issues drawn out in this covering report are those which *officers* consider the key ones, either because of the volume of representations or because there is a significant change in direction which your officers wish to draw to your attention. At the end of each issue, a recommendation is made on the way forward, ie to confirm a Preferred Approach, to decide an appropriate option from those suggested, with any amendments necessary, or to decide on a different approach. Council is asked to determine the appropriate action for both the main issues set out in this report and the individual actions in respect of each representation in the schedules in Appendix 3. Also attached are **Appendix 4**, which is the index of those making representations, and **Appendix 5**, which is an index to the proposed changes.
19. The key strategic issues arising as a result of participation are considered to be:
- The Vision for the new urban quarter
 - Green Belt, Green Corridor and Separation from the villages
 - The site:
 - Cambridge East
 - North of Newmarket Road
 - North Works
 - Employment uses adjacent to the Park & Ride site
 - District Centre
 - Housing:
 - Density
 - Affordable Housing
 - Transport issues including:
 - requirements of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road
 - impact on the existing road network,
 - orbital movements around Cambridge by public transport, cycle and foot.
 - road access to the A14, and
 - public transport accessibility within the development and to key destinations.

- The Country Park
 - Waste
 - Phasing
20. A further issue which was not specifically raised in the responses but where a decision needs to be made on the approach in the AAP, is the phasing of land north of Cherry Hinton, which is identified separately in the Structure Plan.
21. This report includes a summary of issues raised for each of the chapters of the Preferred Options report. The issues of Green Belt, Green Corridor and separation from villages are grouped together and considered early in the report in view of their overarching importance to the approach to the other issues. The remaining issues are addressed in Preferred Options report order.

Considerations

Vision for Cambridge East

CE1 : Preferred Approach

22. The Preferred Approach set out the vision for Cambridge East as a modern, vibrant and distinctive new urban quarter for Cambridge. This drew the largest single number of representations (over 780, around half of all representations, although care must be taken with this figure as it does not equate to the number of representors as many respondents make more than one point and each point is regarded as a representation).
23. In broad terms, representations fall into two groups:
- Those objecting to the loss of Marshall Aerospace and Cambridge Airport
 - Those opposed to the relocation of Marshall Aerospace to the Imperial War Museum site at Duxford.
24. Few representations object to the principles set out in the Preferred Approach.

Assessment

25. At the last meeting of the Group, Members noted that the principle of the relocation of Cambridge Airport is established in the Structure Plan as is the redevelopment of the site. The issue of identifying an appropriate site for the Airport to be relocated to is being addressed by a separate Member Reference Group. These objections are therefore not directly relevant to the preparation of the CEAAP.
26. Recently, Marshall's has issued a statement advising that following further discussions with the Imperial War Museum, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons they have concluded that a possible relocation of Marshall Aerospace to Duxford is no longer feasible. In consequence Duxford will cease to be actively considered by the Marshall Group as a potential alternative location to Cambridge for some of its aerospace activities. The local authorities, Cambridgeshire Horizons, GO-East, EEDA and Marshall's are continuing to work together to consider what work needs to be done on the remaining alternative locations in order to assist a final decision to be made as to which is the most appropriate relocation site.

Recommendation

27. It is recommended that the vision set out in the Preferred Approach in CE1 be confirmed as the guiding vision for the new urban quarter of Cambridge East.

Green Belt, Green Corridor and Separation from the villages

Cambridge East

28. These matters, Green Belt, the Green Corridor and village separation are intertwined and have therefore been drawn together to assist Members' consideration of the issues raised. They also have implications for site definition and are dealt with ahead of that issue.

CE9 – CE11: Options for alternative procedures for dealing with the definition of the Green Belt

29. These options are:
- To define the Green Belt boundary now, as best as possible with refinement in a later review (CE9)
 - To remove the whole site from the Green Belt and then redesignate appropriate areas, primarily the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common, later in a review (CE10)
 - To retain the whole site in Green Belt, with a commitment to review at a later stage (CE11).
30. Each of these options drew around a dozen representations. Some favour retaining the whole site in Green Belt, largely on the basis that they do not wish the development to go ahead (for example RAVE). GO-East is amongst those supporting CE9, which is to define the Green Belt boundary now; GO-East make the point that sufficient work has been done to identify the boundary with sufficient confidence that only minimal changes would be needed later. The County Council and Marshall's favour removing the whole site from the Green Belt, with a commitment to reinstating key elements like the Green Corridor at a later stage (CE10).

Assessment

31. This matter was also considered by a number of the working groups at the Stakeholder Workshop. A key consideration must be to give confidence to the landowner that the site will be developed; Marshall's have indicated that they would not be confident with merely a commitment to release land from Green Belt at some later stage. The principle of releasing the site from Green Belt is also indicated in the Structure Plan Policy P9/2c. However, local communities are understandably concerned to ensure that Green Belt protection is retained over key areas to maintain village character. The option favoured by a number of representations, CE9, including GO-East, would give confidence to both Marshall and local communities.
32. If the Green Belt is to be defined in this AAP, further consideration needs to be given to the appropriate boundaries (see **Map 1**). The Preferred Option for defining the site for Cambridge East in CE3 talks of a line extended north of Airport Way to High Ditch Road. However, this boundary was intended to include urban and countryside uses. In terms of an appropriate Green Belt boundary, the hedge and ditch field boundary running south from Honey Hill to Newmarket Road would provide a clear interim boundary which recognised that, once the Airport is relocated, further development

would take place to the east of Phase 1. This Green Belt boundary might need to be refined at a later review, to take into account the alignment of any road agreed as part of a new interchange at Honey Hill.

33. The boundaries proposed in CE3 are otherwise appropriate for the definition of the Green Belt boundary with the exception of the Green Corridor and separation from Teversham (see below). Separation from Fen Ditton is provided by defining the Green Belt boundary as the disused railway and retaining and enhancing the tree belt within the site for Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road (see separate section North of Newmarket Road site). This is consistent with the existing Green Belt boundary immediately to the west which also follows the disused railway. The tree belt south of the railway should be included in the green separation, even though it is not in the Green Belt.

Recommendation

34. It is recommended that the procedure set out in CE9, to define the Green Belt boundary at this stage, with the potential to refine it in a later review, be adopted as the approach in the Area Action Plan. In determining which areas should be retained in Green Belt, the boundary should take account of the need to protect the setting of the City. The site boundary shown in option CE3 should form the basis of the Green Belt review, with the exception of (see **Map 1**):

- Excluding the Green Corridor from Teversham to Coldhams Common
- Land necessary to maintaining the separation of the villages from the new urban quarter to maintain their character
- The eastern boundary of the Green Belt north of Newmarket Road be defined to follow the hedge and ditch field boundary running south from Honey Hill to Newmarket Road.

CE64 and CE65: Set out a Preferred Option and an Alternative Option for the treatment of the Green Corridor.

35. These options are within the section of the Preferred Options report on meeting recreational needs. CE64 (16 representations, 12 in support, 4 objections including Marshall's) would restrict its use to informal recreation and children's play with an emphasis on its landscape and biodiversity value. CE65 (9 representations, 3 in support, 6 objections) would also allow sports pitches. The text explaining these options suggested the corridor should be around 300m in width, running through the development from the countryside around Teversham to Coldhams Common. It also suggested that the corridor should increase in width as it opens up into a bell shape around Teversham.
36. As well as representations directly on this matter, representations elsewhere on other issues, including the Vision, draw attention to the need to ensure that the Green Belt includes sufficient open areas such that the new development does not impinge on adjacent villages, which in the case of the Green Corridor is Teversham (Fen Ditton is referred to later in this report under North of Newmarket Road). It, together with the issue of the width and general location of the Green Corridor, was also frequently mentioned as an issue at the Stakeholder Workshop.

Assessment

37. Taking account of the approach suggested in the Preferred Options report and responses received, including comments from groups at the Stakeholder Workshop, there is general consensus on the key attributes of the Green Corridor including that it should:
- have a minimum width of 300m
 - open up to a greater width at the Teversham end to maintain the setting and individual identity of the village
 - be landscaped in such a way that open views from the “bell mouth” around Teversham at Airport Way into the Green Corridor enhance the sense of the village set in open countryside
 - have lower building heights and densities on the edges of the built up area where it adjoins the “bell mouth” around Teversham
 - only include informal recreation and children’s play areas so that the emphasis would be on its landscape, amenity and biodiversity value and have a “countryside” character.
38. A key decision will be the appropriate extent of separation from Teversham village. There are no clear features on the ground to assist with Green Belt definition and the form of the new urban quarter will determine the alignment and boundaries of the Green Corridor. Detailed work at Northstowe, on green separation between the town and adjacent villages, identified that achieving appropriate separation is not only about physical distance but also about the landscape treatment of that area. This work concluded that a minimum of 200m is required in order to provide suitable landscape treatment of various and appropriate characters. It is therefore recommended that for the purposes of this AAP, at least 200m would be maintained between any part of the new development and Teversham, again to maintain the village’s setting and individual identity. This issue can be considered in more detail in the review of the AAP which will refine the Green Belt boundaries in the context of further work on the later phases of development.

Recommendation

39. It is recommended that the points set out in the Assessment be used to guide the policy approach to the definition of the boundaries of the Green Corridor and separation from Teversham village, its land-use and landscaping in the Area Action Plan. A provisional interpretation of this, which will be subject to further consideration in preparing the draft AAP, is indicated on **Map 1**.

Phase 1 – North of Newmarket Road

40. CE12 set out the Preferred Approach for the Green Belt Review in Phase 1, which is to remove from the Green Belt the field to the north of the North Works site, as defined by a strong tree belt along the disused railway, High Ditch Road and down to the Park & Ride site.
41. This Approach drew 11 representations, 3 in support, 8 objections. The County Council supports the approach, whereas some including Fen Ditton Parish Council are concerned that development will encroach too close to the village. Marshall make the point that more land should be released in order to accommodate further development to the east beyond Phase 1.

Assessment

42. The approach suggested in CE12 was put forward in the context of a decision yet to be made about the way in which and when the Green Belt boundaries would be defined. It therefore proposed land that could be released from the Green Belt for Phase 1, notwithstanding any decision on the rest of the site. Given the recommendation above to define the Green Belt boundary for the whole of the site in this AAP, it is no longer necessary to address Phase 1 in isolation.

Recommendation

43. In view of the recommendation to define the Green Belt boundary for the whole of the site in this AAP, it is not necessary to pursue CE12 in isolation.

Site

Cambridge East site

CE3 : Preferred Option

44. The Preferred Option proposed boundaries for the site along the disused railway line and High Ditch Road, Airport Way (with a line extended north to High Ditch Road), the urban framework at Cherry Hinton and at Barnwell Road.
45. 7 supports, including GO-East and Cambridgeshire County Council
20 objections, mainly to the principle and scale of development, including
- The Marshall Group who prefer CS4
 - LDA Design who seek land between High Ditch Road and the A14 for “limited development” in association with delivery of the Landscape East concept, ie. “Bridge of Reeds”
 - Fen Ditton Parish Council – concerned at extent of separation.

CE4 : Rejected Option

46. The Rejected Option had an extended eastern boundary for the site which followed Newmarket Road east of the roundabout and High Ditch Road.
47. 3 supports (ie. agree should be rejected), including Cambridgeshire County Council
3 objections (ie. option should not be rejected), including the Marshall Group who argue that this offers a clear boundary and is not so remote from Cambridge that it would provide an “over-stretching urban form”.

Assessment

48. There is greater support for the Preferred Option for the site over the Rejected Option, including from the GO-East and the County Council. Most of the objections to the preferred site are based on the principle of the development, which has already been decided through the Structure Plan. Marshall’s prefer the rejected site which includes further land to the east, bounded by Newmarket Road (east of the roundabout with Airport Way) and High Ditch Road. Our advice remains that CE4 should be rejected because it includes land which could potentially extend the development in this area significantly to the east, such the development north of Newmarket Road would not have a logical physical relationship with the extent of development on the Airport site.

Recommendation

49. It is recommended that the preferred site in CE3 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) but amended to exclude existing residential development on Newmarket Road, and to take account of recommendations in relation to the Green Belt boundary to include only the new built-up area of Cambridge (which will be coincidental with the Green Belt boundary on its outer edge and either side of the green corridor) and therefore, as shown on **Map 1**, to:
- revise the eastern boundary north of Newmarket Road to follow the ditch/hedge line to west of Airport Way roundabout, consistent with the Green Belt boundary
 - exclude the green corridor
 - exclude existing housing south of Newmarket Road

North of Newmarket Road site

CE5 : Preferred Approach

50. The Preferred Approach defined the site by High Ditch Road and the disused railway line, the tree belt and the Park and Ride boundary, the edge of the Fisons housing estate and Newmarket Road.
51. 3 supports, by County Council and Marshalls (2 reps)
8 objections, including Fen Ditton Parish Council, which is concerned that the green separation is maintained and the cycle path across the site is protected and appropriately treated. Other objections raised include proximity to Airport public safety zones and closeness to Fen Ditton and High Ditch Road

Assessment

52. The site for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road is proposed to include the car showrooms on the frontage to ensure that the area is planned holistically, taking account of any uses that remain on the site. The disused railway line forms a clear and appropriate boundary for the Green Belt to the north.
53. The existing tree belt around the northern edges of the site should be included within site boundary, but the AAP should require the development to retain and enhance the tree belt as strategic landscaping to the development. This could include, for example, extensions to the tree belt to vary its width creating a more interesting natural form, with selective additional planting and management of the existing tree belt with predominately native species. The tree belt should also link into other green areas such as the urban park on the Park & Ride site and green fingers through the development to provide wildlife corridors. Given the importance of the tree belt in providing clear visual separation between the proposed development and the village of Fen Ditton, the tree belt should also be included within the green separation (see separate section).
54. The site boundaries have regard to the Airport public safety zones which do not preclude development in this area. They place height restrictions on new buildings, particularly at the front part of the site, but this means that building height must not exceed 4 storeys which will not prevent a suitable form, mass and scale of development. The retention of the Jubilee cycle path across the site from the Park and Ride site to Thorpe Way will be required by the AAP.

Recommendation

55. Take forward the preferred approach into the draft Area Action Plan, as shown on **Map 1**.

North Works

CE6 : Option 1

56. The first option retains the car showrooms with redevelopment of the industrial uses behind. This would provide a buffer to minimise impacts of Newmarket Road but would not maximise use of brownfield land. The limited frontage to the new development may limit the ability to ensure that the area north of Newmarket Road is fully integrated into the wider development.
57. 8 supports, general support to retain the car showrooms, including a statement by Marshalls that “the retention of those car showrooms will not harm the quality of the new housing areas”. The County Council indicates that it would support both but prefers redevelopment of the car showrooms. Other representations consider that the car showrooms provide employment, are an interesting feature, and retention is more realistic.
1 objection, from GO-East saying that option 2 may have advantages.

CE7 : Option 2

58. The second option involves the redevelopment of the whole of the North Works site to make best use of previously developed land and integrate the development into the wider urban quarter.
59. 2 support, GO-East prefer redevelopment of showrooms which may help achieve integration between the two parts of the development either side of Newmarket Road. The view of GO-East is that any final consideration of this issue should be addressed through a design-led approach, which should examine how the most efficient use of the site can be achieved, while minimising the impacts of Newmarket Road on future residents. The County Council indicates that it would support both but prefers redevelopment of the car showrooms.
1 objection, from Marshalls, stating that the car showrooms are the heart of the Marshall Motor Group operation in Cambridge and that they “will not promote a scheme requiring their demolition”.

Assessment

60. From an urban design point of view and in terms of maximising integration with development south of Newmarket Road, there would be benefits from redeveloping the car showrooms on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, a number of existing buildings on the south side of Newmarket Road opposite the showrooms will remain with the development, eg. Marshall’s Listed control building, and the showrooms could help to provide a buffer between the busy Newmarket Road and new residential development. Marshall’s has also given a very clear statement of its position: that it will not pursue a scheme which requires redevelopment of the showrooms. It may therefore be desirable in pure planning terms to redevelop the showrooms, but it does not appear to be a realistic way forward in the short term.

61. The Cambridge East development will take place over many years. It may be unreasonable to require the redevelopment of the car showrooms in the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. However, the AAP could set out a clear policy aspiration for their redevelopment in the longer term. This need not mean that the use would necessarily relocate, but would mean that a more appropriate form of development could be achieved on this important frontage. This could take the form of a more sustainable, higher density, mixed use development, perhaps with other uses such as residential over the ground floor showrooms.
62. If this approach is pursued, it is particularly important that the area between the car showrooms and the Park & Ride site is made best use of to ensure that a prominent and high quality built frontage is achieved to provide an entrance to the new residential neighbourhood behind the car showrooms. This includes the employment uses adjacent to the Park & Ride site (see CE8 below). The frontage should include residential uses, eg. apartments and town houses, to create a residential presence at the entrance to the new neighbourhood. The proximity to the engine testing bay is an issue for residential amenity and this will need to be addressed in association with the development, whether this be by relocation or other measures.
63. It will also be important to improve the urban character of the existing car showrooms frontage, in particular the expanses of open car parking generally, and also the lower density area to the west where there are very large gaps between buildings with views through to lower quality employment development behind. The opportunity should be taken in the redevelopment and rationalisation of the Motor Group premises on the rest of the North Works site, to maximise the amount of previously developed land that is made available for the new residential neighbourhood, and to improve the frontage of Newmarket Road. In order to provide the shortest routes for cycles and pedestrians from the new neighbourhood to the City Centre and other destinations to the west, a new link should be provided through the car showrooms site close to the City boundary linking from the main part of the site to Newmarket Road.

Recommendation

64. Take forward CE6:Option 1 into the draft Area Action Plan, with amplification as set out above.

Employment Uses Adjacent to the Park & Ride site

CE8 – Preferred Approach

65. The Preferred Approach is to redevelop these uses as part of the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road to ensure a high quality frontage is achieved for the development and the use of previously developed land is maximised.
66. 1 support, from the County Council agreeing that these uses would not be compatible with a high quality urban extension, and that the petrol filling station should be relocated elsewhere in the development.
2 objections, Marshall is sympathetic to the need to redevelop this site but operational requirements may determine that it cannot be achieved as part of phase 1, and an individual seeks the retention of the petrol station on or close to its present site.

Assessment

67. As set out above, if the car showrooms are to retain in their present location and form for the foreseeable future, it is imperative that maximum use of made of the limited frontage between the showrooms and the Park & Ride site in order to provide a quality face for the new development and to integrate it into the wider development in the longer term. Whilst it is understood that the relocation of the petrol filling station may have to be in a later phase of development in order to retain the facility in the area throughout the development, this argument does not apply to the other employment uses in this location. These uses take up a lot of land and do not lend themselves to the creation of an attractive urban frontage. If the car showrooms are to remain, it is even more important that these buildings are redeveloped, if a quality urban environment is to be achieved. In view of the proximity to the engine testing bay on the south side of Newmarket Road, it may be possible for the redevelopment of these uses to be towards the end of the implementation of Phase 1 to protect residential amenity, but it is nonetheless important that they are redeveloped as part of the completion of this first phase.

Recommendation

68. Take forward CE8 into the draft Area Action Plan, with amplification as set out above.

District Centre Location and Form

CE13: District Centre Location – Preferred Approach

69. The Preferred Approach is to locate the District Centre broadly at the geographical centre of the urban quarter at the heart of the development and on the dedicated public transport route to maximise accessibility to residents.

70. 3 supports, including the County Council and Marshall's
1 objection, this is premature because disposition of land available for development has yet to be determined.

CE14 – District Centre Role and Form – Preferred Approach

71. The Preferred Approach is for a range of uses and facilities appropriate to the needs of the new quarter's residents and be capable of creating a vibrant centre in the heart of the new community, which complements rather than competes with the City Centre.

72. 5 supports, including the County Council and Marshall's

Assessment

73. General support for location, role and form is noted. It is appropriate for the AAP to give a broad indication of the appropriate disposition of land uses within the development, particularly for a key use such as the District Centre, which should be located at the heart of the new urban quarter.

Recommendation

74. Take forward preferred approaches CE13 and CE14 into the draft Area Action Plan.

Local Centres

75. GO-East request that the AAP provide more clarity on when a decision will be made on the number and location of local centres in Cambridge East as a whole (CE15). This will form part of the review of the AAP once there is more certainty over the timing of the Airport relocation. The County Council indicates a need for one library to meet the needs of the overall development. It supports the approach for local centres to be locations for small scale employment uses.
76. The preferred approach to the local centre for Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road (CE16), that it will provide a community focus and location for services and facilities and local employment, is supported by the County Council and Marshall's.

Housing

Density

CE17 – Option 1

77. Option 1 would have a target average density of at least 50 dwellings per hectare (dph) with higher densities in and around the District Centre, Local Centres and public transport stops. The actual figure would be determined following further study.
78. 4 supports, which particularly relate to the density appropriate close to Fen Ditton, including from Fen Ditton Parish Council.
13 objections, including:
- Marshall, which views 50 dph as too low to deliver efficient use of land in this location
 - GO-East advises that there should be no ceiling on density and that it should be a design-led approach which makes best use of land with a priority on high density development as set out in the Structure Plan.
 - 8 objections argue 50 dph is too high with some suggesting 30-35 dph as preferable. 3 of these (from Teversham Parish Council and 2 South Cambridgeshire DC Councillors for adjacent Parishes) argue in particular that lower densities are required at the outer edge of the development adjacent to rural areas.

CE18 – Option 2

79. Option 2 would have a target average density of up to 75 dph, again with higher densities in and around the district centre, local centres and public transport stops. The actual figure would be determined following further study.
80. 1 support, from Marshall, which argues that 75 dph would help achieve efficient use of land and that with appropriate quality of urban design could create a vibrant and pleasing place.
81. 11 objections, including that 75 dph is too high with some suggesting 30-35 dph as preferable, that high densities lead to social problems. GO-East advises that there should be no ceiling on density and that it should be a design-led approach which makes best use of land with a priority on high density development as set out in the Structure Plan.

Assessment

82. The representation by GO-East that any density policy should not set an upper limit on the average density is accepted. Density should ultimately be arrived at following a design led approach, with the objective of density being as high as is appropriate in order to make most efficient use of land, whilst ensuring that a high quality new urban quarter for Cambridge is delivered. Therefore, whatever density chosen, it should not have a ceiling as suggested by the words “up to” in Option 2.
83. The Structure Plan specifically states that the Cambridge East development will be high density. A balance needs to be struck between ensuring that the average density achieved across the development meets that Structure Plan requirement, and aspiring to be as high as is consistent with a high quality urban environment and creating a sustainable community. This could be achieved by combining the options and setting a target for “average density in the order of 75 dph”, but requiring “at least 50 dph”.
84. Since this is an average density across the development, it allows for variation in density. Therefore, the sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham, could be at lower densities and more particularly of restricted height, eg. maximum of 2 storeys, to protect village character and amenity. Conversely, areas around the District Centre, Local Centres and bus stops on the dedicated public transport routes could be at much higher densities to maximise accessibility to services and facilities.
85. In determining actual densities, and therefore total number of homes and traffic movements, regard will also need to be had to the outcome of the County Transport Study and the provision of the necessary transport infrastructure to service the site.

Recommendation

86. A combination of Options CE17 and CE18 be taken forward in the Area Action Plan with a target for “average density in the order of 75 dph”, but requiring “at least 50 dph” across the development as a whole. The policy should also require higher densities in the most accessible locations and provide for lower densities on sensitive outer edges of the development, particularly close to villages, with an emphasis on limiting building heights in these locations.

Affordable Housing

CE20 – Preferred Approach

87. The Preferred Approach for affordable housing is to apply the district wide affordable housing targets to Cambridge East. Any issue over viability would be addressed as part of the consideration of a planning application alongside the other calls on the development. The types of affordable housing would be determined at the time of a planning application but would include social rented housing as well as a significant proportion of intermediate tenure.
88. 3 supports, including Cambridgeshire County Council.
6 objections, including:
- Marshall argue that the level of affordable housing could give rise to social problems and that uncertainty over finding in term of quantity and over a long period of development

- GO-East advise that the AAP should have its own affordable housing requirements for the development as a whole and not apply each Council's own policies within their own areas
- Addenbrooke's Hospital objects to the weak reference to key worker housing given studies identifying lack of key worker housing as a serious problem in Cambridge and the surrounding area.
- 1 individual seeks 50% of the housing footprint to be for affordable housing, not 50% of dwellings because this causes social homes to have much smaller plots.

Assessment

89. It is agreed that the AAP should have its own affordable housing policy and target. The approach in the City Local Plan and evolving South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document are very compatible and it is not foreseen that this would cause any drafting problems. Both Councils are seeking 50% affordable housing both district wide and in major new developments. This is consistent with the high level of housing need identified in both Councils' Housing Needs Surveys and with the Structure Plan requirement for at least 40% of all housing in the Cambridge Sub Region to be affordable, which will require a higher provision on larger sites at the heart of the Sub Region. The AAP will make clear the scope of the definition of affordable housing and that it includes provision for key workers.
90. It is proposed to include an indicative tenure mix for affordable housing at Cambridge East to help developers and funders plan with more confidence. It is considered that an appropriate indicative tenure mix would be that of the 50% affordable housing overall, approx 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations. This has regard to the high level of need identified in both Councils' Housing Needs Surveys and the need to create balanced communities. However, the actual tenure mix will be determined each time an individual application comes forward in the light of the needs and other considerations relevant at that time.
91. A study is about to be commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons in conjunction with the City and District Councils and the Cambridge Landowners Group entitled "Good Practice in Planning for and Delivering Mixed, Balanced and Socially Inclusive Communities within Major Proposed Developments in the Cambridge Sub Region". It is hoped that initial findings will be available before the draft Area Action Plan is finalised in May, although the study will have a particular role in the masterplanning and planning application stages. It will also inform the public examination of the AAP.

Recommendation

92. CE20 be taken forward in the AAP, but with a single policy in the AAP combining those in the City Redeposit Local Plan and South Cambs draft Core Strategy. Include an indicative tenure mix for affordable housing at Cambridge East, that of the 50% affordable housing overall, approx 30% would be social rented and 20% intermediate housing, the actual mix to be determined at the time of an application having regard to identified need and other material considerations.

Employment

93. The County Council and Marshall's support the preferred approach to employment, that provision be limited to ensure adequate provision for jobs whilst not undermining the objective for the urban quarter to be housing led in order to rectify the current imbalance in the Cambridge area. EEDA wishes the policy to reinforce the leading role of Cambridge in science and technology research. This is accepted to the extent that it is compatible with the balance of uses and role of this site. One representation considered that because of the predominance of housing, Cambridge East would not contribute to the Cambridge Phenomenon.
94. EEDA would prefer the employment provision for this site to be made in hectares as suggested in CE22 and not as a jobs requirement as in CE23. The County Council and Marshall's support the expression as a jobs requirement. Due to the high density nature of development proposed on the site and the need for an imaginative approach to employment provision, including in mixed use schemes, CE23 is preferred as an appropriate means of ensuring the emphasis of providing new homes anticipated by the Structure Plan is not undermined by potential overprovision of employment.

Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture, including Community Development

95. The preferred approach to publicly provided community services and facilities (CE24) received a number of supports. Addenbrooke's supported the potential for a "health campus" able to provide a wider range of services than a conventional health centre. GO-East advised that more certainty of the requirements for Phase 1 is required and also more certainty about when the amount of types of facilities for the development as a whole will be identified. The role of voluntary groups in providing community facilities was highlighted and will be included in the AAP. The issue of timing of the provision of facilities was raised. The preferred approach requires the phased delivery of services to be determined as part of any legal obligation.
96. The preferred approach to commercially provided facilities (CE25) was also generally supported.
97. The County Council states a preference for the secondary school not to be located within the District centre, in view of the potential management and security issues this can raise. The Preferred Options report does not specify the location of the secondary school but identifies key issues to be taken into account in determining its location (paragraph 8.17). In particular it should be accessible to residents of the urban quarter as a whole and located on a stop on the high quality public transport route. This could be at the District Centre or a Local Centre. In view of the County Council's concerns about a location at the District Centre, the approach should be to locate the secondary school at a Local Centre.
98. Strong support, including from the County Council, to school playing fields not counting towards public open spaces standards (CE28). Marshall's, whilst supporting this approach, also comment that school playing fields should be regarded as community facilities, and be available to the community. It is proposed that this approach be pursued in the AAP.
99. There is support for the provision of faith buildings in Cambridge East (CE29), including from Marshall's and County Council. One representation felt such facilities should be funded by faith groups and not the public purse. This is not in conflict with the

requirement for the development to provide such facilities if consultation confirms a need for it.

100. The principle of Cambridge East providing leisure, art and cultural facilities to meet the needs of the City and the wider sub region (CE31) was supported, if in highly accessible locations.

Addressing Transport Needs

North of Newmarket Road

CE33 : Preferred Approach

101. The Preferred Approach sets out requirements for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, including a single road access onto Newmarket Road, a separate public transport only access onto Newmarket Road, improved bus priority on Newmarket Road and provision for cycles and pedestrians, and car parking at PPG13 standards.
102. 5 support, including The Marshall Group, Mrs Anne Campbell MP
8 objections, mainly to the impact on local roads and to the public transport only access onto High Ditch Road, including:
- Cambridgeshire County Council who require vehicular access at two points onto Newmarket Road
 - Anne Campbell MP – narrowness of High Ditch Road

Assessment

103. Most of the objections relate to the principle of development in this location on the grounds that the public transport provisions will be inadequate and local roads will not be able to cope. However the principle of the development has already been decided through the Structure Plan. Government advice is that developments of over 300 houses need more than one road access point to allow for access for essential traffic if the principal access point is blocked. Our advice is that scope exists to provide two access points over the two phases of development, one on either side of the park and ride site. For the first phase there is scope to provide the main access point to the west of the park and ride site and the second either as a spur from the park and ride access road or to the east of the park and ride site. There may be scope to make the second access point limited access for emergency vehicles and public transport only.
104. It would sensible to ensure a design that would not preclude the future provision of a public transport only access onto High Ditch Road at some point in the future.
105. Officers have also identified an apparent contradiction regarding car parking standards in the Preferred Options Report which suggests (CE33) "Car Parking standards at PPG13 levels" for Land North of Newmarket Road. However, CE48 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Option states that "The car parking standards for all developments in Cambridge East would be those set down in the Cambridge Local Plan" (which are below PPG13 levels). The intention is that car parking standards should be those in the Redeposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan in the interest of delivering the desired modal shift.

Recommendation

106. It is recommended that the preferred approach to transport for North of Newmarket Road in CE33 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) subject to the following amendments:
- two road access points to Newmarket Road
 - car parking standards at Redeposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan levels
 - design should not prevent future provision of a public transport only access onto High Ditch Road

Road Access

CE34 : Preferred Approach

107. The Preferred Approach is to provide road access to Cambridge East onto Newmarket Road (at two points), Airport Way, Coldhams Lane and Barnwell Road.
108. 2 support, The Marshall Group and Cambridgeshire County Council
14 objections, mainly to the principle of development and its transport impacts, including:
- The Wildlife Trust – no road access to Barnwell Road through the Barnwell Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
 - Teversham Parish Council / Councillor Caroline Hunt / Councillor Robert Turner– Airport Way access to only be at Gazelle Way roundabout and not at Church Road
 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group – Area Action Plan is premature in absence of transport assessments and studies

Assessment

109. In order to minimise the impact of the development on the transport network it is necessary to include all-purpose junctions onto all of the principal roads surrounding the site including Barnwell Road. However the Area Action Plan does not have to be specific regarding their locations and this is not yet possible before the necessary detailed transport assessments have been done and masterplanning progressed. It may be possible to utilise the existing Barnwell Drive junction to avoid the Local Nature Reserve (LNR) but if this were not feasible a link across the LNR would be unavoidable. Given the location of the green corridor adjoining Teversham, and the extent of the development area north of Cherry Hinton, it is accepted that the link to Airport Way should be at the Gazelle Way roundabout. The County Council are currently undertaking a County Strategic Transport Study of all of the developments planned for the County with the intention of providing appropriate long term transport solutions. Final publication is expected in October / November 2005: It will inform the examination in public of the Area Action Plan expected in early 2006, which will examine the soundness of the plan including its road access proposals.

Recommendation

110. It is recommended that the preferred approach to road access in CE34 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) subject to the following amendments:
- access to Airport Way to be only at the Gazelle Way roundabout
 - access to Barnwell Road to avoid crossing the Local Nature Reserve if this is possible and otherwise to minimise the impact on the reserve

Orbital Movements

111. Three options were included in the Preferred Options report, with no preference stated. CE35 involved improving orbital capacity on existing routes for all traffic. CE36 involved building additional orbital roads for all traffic. CE37 was to develop orbital routes open to public transport only.

112. *CE35 : Option 1*

113. 2 support, The Marshall Group and Cambridgeshire County Council
8 objections, including:

- The Highways Agency – impact on trunk road network, need for a study looking at transport strategy for Cambridge East, A14 junctions and orbital movements
- Teversham Parish Council – increased orbital capacity will increase traffic levels unless orbital routes are only for public transport

CE36 : Option 2

114. 4 support, including Fen Ditton Parish Council
12 objections, mainly to creation of a ring road generating extra traffic and encouraging development on its inner boundary, including:

- The Marshall Group – no evidence of need for such routes
- Cambridgeshire County Council – no justification, likely to generate extra car travel
- The Highways Agency – as above

CE37 : Option 3

115. 6 support, including Cambridgeshire County Council, Teversham Parish Council and RAVE

7 objections, including:

- The Marshall Group – no evidence of need for such routes
- The Highways Agency – as above

Assessment

116. There is little support or justification for new orbital road building and only limited support for improving the capacity of existing roads. If a new orbital road does prove to be needed at some time in the future, a public transport only road would be likely to attract the most public support. No route or specification for such a link has been developed. Our advice is that orbital movements should be catered for by limited improvements to the capacity of existing routes because new links do not appear to be needed to support the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. The overall need for new orbital road building either for all traffic roads or for public transport routes only should be considered when the Cambridge East (AAP) is due for its first review, which will be informed by the outcome of the County Strategic Transport Study.

Recommendation

117. It is recommended that the approach to orbital movements set out in CE35 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP), and that the issue be a subject for further examination upon the review of the AAP.

A14 Access

118. Four options were included in the Preferred Options Report with no preference stated. CE38 proposed a new interchange onto the A14 in the vicinity of Honey Hill to replace the existing junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy. CE39 proposed that Ditton Lane would be restricted to public transport. CE40 proposed that there would be junction improvements only. CE41 proposed a new half interchange with west facing slip roads in the vicinity of Honey Hill and retaining Quy in its present form (whilst it was not explicit, this option intended that the Ditton Lane junction would be closed and replaced by the new Honey Hill junction).

CE38 : Option 1

119. 1 comment, from English Nature concerning Wilbraham Fen SSSI
17 objections, concerning impact on Ditton Lane and High Ditch Road, loss of access for local residents in Horningsea and Fen Ditton, that any link from the A14 should not connect with the top of Airport way, one junction could not cope and including:
- The Marshall Group – no new junctions are needed
 - Cambridgeshire County Council – closure of Quy junction would block access from the A14 west to Newmarket
 - Teversham Parish Council – supports CE40
 - Highways Agency – no objection in principle as it reduces number of points of access to the A14 but more information needed

CE39 : Option 2

120. 1 comment, as above
3 support, including The Marshall Group
12 objections, concerning impact of public transport on High Ditch Road, inadequate capacity leading to congestion, loss of access for local residents and including:
- Cambridgeshire County Council – would not comply with Structure Plan
 - Teversham Parish Council – supports CE40
 - Highways Agency – no objection in principle as it reduces number of points of access to the A14 but more information needed

CE40 : Option 3

121. 1 comment, as above
6 support, including The Marshall Group, Teversham Parish Council, Fen Ditton Parish Council
- 7 Objections, concerning inadequacy of Ditton Lane, loss of countryside and impacts on High Ditch Road and including:
 - Cambridgeshire County Council – would not comply with Structure Plan
 - Highways Agency – no objection in principle as it reduces number of points of access to the A14 but more information needed

CE41 : Option 4

122. 1 comment, as above
2 support, including Cambridgeshire County Council
9 objections, concerning inadequacy of Ditton Lane, loss of countryside and impacts on High Ditch Road and including:

- The Marshall Group – unnecessary and harmful to Green Belt
- Teversham Parish Council – supports CE40
- Highways Agency –objects in principle as it involves the creation of a new access to the trunk road network (A14) even though the Ditton Lane junction would be closed

Assessment

123. There is greater support (and fewer objections), for the retention of the existing junctions (CE40), than for the creation of a new junction to replace the two existing junctions (CE38), or for the conversion of the Ditton Lane junction to public transport only (CE39), or for the provision of a new interchange replacing Ditton Lane (CE41).
124. Option CE40 retains convenient access to the A14 for local people and will suffice for the development of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road. Option CE33 addresses the needs of Phase 1, and does not require the provision of A14 access improvements as part of that first phase of development. The County Council has not objected to CE33, as it relates to the A14. The County have however objected that the closure of the Quy junction would hamper access to Newmarket using the A1303, this is a strong argument for the retention of Quy junction.
125. Notwithstanding the policy of the Highways Agency to minimise the number of access points onto the trunk road network, the scale and location of the Cambridge East development taken as a whole will inevitably impact upon the A14. It has yet to be determined how best to provide improved access to the A14 whilst minimising those impacts. The County Strategic Transport Study will be a important step in this regard. The Highways Agency have stated in their representations that they would welcome the opportunity to engage and help to develop an access strategy which will include consideration of the cumulative impacts of development in the Cambridge Sun-region, as well as transport measures which could restrict movement in the city centre and further increase pressures on the A14, M11, A11 and A428.
126. Our advice is that the existing junctions should be retained in respect of Phase 1 of the development north of Newmarket Road. The form of that development should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 dependent upon the outcome of further studies. In respect of the longer term and the development of the Airport site itself, the AAP should expect improved and satisfactory access to the A14 without ruling out either of the options of junction improvement or provision of a new junction.

Recommendation

127. It is recommended that the preferred approach to A14 access for inclusion in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) be as follows:
- no change to current junctions at Ditton Lane and Quy in relation to development north of Newmarket Road
 - that development of the Airport site south of Newmarket Road be dependent upon provision of improved and satisfactory access arrangements to the A14 through junction improvements at Ditton Lane and Quy, and /or the provision of a new junction onto the A14
 - that the design of the development north of Newmarket Road should not preclude the future provision of a new junction onto the A14 between the existing Quy and Ditton Lane junctions, as a replacement for the Ditton Lane junction

External Public Transport

CE42 : Preferred Approach

128. The preferred approach is bus based, further research to examine scope for guided bus access. Routes to be based on Newmarket Road (City Centre and West Cambridge), a northern link (Science Park, Cambridge Northern Fringe, Guided Bus connection), a southern link (Addenbrooke's Hospital), an additional guided bus link to the City Centre and examination of need for other orbital public transport links.
129. 3 support, The Marshall Group, Cambridgeshire County Council and Toft Parish Council
13 objections, mainly concerning public transport routes crossing sensitive open spaces and including:
- The Wildlife Trust – object to bus route across Coldham's Common, which would sever the green corridor and harm its ecological value
 - Teversham Parish Council – spoliation of the environment
 - Ramblers Association – opposed to a road across Ditton Meadows

Assessment

130. The site has been identified by the Structure Plan for a strategic scale of development. It cannot be expected that such a development would not have environmental implications although every effort will be required to minimise these and mitigate any harm. Whilst many of the proposed routes would run on existing roads others may need to cross existing open spaces in the City. The transport case for such links will not be clarified until the publication of the County Transport Study, which will allow the transport case to be considered alongside the environmental implications of such routes.
131. However, no such links are necessary to enable the development of Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road to proceed (CE33).
132. Furthermore some of the routes would cross open spaces which lie outside the boundary of the AAP (Coldham's Common / Ditton Meadows) and so could not be proposals in the AAP but would require to be taken forward as a part of a separate City Council Local Development Document.
133. Our advice is therefore to endorse the preferred approach subject to a future review of the AAP and coordination of transport route proposals with the City Council Local Development Scheme.

Recommendation

134. It is recommended that the preferred approach to external public transport in CE42 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP) subject to the inclusion of a statement concerning the need to minimise and mitigate the environmental impacts of the public transport routes.

Park and Ride

CE43 : Preferred Approach

135. The Preferred Approach is to identify a new Park & Ride site to replace the existing one north of Newmarket Road. This could be to the south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way.
136. 3 support, including The Marshall Group, and Cambridgeshire County Council
10 objections, including:
- Anne Campbell MP – site should remain in current location
 - Teversham Parish Council – prefer site north of Newmarket Road, would erode separation of village from Cambridge

Assessment

137. The Park & Ride site is well wooded and provides an opportunity for a mature park for the area north of Newmarket Road. Its relocation would permit this and allow for a marginal improvement in the weight of traffic on Newmarket Road by intercepting it slightly further to the east, rather than within the new urban quarter. The proposed relocation site would adjoin the proposed site of the country park and could offer dual use to provide for its parking needs. The adjacent country park and the proposed Park and Ride site are both in the ownership of the Marshall Group and are deliverable which is an important consideration.

Recommendation

138. It is recommended that the preferred approach to Park and Ride in CE43 be included in the draft Area Action Plan (AAP).

Car Parking

139. The Preferred Option in CE48 is for car parking standards in Cambridge East to be as in the City Council's Local Plan. An Alternative Option CE49 proposes that in the District Centre, the maximum car parking standards would be those used in the City Local Plan for the CPZ.

CE48 : Preferred Approach

140. 3 support, including The Marshall Group and Cambridgeshire County Council
1 objection, from Go-East stating that the AAP should be a complete plan and should not delegate policy matters to another plan.

CE49 : Alternative Option

141. 1 support, Cambridgeshire County Council
2 objection, including The Marshall Group stating that standards appropriate for a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in central Cambridge are inappropriate for Cambridge East.

Assessment

142. The intention is to include the parking standards within the AAP itself. Given that the development of the District Centre can only commence after the relocation of the runway dependent businesses it is not thought necessary to specify more restrictive

parking measures at this stage. This matter can be considered again upon the review of the AAP.

Recommendation

143. It is recommended that the preferred option to car parking standards in the AAP should be as set out in CE48 and that no more restrictive standard be applied to developments in the District Centre as proposed by CE49.

Landscape and Biodiversity

144. There is a high level of support from the key countryside bodies to the preferred approach to landscape at Cambridge East (CE50), including English Nature, the Countryside Agency and the Wildlife Trust. The County Council and Marshall's also support the approach. English Heritage suggest that any policy should take account of the Historic Landscape Characterisation database. Whilst this may be relevant for the country park and other off site landscaping and countryside access works, the Airport site has been heavily managed for many years and has very little historic landscape character remaining. Two new bullet points are proposed so that the landscape strategy envisaged in the preferred approach would set criteria for the strategic landscaping of the site, including along Airport Way and in areas of green separation from villages, and give consideration to requiring key aspects of strategic landscaping eg within the green separation, at the beginning of each major phase of development.
145. There is also a high level of support from the countryside bodies to the preferred approaches to biodiversity (CE51) and use of water features to contribute towards biodiversity (CE52) and the need for a landscape and biodiversity management plan (CE53).

Archaeology and Heritage

146. English Heritage request some detailed word changes to the preferred approach to archaeology (CE54), in particular to seek an archaeological assessment as part of any planning application, rather than to require it before development of the site is order the any findings can influence the form of the development. A change is proposed to this effect.
147. The County Council raises concerns about certain comments in the SEA/SA assessment of the Preferred Approach carried out by the District Council's independent consultants. The concerns raised will be reported to the consultants and the Council should ensure that they are taken into account by the consultants in their full SEA/SA of the AAP for submission.
148. Marshall's object to the preferred option to retain both listed buildings and other significant airport buildings that may be representative of a significant chapter in Cambridge's history (CE55), arguing that only listed buildings need to be protected. However, it is considered in principle that unlisted buildings that have architectural or historic importance, particularly if they provide a setting to a listed building, should be retained. A detailed assessment of such buildings is therefore required in order to inform such a decision. This is referred to in paragraph 11.5 but should be made explicit in the policy in the AAP. Any decision on the future of unlisted buildings will

also have to be made in the context of the proposed development of the site as a whole in order to ensure that a high quality development is achieved.

149. The County Council supports the preferred option but raises concerns about certain comments of the independent SEA/SA carried out by the District Council's independent consultants. As with CE54, the concerns raised will be reported to the consultants and the Council should ensure that they are taken into account by the consultants in their full SEA/SA of the AAP for submission.

Meeting Recreation Needs

Public Open Space

150. There was general support for the preferred option (CE57) to use of the Cambridge City minimum openspace standards for the Cambridge East development as a whole. These will be set out in the Area Action Plan.
151. Generally there was support for the preferred approach to setting accessibility requirements for formal sports facilities that all homes should be within 1000m (10-15 minutes walking time) of such facilities (CE59). Marshall's sought a higher range of 1000 to 1500 metres. However, the preferred approach sets a maximum of 1000m, with flexibility above that distance. This is considered the most that is reasonable to ensure accessible open space to all parts of the development.

Formal Sports Provision

152. The preferred approach requiring the preparation of a Strategy for Formal Sport was supported (CE60), but representations called for it to include children's play. It is recommended that a separate Play Strategy be prepared to assist in the implementation of the public open space facilities (CE57).
153. There was concern that further work was needed to determine the exact list of formal sports facilities to meet the needs of Cambridge East. These concerns will be addressed by preparation of the strategy. Although it will address the needs of a whole, it will also need to identify the requirements of phase 1 of the development north of Newmarket road. There was support for the dual use of sports facilities located at the secondary school (CE61).

The Urban Park

154. There was general support for the provision of an urban park north of Newmarket Road, including from Sport England, the Wildlife Trust and Marshall's. RAVE raised concern at this facility being located on the current Park & Ride site. The issue of relocating the Park & Ride is addressed at option CE43. It is recommended that the preferred approach be pursued.

The Country Park

155. CE71 is the Preferred Option for a country park to be provided on land north of Teversham linking to the Green Corridor. CE72 is a rejected option to locate the

country park south of Teversham while CE73 is a rejected option to locate it north of High Ditch Road.

CE71 : Countryside Recreation – Preferred Option

156. There are 10 representations of CE71, the Preferred Option north of Teversham. Of these 7 are in support (including Marshall's, the County Council and the Wildlife Trust. Some in support would like to see the country park extend south of Teversham as well as being to the north of the village. There are 3 objections, largely preferring the location south of Teversham.

CE72: Countryside Recreation – Rejected Option 1

157. There are 7 representations on CE72, 5 of which see the area south of Teversham as the appropriate location for a country park, with 2, including Marshall's opposing the location. A number of representations and comments at the Stakeholder Workshop suggest that the Country Park would provide greater long term protection.

CE73: Countryside Recreation – Rejected Option 2

158. Only 2 representations have been made on CE73, both agreeing that this is not an appropriate location.

Assessment

159. There is general support for the creation of a country park associated with the development of Cambridge East. There is no support in representations for a location north of High Ditch Road. The arguments put forward for a location south of Teversham focus on perceived protection from long term threats for further expansion of Cambridge to the east. This area will remain in the Green Belt as a crucial area in maintaining the setting of the City and ensuring continued separation. The advantages of a location to the north of Teversham over a location to the south are:

- It is better related to the main body of the new urban quarter
- It is better placed to link to a green corridor northwards to join up with the National Trust's vision for an extended Wicken Fen
- It is in the same ownership as the majority of Cambridge East and therefore there is more certainty about its deliverability
- It could be linked to Wilbraham Fen, providing a wider countryside experience
- If the Park & Ride site is relocated to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way, there would be advantages of a dual use car park to serve both Park & Ride and the country park.

Recommendation

160. It is recommended that the Preferred Option set out in CE71 for a country park north of Teversham, be included in the draft Area Action Plan.

Crossing the Green Corridor

161. Several representations were received concerned about the principle of roads crossing the Green Corridor in relation to preferred approach CE66, arguing that existing roads such as Airport Way and Barnwell Road should be put underground to ensure a continuous green area. These concerns are noted, however, it is not

uncommon for many of the Green Corridors which stretch from the countryside into the heart of Cambridge to have significant roads crossing them. Indeed, Barnwell Road crosses the existing Green Corridor. This pattern is repeated on other green corridors around the City.

162. The important characteristic of the Green Corridor is that it is a broad swathe of open countryside that reaches into the heart of Cambridge and is not interrupted by built development. Whilst it is desirable to minimise the number of road and other crossings of Green Corridors in order to maximise its benefits both visually and functionally, as amenity for residents and for wildlife, it is inevitable that there will be some crossings to provide orbital linkages around the City. It is therefore not inconsistent for Airport Way and Barnwell Road to remain.
163. However, measures would be desirable to provide improved safe crossing points for both people and for wildlife. This principle was put forward by a number of representations, including from the Countryside Agency and the County Council. It is also an appropriate objective for any new crossings that are necessary to provide satisfactory linkages between different parts of the urban quarter and with wider Cambridge are designed in such a way as to limit their visual impact and provide for safe movement along the corridor. It is recommended that the preferred approach be pursued.

Other Recreation Issues

164. The preferred approach to the use of surface water drainage features as key design features in the development (CE67) received general support. In response to a representation by the County Council it is proposed to add that any water features should include reed beds or other planting for biodiversity and to aid water quality.
165. The preferred approach to management of open space (CE69) was generally supported. However, it is recommended to allow greater flexibility in the AAP through a criteria based policy on the exact method of management and funding pending further assessment.

Land Drainage and Water Conservation

166. There was wide support for the preferred option for surface water drainage (CE75), including from Marshall's, English Nature and the County Council. The Environment Agency had a number of detailed concerns which can be incorporated in the policy in the AAP, including the requirement for the Flood Risk Assessment to be carried out.
167. There was support for the preferred approach to foul drainage and sewage disposal from the Environment Agency and Marshall's. (Note: there is an error in Appendix 3: the "Decision" is missing for this option. It should recommend that CE77 be pursued.)
168. The preferred option for management and maintenance of watercourses (CE78) is supported by the County Council and Marshall's. Representation from the Environment Agency shows a need to clarify that this option is intended to include all surface water drainage systems and SuDS, as well as water bodies and watercourses. It is recommended that this option is pursued. The approach to water conservation is generally supported and should be pursued.

Telecommunications

169. The preferred approach (CE82) is supported and recommended to be pursued.

Energy

170. There is support for the preferred approach to energy provision (CE83) from the County Council and Marshall's. GO-East advises that the joint AAP should include its own policy, and not delegate to other plans of the respective authorities. One objection seeks a higher target than 10% of energy requirements of the development to be provided by renewable energy. However, this target is consistent with the evolving RSS14 and with the City Redeposit Local Plan and the emerging South Cambs Core Strategy.
171. The HBF argue that targets for energy conservation in the AAP should not be linked to SAP ratings which are too simplistic a mechanism but also that this issue is properly administered through Building Regulations. For consistency with the response to similar representations to the option in the Core Strategy, it is recommended that the policy derived from preferred approach CE84 requires developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction but encourages them to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum levels.
172. The County Council supported the proposal that this development should include exemplar projects in energy efficient design (CE85). Marshall's comments that it recognises the need for innovation in seeking energy efficient development but objects on the basis that there is a tension between increased capital cost adding to the general cost of housing. However, it is considered that there may not always be a tension between construction costs and higher standards of energy conservation. For example, high density housing in the form of apartments and terraced housing is more energy efficient than detached or semi-detached housing. Again matters such as orientation and design may involve no additional cost. Improved insulation may add additional cost but may be low in comparison with the overall costs of construction. Any additional capital cost to the buyer may be more than off-set by lower running costs, an increasingly attractive market matter in a situation where energy costs are likely to rise and the public becomes increasingly aware of the importance of saving energy because of climate change. It is recommended that the preferred approach be pursued.

Waste

173. The Area Action Plan cannot make policies for waste. This is a matter for the County Council as Waste Planning Authority, which has policies relating to the major developments in its adopted Waste Local Plan 2003. Discussions have taken place between the 3 authorities and with GO-East and ODPM to confirm this position. The Cambridge East AAP can refer to the policies of the Waste Local Plan for information, which allocates the development as an Area of Search for both a major waste management facility and a household waste recycling centre. There is no specific site within the Area of Search identified for either of these facilities. The County Council is preparing a Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework, and in the transitional period the policies of the adopted Waste Local Plan will be 'saved'.

174. The County Council as Waste Disposal Authority is also progressing its Public Finance Initiative (PFI) for waste management, and the procurement process will begin in March 2005. Private waste management companies will be seeking to secure suitable sites for waste management during early / mid 2005. A principal consideration will be those Areas allocated in the adopted Waste Local Plan.
175. The way that district local plans and waste local plans tend to interact under these circumstances is that an allocation for a general employment area in a district local plan (ie. for B2 uses) would facilitate a waste facility coming forward for determination by the waste planning authority. There is no specific employment allocation proposed at Cambridge East because of the high density nature of the development and a more integrated mixed use approach is proposed.
176. Discussions are under way to explore how the matter of waste should be addressed at Cambridge East, including in the Area Action Plan.

Recommendation

177. It is recommended that officers of the City, South Cambs and County Councils discuss how to take forward the issue of waste at Cambridge East and bring back their findings to the Member Reference Group meeting on 5 April 2005 and any relevant issues for the AAP to the meeting of Council on 15th April.

Noise

178. There was general support for the preferred approach (CE86) to noise. The issue of noise from the Airport for the first phase north of Newmarket Road is a serious issue that will need further consideration and could require the relocation of the engine testing bay, particularly for noise-sensitive development near the front of the site. It is recommended that the preferred approach be pursued.

Phasing and Implementation

179. The development of a large new urban quarter of the scale of Cambridge East will inevitably be phased over a lengthy period. The issue of relocation of Cambridge Airport is an additional factor influencing a phased approach. The opportunity to bring forward an early first phase of development on land north of Newmarket Road ahead of the relocation of the Airport has been addressed in the Preferred Options Report and a proposed site and set of policies to guide that phase of development will be included in the draft Area Action Plan. It will be important to identify the services and facilities and infrastructure that are required to serve this first phase of development, in the context of the longer term proposals for the new urban quarter as a whole.
180. The Preferred Options Report states that the AAP will be reviewed soon after it is adopted, once there is more certainty over the timing of the relocation of the Airport. A further consideration is whether there is scope to bring forward a second phase of development north of Cherry Hinton ahead of the Airport relocating. This would not be prohibited by the operation of the main runway, although all existing grass runways would have to close. Potentially in the order of 1,700-2,500 dwellings could come forward on land that would not be constrained by the Airport, of which around 250-350 dwellings would be in South Cambs.

181. However, there are wider considerations. The issues of noise and air quality would need to be investigated to ensure that a satisfactory residential environment could be created, and only if that could be achieved would any development be appropriate ahead of the airport relocating. The health impacts should also be carried out for any new development to assess the effect of the ongoing airport operations on the new community. Even if this indicated that some development could take place, regard must be had to the need to create a development of an appropriate scale which will relate to its surroundings.
182. It is considered that, subject to environmental and health impact assessments indicating that residential development would be acceptable adjacent to the operating Airport, and the closure of the grass runways:
- Before the relocation of the Airport is resolved, only limited development could take place both to ensure housing was at sufficient distance from the runway to protect amenity and also so that it is of a scale that can relate to, and be served by, existing development to the south. This would be in the order of 800 dwellings in total, around 60 of which would be in South Cambs;
 - Once there is certainty over the relocation of the Airport, the larger phase of development could come forward that will relate to, and be served by, the new urban quarter. This could be in the order of 1,700-2,500 dwellings in total (ie. including any earlier limited development under the first bullet), of which 250-350 dwellings would be in South Cambs.
183. Ideally, it would be desirable for the heart of the new urban quarter to come forward relatively early in the development to bring forward services and facilities for residents and also provide a critical mass to support early provision of the dedicated public transport routes to help encourage a culture of sustainable living for residents of the new development from the outset. It is much more difficult to change people's habits once they have become established. However, the long term timing of the Airport relocation may justify bringing forward a second phase of development north of Cherry Hinton if this can be satisfactorily achieved. This would also help both Councils in terms of meeting their housing land supply requirements contained in the Structure Plan to 2016.

Recommendation

184. These are significant issues that cannot be resolved for this first version of the Area Action Plan. It is suggested that the Plan highlight the potential for a second phase of development north of Cherry Hinton, identify the issues of health impact, noise and air quality as key issues to be resolved ahead of any decision on timing of this area, and make clear that this will be addressed in the review of the Area Action Plan.

Financial Implications

185. The cost of progressing the LDF including the Cambridge East AAP is set out in the Council's budget.

Legal Implications

186. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 imposes a statutory duty to prepare a Local Development Framework and to keep it up to date. Cambridge East is identified as a location for an urban extension of Cambridge in the Structure Plan in

Policy P9/2c and therefore requires a joint Area Action Plan with Cambridge City Council to take this forward.

Staffing Implications

187. The programme for the LDF has been compiled having regard to the staffing resources that the Councils can commit to planning policy preparation in the context of wider pressures for the early delivery of the development strategy set out in the Structure Plan.

Risk Management Implications

188. The Cambridge East AAP is a key Development Plan Document within the LDF and this development is a key part of the Structure Plan strategy for the Cambridge area. Whilst the development of the site as a whole is dependant on the relocation of Cambridge Airport, the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road is able to come forward early in the plan period with the Airport still operating. If the AAP is not in place at an early stage there is the risk of the development being determined by the development control and appeal process.

Consultations

189. The Preferred Options Report has been the subject of extensive public participation.

Conclusions/Summary

190. The public participation exercise has been effective at involving local communities, individuals and organisations and has given them an early opportunity to determine the direction the AAP should take. It has presented a valuable opportunity for existing residents and communities to consider the implications for them of developing a new town at Cambridge East. The Council will need to take these views into account in determining the approach to be taken in developing the Area Action Plan for Cambridge East which will guide the preparation of masterplans and any supplementary planning documents and be the starting point for determining planning applications. It is in the interests of the District as a whole to ensure a high quality urban environment which will achieve a good quality of life for the future residents of Cambridge East. Agreeing the approach to be taken in developing policies should enable the Council to meet its objective of submitting the joint AAP to the Secretary of State in the summer of this year.

Recommendations

191. Council is recommended to agree the recommendations set out in this report and Appendix 3 as the basis for developing the policies to be set out in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. Council would receive this draft AAP at the special meeting arranged for 15th April 2005.
192. It is also recommended that any minor editing changes necessary to the responses as set out in Appendix 1 be delegated to the Development Services Director, with any

which involve a material change being delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Core Strategy Preferred Options Report, SCDC, October 2004

Cambridge City Redeposit Draft Local Plan 2004

Cambridge East Area Action Plan, Preferred Options Report, SCDC/Cambridge City Council, October 2004.

Representations received in response to the above documents.

Agenda and Minutes of the meeting of the Council, 20th/21st January 2005.

Agenda and draft Minutes of the meeting of the Cambridge East Joint Member Reference Group 21st February 2005

Contact Officer: Caroline Hunt – Principal Planning Policy Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713196